

**WOMEN IN LEADERSHIP IN PRIVATE FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND
UNIVERSITIES IN KANSAS AND MISSOURI AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF
SELF AND WORKPLACE CULTURE**

Hollie Mae Becker

B.A., Theatre, Saint Mary College, 2000

B.A., History, Saint Mary College, 2001

M.A., Counseling Psychology, University of Saint Mary, 2006

M.A., Education, University of Saint Mary, 2006

Submitted to the Graduate Department and Faculty
of the School of Education of Baker University in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Education
in
Educational Leadership

March, 2008

Copyright 2008 by Hollie Mae Becker

Clinical Research Study Committee

Major Advisor

ABSTRACT

This study expands the work begun by Kathryn Smoot Egan in 1994, which she revisited in 1996, and which was replicated by Christine Lash in 2000. Egan and Lash's studies attempted to classify women's worldviews and mentoring styles using Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule's 1986 theory of women's cognitive development. The purpose of this study is to gather information about the perceptions women leaders have toward their workplace, their work, themselves and career mentoring or, in the words of Kathryn Egan, "women's worldview or epistemologies." This study seeks to determine what commonalities exist among women who have achieved leadership positions at accredited, private four-year colleges and universities in Kansas and Missouri. Furthermore, it seeks to follow up Egan's work by examining how women protégés learn from and relate to their mentors.

This study contains both qualitative and quantitative elements, and was conducted with a descriptive approach. The study was conducted through survey research, using Kathryn Egan's survey in an electronic format, with an additional section regarding demographics. The survey utilized a cross-sectional design.

Research Hypotheses

The researcher formulated three research hypotheses. They were:

Research Hypothesis One: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of self as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

Research Hypothesis Two: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of the workplace as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

Research Hypothesis Three: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of self in relation to the workplace as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

As a result of the one-way ANOVAs run on the data from this study, no differences were seen between groups at the 0.05 level. Therefore, the researcher accepted all three Research Hypotheses. It seems surprising to find no differences between groups since, according to Egan's theory, women in higher positions would tend to be more fully developed on the hierarchy, and therefore would hold different perceptions of self and self in relation to workplace. One possible explanation for the lack of statistically significant difference between groups could be the group of presidents was not large enough, as there were only 6. Another possible explanation could be Egan obtained her results from women working in the media field, with members in national organizations, while this study had participants only from the states of Kansas and Missouri in the field of education.

DEDICATION

This clinical research study is dedicated to my four most favorite people in the world, who also happen to be my biggest fans – my grandparents, my husband, and my mom-
my own personal trifecta.

To my grandpa, Duane Becker,

For his unwavering support, his constant words of wisdom, his love, guidance and “at-a-girls,” and for being the best father any girl could ever wish for.

To my grandma, Nancy Becker,

For her endless love, her bountiful words of encouragement, her fiery spirit, for making me never doubt how much I was loved, for always telling me I am her “special girl,” and for being the most incredible woman I know.

To my husband, Mika Sorri,

For everything – for his limitless supply of smiles and encouragement, for always having my back, for thinking that I am capable of anything, for loving and supporting me unconditionally and without limit, for agreeing to postpone our honeymoon for two years so that I could finish my degree and, most importantly, for making my life complete.

You make me happier than I ever thought was possible.

To my mom, Sandy Bell,

For her encouraging words, her big heart, and her endless love and support.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As I write this I can hardly believe I am at this point in my doctoral program – the end! It has been a long, hard, and very emotional journey for me. There are several people who were essential to my success and I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge and thank:

My family: my grandparents, Duane and Nancy, my husband, Mika and my mom, Sandy.

Thanks for picking up the slack when I was overwhelmed at school, for being so thoughtful and caring, and for being so supportive. I could not have done this without you! I am so lucky!

Danielle Trebus, my mentor, my buddy, and my friend. You were the one who helped pick up the pieces when my first topic did not work out, and you gave me the idea for this one. Your help in researching, and most of all your love, support, and encouragement have made it possible for me to do this. You have always believed in me – and I appreciate you more than you could ever know.

My major advisor, Dr. Susan Rogers, who provided support and encouragement throughout this entire process. Thank you for having such high expectations -- I am a better student, researcher, and writer because of you. You always came through for me, and I really appreciate everything you have done for me.

Dr. Karl Krawitz, for being such an incredible teacher. You were always willing to make time for me, even when you did not have the time. Your help with my statistics has been invaluable and I could not have gotten through this without you. Thanks for your generosity, your guidance, and your support. I really appreciate everything.

Dr. Sandra Vanhose, Dr. Marc Carter and Dr. Willie Amison, for serving on my committee and giving me such wonderful and constructive feedback. I appreciate the time you took to be a part of this journey, and I also appreciate your support.

All of the teachers who have impacted my life:

Dr. Kelly Farrar, you are one of the most incredible people I know. I have so much respect for you, and you are one of the best teachers I ever had. Thanks for your continued support and encouragement. I am so glad you are a part of my life.

Sister Mary Pat Lenahan, you are such an inspirational person. Your dedication and passion are so contagious and, as I have told you many times, I always think of you in my darkest days, and everything seems better.

Van Ibsen and Danielle Trebus, you both were a wonderful part of my college experience. I learned so much about theatre, about myself, and about life from you both. Thanks so much for all you do and for how much of yourselves you invest into your work.

And last, but certainly not least, my two dearest friends in the world,

Katie Litras and Veronica Klapp.

Katie, you have taught me the importance of loosening up and not always being an overachiever. You have always supported me, even when I took on too much, and you never fail to make me laugh. You are an incredible person and a wonderful friend.

I love you so much.

And Veronica, if I did not know any better, I would say you were Katie's twin! You have been such a great friend and I deeply appreciate all your love and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	xii
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	7
Research Questions.....	8
Research Hypotheses.....	9
Definitions.....	9
Limitations and Delimitations.....	10
Assumptions.....	11
Significance of the Study.....	11
Overview of Methodology.....	11
Organization of the Clinical Research Study.....	12
CHAPTER TWO.....	13
Introduction.....	13
Organization of the Chapter.....	14
Why Study Women Leaders?.....	14
Brief History of the Struggle for Women’s Rights.....	15
It Starts at the Beginning: Society and the Subordination of Women.....	23
Mentoring.....	33
The Wage Gap.....	35
Kathryn Egan’s Theory.....	38
Summary.....	41
CHAPTER THREE.....	43
Introduction.....	43
Research Hypotheses.....	43
Research Design.....	44
Population and Participants.....	45
Research Instrument.....	45
Data Collection Procedures.....	46
Statistical Analysis.....	47
Bias and Error.....	48
Reliability and Validity.....	49
Summary.....	49
CHAPTER FOUR.....	50
Introduction.....	50
Research Hypotheses.....	51
Methodology Summary.....	51
Population and Participants.....	53
Epistemological Results.....	54

Perceptions Results	56
Mentoring Results	59
Summary	62
CHAPTER FIVE	63
Introduction.....	63
Summary of Results.....	63
Discussion of Results.....	64
Relationship of Results to Theory.....	65
Summary and Conclusion.....	66
Implications for Further Research and Practice.....	66
APPENDICES	68
WORKS CITED.....	120

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Number of Full-time Wage and Salary Workers, 2000-2005	27
Table 2. Median Weekly Earnings of Full-time Wage and Salary Workers, 2000-2005..	37
Table 3. List of Private, 4-year Colleges and Universities in Kansas and Location.....	52
Table 4. List of Private, 4-year Colleges and Universities in Missouri and Location.....	53
Table 5. Job Titles of Participants.....	54
Table 6. Epistemological Results: Constructivists and Proceduralists by Group.....	55
Table 7. Perceptions of Self Statements	56
Table 8. One-Way ANOVA on Perceptions of Self Statements	57
Table 9. Perceptions of Workplace Statements	57
Table 10. One-Way ANOVA on Perceptions of Workplace Statements	58
Table 11. Perceptions of Self in Relation to the Workplace Statements.	58
Table 12. One-Way ANOVA on Perceptions of Self in Relation to Workplace Statements.....	59
Table 13. Mentoring Results: Number of Mentors.....	59
Table 14. Mentoring Results: “I could have gotten where I am without my mentor”	60
Table 15. Mentoring Results: “My mentor gave me emotional support”.....	61
Table 16. Mentoring Results: Length of Longest Mentoring Relationship	61

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: IRB Application.....71

Appendix B: IRB Letter of Approval.....76

Appendix C: E-mail from Dr. Kathryn Egan Granting Permission to Use
Survey.....78

Appendix D: Email Invitation Sent to Women Leaders.....80

Appendix E: Egan’s Survey Questionnaire82

Appendix F: Demographic Section Added to Survey.....89

Appendix G: Epistemological Statements.....92

Appendix H: Perceptions of Self Full Data Table.....94

Appendix I: Perceptions of Workplace Full Data Table.....97

Appendix J: Perceptions of Self in Relation to Workplace Full Data
Table.....100

Appendix K: Full Demographic Data.....103

Appendix L: Full Mentoring Data.....110

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

According to Linda Babcock and Sara Laschever, “from the mid-1980s to the mid-1990s, the percentage of college presidents who were women more than doubled -- from 9.5 percent to 21.2 percent” (xiii). In addition, it has been reported that “colleges and universities are hiring more female presidents than ever before. But some observers of the college presidency question whether women are considered for the plum leadership jobs, and whether they wield much clout on their campuses or around the country” (Leatherman A19). At the time that this clinical research study was written, out of 42 private four-year colleges and universities in Kansas and Missouri, only 7 institutions had women presidents. The researcher wished to investigate how many women held leadership positions at these institutions, and what their perceptions were regarding self, workplace, and self in relation to workplace. Furthermore, the researcher wished to examine their backgrounds and experience with career mentoring.

Although it seems today that inequity in the workplace is a gross impediment to achieving sexual equality, it was not so long ago that women were denied certain basic rights which we now take for granted. According to Babcock and Laschever, even though women were given the right to vote in the states of Wyoming and Utah in 1869 and 1870, respectively, no country granted women voting rights until New Zealand did so in 1893, followed by the U.S. in 1920 and England in 1924, less than a hundred years ago (24). In fact, Switzerland did not grant women the right to vote until “the astonishingly late date of 1971” (24). Furthermore, “no woman was allowed to earn a

Bachelor of Science degree anywhere in the British Empire until 1875” (24). In the United States, around the same time, the first major female American psychologist, Christina Ladd Franklin, was denied her degree from John Hopkins University. Even though she published her dissertation in 1883, she was not granted her Ph.D. until 1926 (25). In addition, divorce was not even an option for women of the past. Carl Degler explains that “before 1773 not a single petition for divorce by a woman in Massachusetts on the grounds of adultery by a husband was accepted by the courts, though many had been from husbands alleging such behavior on the part of their wives” (17). Indeed, women in the late 1700s through the late 1800s lived in a very different time, with very explicit and restrictive regulations to live by.

To be certain, there are more women leaders today than there were ten, twenty, or fifty years ago. For instance in July of 2006, Baker University, in Baldwin City, Kansas, appointed the first female president in the 150 years of its existence. However, this increase in women achieving top leadership positions has slowed significantly in recent times. Between 1998 and 2001, the number of women hired as college presidents increased by only 1.8 percentage points (Babcock and Laschever xiii). This could be due to the increasing number of women in the job market, or to gender discrimination, or to a combination of both. However, as Courtney Leatherman points out, when over half of undergraduates are women and over half of Ph.D.s go to women, “to find only 12 percent in the top posts says to me something is seriously wrong” (A20).

Indeed, women comprise a larger proportion of student bodies across the United States, and are entering the work force in areas that, until recently, have traditionally been male-dominated. In fact, while in 1900 only 1 in 5 workers were female, today

almost half of the job force is comprised of women (Goldin 3). Babcock and Laschever state that more women are participating in the United States' work force than at any other time in recent memory: "In the year 2000 in the United States, 76.8 percent of women aged 25 to 54 worked outside the home compared to 64 percent of women in that age group in 1980, a 20 percent increase in 20 years. Women's share of self-employment also increased from 22 percent in 1976 to 38 percent in 2000, with a total of 3.8 million women in the United States self-employed in the year 2000" (xi).

In comparison, women of today seem to have come an astoundingly long way, having not only acquired the right to vote, and the right to divorce their husbands, but having also taken a place in the workforce alongside, and sometimes even supervising, men. Due to these advancements, much of the discussion about women's equality has quieted. Is this seeming satisfaction the result of a perception that women have "caught up" with men in terms of education, pay, and advancement? Some would say yes -- yet the careful observer still reads headlines such as "Unequal Pay for Equal Work: The Gender Gap in Academic Medicine," "New Measures for Gender Inequities," "The Wage Gap: Why Women Are Still Paid Less Than Men," and so on. Radio stations still play songs such as "I'm Just a Girl" by No Doubt. Books with catchy names like Cult of Power: Sex Discrimination in Corporate America and What Can Be Done about It by Martha Burk and Getting Even: Why Women Get Paid Less than Men, and What to Do about It by Evelyn Murphy fill book shelves in local stores.

In their book Women Don't Ask: Negotiation and the Gender Divide, Babcock and Laschever state, "Just because a few women manage to succeed despite the impediments our society erects in their paths doesn't mean that these impediments

don't exist or that there's no problem" (16). Evelyn Murphy agrees, adding, "the most blatant barriers to women in the workforce may be down, but that just makes eliminating the 'hidden' barriers – unspoken assumptions, unexamined attitudes, habitual ways of behaving – that much more urgent" (7). In addition, Aburdene and Naisbitt purport that "women's liberation has not yet been achieved" (xv).

These barriers do not solely restrict women's paychecks, but also their opportunities, such as the opportunity to be mentored. Gardiner, Enomoto, and Grogan, authors of Coloring Outside the Lines: Mentoring Women into School Leadership, states "the under-representation of women in high-level leadership positions is thought to be connected to mentoring. Mentoring and role modeling are essential for success in educational administration, and women have limited access to both" (6). Even when women find willing male mentors, the relationship forged is not necessarily an effective one, because often times the mentors cannot relate to their protégé.

Other researchers have discussed the impact of socialization on women – how since the time they are born women are taught certain gender appropriate behaviors, which may lead them to never consider pursuing a leadership position. According to Gardiner et al. "gender stereotypes about women 'not being as tough as men,' or 'women not being able to understand fiscal matters or manage money,' have a negative effect on women. Women may challenge these stereotypes themselves, but nevertheless they feel these public views may serve to heighten a woman's concerns about taking on a high-level leadership role" (105). Aretha Pigford agrees:

From the moment the magical words, "It's a boy!" or "It's a girl!" are uttered, children are provided different messages and experiences based

solely upon their gender. Dressed in their dainty, pink outfits, girls are treated like fragile creatures who must be protected and handled with care. In pairs or small groups, they learn to play games where everyone gets a turn, winning is not stressed, and boasting is discouraged. Throughout their formative years, girls learn the importance of being polite, clean, and courteous. Boys, on the other hand, are encouraged to be active, to explore, to be independent, and to take charge. They play games that have definite leaders and followers as well as clear winners and losers. (9)

Gloria Steinem, a famous feminist journalist, states, “the first problem for all of us, men and women, is not to learn, but to unlearn” (1). Linda Babcock and Sara Laschever agree; “Observing that much of the world is controlled by men, children incorporate this information into their gender schemas and conclude that this is not merely the way things are, but the way things should be” (28). If this is indeed true, it means that even though more women leaders exist today than ever before, many more have the ability, and even the opportunity, but have been brainwashed from birth to believe they are not capable of performing, or should not pursue a leadership position.

This indoctrination can leave a number of women feeling as though something were missing. Betty Friedan, author of the famous feminist work The Feminist Mystique, perhaps sums it up best when she wrote:

The problem lay buried, unspoken, for many years in the minds of American women. It was a strange stirring, a sense of dissatisfaction, a yearning that women suffered in the middle of the twentieth century in

the United States. Each suburban wife struggled with it alone. As she made the beds, shopped for groceries, matched slipcover material, ate peanut butter sandwiches with her children, chauffeured Cub Scouts and Brownies, lay beside her husband at night – she was afraid to ask even of herself the silent question – ‘Is this all?’ (15)

Even more alarming than the social and professional barriers faced by women, is the fact that even when some women do achieve a leadership position, they still get paid less than men in the same positions do – and may not ever realize it. Many researchers claim that a gap still exists between men and women in terms of pay and advancement. “One year out of college, women working full-time earn 80 percent of what men earn [...] ten years later, women earn 69 percent as much as men earn” (On Payday 1). Babcock et al. contend that “women working full-time – not part-time, not on maternity leaves, not as consultants – still only earn 77 cents for every full-time male dollar” (3). Gardiner, Enomoto, and Grogan agree, adding that even though the number of women who have successfully attained positions of leadership in education has increased, the glass ceiling still has not been broken (5).

It seems surprising that there has not recently been as much dialogue about the wage gap as there has in past decades. Babcock and Laschever claim this is because until now, women have dedicated so much of their lives to unpaid labor in the home that they are “unaccustomed to thinking of their work in terms of its dollar value” (43). Murphy agrees, explaining:

Many women were dumbstruck by how much more money they were making than they’d ever imagined possible. Women were comparing

themselves with themselves, their income and achievements with their own expectations – and by that measure, they were doing great. But the wage gap is not about an individual’s comparison with herself. It compares the average earnings of all women with the average earnings of all men. (5)

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to gather information about the perceptions women leaders have toward their workplace, their work, themselves and career mentoring. Research offers compelling evidence that women still have tremendous odds to overcome to secure leadership roles.

For example, women seeking mentors encounter obstacles that men do not, because there are significantly fewer females who have been successful in obtaining leadership positions available to guide or advise other women. Kathryn Egan, in her research, indicates “research focused on women in mentoring relationships provides evidence that one or more mentoring relationships result in the same benefits for women as for men -- benefits such as greater job success and satisfaction, and perceptions of having personal power and influence within their organizations” (Flexible Mentoring 401). Moreover, she purports women have a unique need to balance career and family relationships, while at the same time needing to achieve the goals they have set for themselves. Her intent in creating her study was to “help women define what they require in a mentor in order to achieve success” (402), since research states mentoring is one of the biggest determiners of women’s success as leaders. This study seeks to determine what commonalities exist among the women who have

successfully achieved leadership positions at accredited, private, four-year colleges and universities in Kansas and Missouri. Furthermore, it seeks to follow up Egan's work by examining how women protégés learn from and relate to their mentors. In Egan's article Women Who Succeed, she states:

Some women have overcome the barriers to achieving tenure and promotion and have successfully reached career goals within the traditional academic system, while at the same time achieving success within the context of personal life goals and relationships. These women may provide role models and guidelines for structuring a new academic environment. In order to derive such guidelines, academics need to understand how these women overcame the barriers. (961)

Kathryn Smoot Egan published two studies, the first in 1994 in Journalism Quarterly and the second in 1996 in The Journal of Business Communication. Both were aimed at specifically measuring women's hierarchical stage of development (according to Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule's Women's Ways of Knowing) and the mentor-protégé relationship in a business context. This study seeks to explore if her results are applicable to the field of higher education.

Research Questions

This study aims to identify the commonalities, if any exist, between women who have successfully attained positions of leadership in private colleges and universities in Kansas and Missouri.

Research Question One: Do they share similar educational and/or family backgrounds and experiences?

Research Question Two: Have they had at least one positive mentoring relationship?

Research Question Three: Do they work in an equitable environment?

Research Question Four: Do they feel they have control over their careers and/or lives?

Research Question Five: Are women in certain job titles (such as president, or dean, and so on) in the same category of epistemological development?

Research Hypotheses

The researcher formulated three research hypotheses. They were:

Research Hypothesis One: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of self as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

Research Hypothesis Two: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of the workplace as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

Research Hypothesis Three: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of self in relation to the workplace as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

Definitions

A **leader** (or **position of leadership**) shall be defined as any woman who is a college or university president, vice-president, chancellor, vice-chancellor, executive director, director, dean, assistant dean, associate dean, or a department chair at an accredited, private four-year college or university in Kansas and Missouri.

Mentoring shall be defined using Gardiner, Enomoto, and Grogan's definition: "Mentoring is characterized as an active, engaged and intentional relationship between two individuals based upon mutual understanding to serve primarily the professional needs of the protégé. Quality mentoring relationships can be distinguished by certain ways of relating, by expectations and parameters placed on the relationship that serve to promote the protégés' professional success and well being" (52).

Limitations and Delimitations

Inherent in any study is a set of limitations, or possible flaws in the study that are out of the control of the researcher. In order to compile a list of all women leaders meeting the definition, the researcher searched each college and university's web site. If the college or university did not have an up-to-date or complete list, then there may have been some women left off of the list. Moreover, most institutions did not have pictures available online, so when the list was being compiled it was difficult to discern if some names were male or female. For example, the researcher sent invitations to participate in this study to several men by mistake, assuming names such as Kim or Frances were female. Likewise, names such as Pat were left off, unless evidence showed Pat was short for Patricia. Terri and Terrie names were included, but not Terry, and so on. Therefore, the compiled list is most likely not 100 percent accurate.

In addition, this study is limited in its generalizability, as all women asked to participate were leaders in Kansas and Missouri. While women leaders from other Midwestern states might answer the questions in the survey similarly, women from states on the East and West coasts of the United States might have completely different answers and/or experiences. Finally, another limitation of this study was that, due to

turn-over, women who were no longer in leadership positions might have participated, and women who are now in leadership positions might not have been invited because they were too new to the institution to have been listed.

Delimitations, on the other hand, are boundaries purposefully set up by the researcher in order to make the study manageable. In this case, the study was delimited to Kansas and Missouri women leaders only. Furthermore, only women who fit the definition were invited to participate.

Assumptions

The researcher assumes that the women who received an electronic invitation and chose to participate in this study took the survey themselves, and they were honest in their answers.

Significance of the Study

This study promises to add to the literature on women in leadership positions in the field of higher education. It also might provide insight into what traits, characteristics, backgrounds, and/or experiences women who have been successful in obtaining leadership positions have in common. This identification of commonalities can assist other researchers and institutions to support the next generation of women leaders to develop the traits and characteristics that will help enable them to obtain and retain positions of leadership.

Overview of Methodology

The researcher obtained a master list of all accredited, private 4-year colleges and universities in the states of Kansas and Missouri. From this list the researcher

searched each institution's web site, identifying the women who fit this study's definition of a leader. Each woman's name, title, and email address was recorded into a database. Next, Kathryn Egan's survey was typed into a Word document, and a demographic section was added at the beginning. The researcher purchased a subscription to SurveyMonkey.com and converted the survey to a series of online pages. Once this process was completed, an electronic invitation was sent, via email, to all women on both lists. Four additional reminders were sent, over the course of three months. Finally, the survey was closed, and the researcher downloaded the results into SPSS software for data analysis.

Organization of the Clinical Research Study

This clinical research study is organized into five chapters, with a complete listing of all contents in the Table of Contents. Chapter Two is a review of the literature, Chapter Three contains a detailed description of this study's methodology, Chapter Four contains the results of the survey, and Chapter Five contains a discussion of the results and recommendations for future research. There is an appendix at the end that contains pertinent documents such as the approved research proposal, the survey instrument, and the written permission to use the survey, as well as the electronic invitation to participate in the survey, and additional data tables.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this particular study is to gather information about the perceptions women leaders have toward their workplace, their work, themselves and career mentoring. Kathryn Egan states “although more women have been hired into academe since affirmative action was initiated, women still are not as successful as men in achieving tenure and promotion. Women take two to ten years longer than men to achieve promotion, and their average salary is lower than men’s at every rank” (Women Who Succeed 960). Moreover, Egan purports women have a unique need to balance career and family relationships, while at the same time needing to achieve the goals they have set for themselves. Her purpose in studying women, leadership, and mentoring was to understand how women overcame the barriers they faced so that other women aspiring to leadership positions could have role models and a “map” to show how the obstacles can be overcome (961).

This study seeks to determine what commonalities exist among the women who have been successful in achieving leadership positions at accredited, private four-year colleges and universities in Kansas and Missouri. Kathryn Egan’s study, published in The Journal of Business Communication and Journalism Quarterly, was aimed at specifically measuring the mentor-protégé relationship in a business context, while this study seeks to explore whether the same results are true for the field of education.

Organization of the Chapter

This chapter is organized into several key sections. First, the purpose of studying women leaders is explained. Then a brief history of women is provided, highlighting the obstacles they have overcome in order to make it possible for them to hold positions of leadership today. In addition, the socialization of women is discussed along with the implications socialization has on potential women leaders. Mentoring is then addressed, first its beginnings, and then its purpose and benefits. Research on the wage gap is then imparted. Kathryn Egan's theory is expounded, and then a summary is offered.

Why Study Women Leaders?

With more and more women flooding the job market, something will have to change in terms of the obstacles that previously kept them from the very top positions of leadership. These changes will be relevant to women leaders in universities and college across America, not just in Kansas and Missouri. As Aburdene and Naisbitt state, however, "it is not about women taking over, but women and men together expressing their full potential – neither superior or inferior" (*xxiii*). Furthermore, Susan Madsen has this to say about the lack of research on women in leadership in higher education:

Even with the concern about the preparation of future educational leaders, there has been little research published that explores the particulars of the development of current outstanding presidents.

Further, even less is focused on the development of high-level women leaders in education. The literature does not continuously mention the

lack of women leaders in high-level; yet again, few pieces and projects have focused on the deep exploration and investigation of the backgrounds and experiences of successful women leaders.

Understanding the influences, backgrounds, and career paths of women who have succeeded in obtaining and maintaining powerful positions of influence within higher education is essential in deepening and broadening our understanding of leadership development as a whole.

(571)

Therefore, researching what makes certain women successful in obtaining and maintaining positions of leadership is time well spent, in order to provide insight as to what commonalities exist between them. This type of information can help positively influence the next generation of women leaders by arming them with the tools utilized by the women who first paved the way to the top.

Brief History of the Struggle for Women's Rights

In 1815, according to Joyce Jacobsen, author of The Economics of Gender, working women in the United States made just 29 cents for every dollar a man earned; by 1995 they had worked their way up to 74 cents on the dollar, which means they gained a raise in salary of about a fourth a penny every year (4). America evolved into an industrial society around the early to mid 1800's, and thus the number of women entering the service sector rose. "The period from 1820 to 1860 marked the evolution in America towards an industrial economy [...] Prostitution in cities, particularly New York City, appears to have risen substantially during this period" (436). Why did prostitution rise? It was a job where women could make a considerable amount of

money, and a job from which women would not be rejected. However, as wages and working conditions improved in the service and manufacturing sectors during the 1920s, prostitution became a less attractive earnings option (439).

The typewriter was largely responsible for first bringing large numbers of women into the business world as secretaries. Women looked largely to secretarial positions for employment perhaps because these positions were subordinate to men and society at that time thought it a suitable position for women to seek. Yet, the stereotype of the “fragile female” persisted, and it still remained difficult for women to find or even to get training for many jobs. In fact, Feuers claims that “when the New York YWCA in 1881 announced typing lessons for women, protests arose because it was thought that the female constitution would break under the strain” (6).

However, the 1950s saw many changes in social perspectives towards women. First, young women started attending college in larger numbers, looking to obtain what Goldin refers to as the “Mrs.” Degree. “During the 1950s, women were drawn into college by the financial value of the ‘Mrs.’ Degree. College attendance increased the chances of marrying a college-educated husband with high earnings potential [...] 57% of women graduates married before or during their year of graduation” (Jacobs 166). Second, in the 1950s employers began to prefer to employ older married women over younger women, assuming that older women would be more stable workers, since they had grown out of their child-bearing years (450).

Other disturbing practices in the work world that surfaced during this time included “marriage bars.” Joyce Jacobsen clarifies:

Marriage bars are rules dictating women employees' allowable family status. These rules relate to hiring and/or retention. In some cases, women who were hired when single and who subsequently married were not fired; however, women who became pregnant would sometimes be fired. Marriage bars were often accompanied by preferential hiring of married men. These bars arose particularly in teaching and clerical work, and they became common practice in the late 1800s through the 1930s, a period of economic depression. A 1940 survey found that about 87 percent of local school districts and over 50 percent of office workers were working under some marriage or pregnancy bar. (450)

In fact, numerous policies were established with the explicit objective of treating women differently, which in most cases, means worse (447). These policies were “instituted through court rulings, through legislation, or through individual firm or industry practices” (447). When women could find employment, they were largely employed in clerical/secretarial jobs and service occupations. By 1970, these jobs were feminized – in other words, they were the jobs available to women (take them or leave them) because these were the jobs men did not want – the “leftovers.” Jacobsen notes “only three service occupations had noticeable gains in male representation: cooks, kitchen workers, and house servants. Notably, many of the men entering these areas were members of minorities, and many were recent immigrants” (206).

While in 1900 only 1 in 5 workers was a woman, today almost half of the job force is comprised of women (Goldin 3). Yet, according to Babcock and Laschever, homemaking is still the largest single occupation for women – even in their thirties - in

the United States (44-45). Furthermore, the United States has “one of the lowest labor force participation rates for college-educated women in the developed world; only in Turkey, Ireland, Switzerland, and the Netherlands does a smaller proportion of female college graduates work for pay” (44-45).

What other jobs, besides homemaking, do women hold today? “Subordinate jobs” is the overwhelming answer. Jacobsen claims that “gender segregation in the labor force is a pervasive phenomenon with deep roots in the gender division of labor in both modern and historical societies. Segregation occurs within and between firms, occupations, and industries” (205). For example, in 2001 only 10.9 percent of the board of directors’ seats at Fortune 1000 companies were held by women (24). Blue-collar jobs remain the most heavily dominated by males, including production, craft, and transportation-related jobs, such as carpentry, electrical work, and construction. “Librarians as a whole are over 80 percent female. However, a disproportionate percentage of the most prestigious and influential positions, which are generally also the best-paying, are held by men. In fact, any position that involves supervisory capacities is disproportionately male” (208). Insofar as educational administration goes, it is a “predominantly white male occupation, with 93 percent men and 96.6 white” (Gardiner et al. 1).

It was not so long ago women could not work at all, could not vote, and could not own land – they could not make their own decisions or exercise control over their lives. “Battling for other forms of control – such as the right to own property, make free and informed choices about procreation and birth control, and work in any profession of their choosing – occupied women in Western culture for much of the twentieth

century [...] That women feel as though their lives are controlled by others should not surprise us, perhaps” (Babcock and Laschever 24). This dependence of women on men served to create an external locus of control for women, meaning that women grew up knowing that they have little to no control over their life. Babcock and Laschever explain:

Those who have an ‘internal locus of control’ feel that they ‘make life happen’ whereas those with an ‘external locus of control’ feel that life happens to them. Research has found that people with an internal locus of control spontaneously undertake activities to advance their own interests more than people with an external locus of control [...] As it turns out, the average scores for women are significantly higher on locus of control scales than those for men. This tells us that women are more likely to believe that their circumstances are controlled by others while men are more likely to believe that they can influence their circumstances and opportunities through their own actions. (23)

In addition, women’s continued lack of political and economic power further exacerbates the actuality that much of the control over their lives does in fact remain in the hands of others – namely, men. This “basic reality of life [that is, the unequal distribution of power between men and women] determines adult perceptions about who is in control and influences the developing beliefs of children. Keen observers, children study the different ways in which men and women act, the different roles they play in society, and the different preferences and abilities they display” (27).

Therefore, this issue remains an area of concern for women today. “Even today, men control both the economic and political environments in which women live and work” (24). Men are still able to acquire more “economic resources” than women – “they earn higher salaries, own more property, boast bigger stock portfolios, and leave behind larger estates when they die” (Babcock and Laschever 130). Additionally:

Over the past 35 years, affirmative action, changes in social norms, reduced gender discrimination, a decline in occupational segregation, and an increase in access to higher education for women all contributed to a dramatic improvement in women’s economic status. But our assumptions about women’s progress often far outstrip reality. Much of that progress slowed almost to a standstill in the 1990s. For full-time workers, the ratio of women’s to men’s earnings increased from 60.2 percent in 1980 to 71.6 in 1990, but between 1990 and 2000 that ratio increased only 1.6 percentage points, from 71.6 to 73.2. (xii)

Murphy adds “As the economy steamed ahead in the mid-1990s, on average, women’s earnings did not go up as much as men’s did [...] The 1990s was the decade in which women should have closed the wage gap. Women had all but closed the ‘merit gap’” (5). Why, then, when women seemed to be making so much progress on the unpredictable and incredibly demanding pathway toward equality did things slow down, and in some cases, even halt? Some scholars, including Babcock and Laschever, Martin, and Bukatko, imply the answer lies in the developmental years of females – in their conditioning from birth to accept their role to be underneath men, not beside them.

In terms of historical perspective of women in higher education, as late as the nineteenth century higher education was deemed as inappropriate for women, because their fragile natures could not handle such a taxing undertaking. Nancy Betz and Louise Fitzgerald assert:

Although it was considered appropriate for women to be taught to play a musical instrument, embroider, or to speak a genteel language such as French, any serious 'book learning' was viewed as potentially dangerous to women's fragile (i.e. 'inferior') minds and worse, to their reproductive capacities. (6)

Betz and Fitzgerald report that the first women who received a college education were "from wealthy families who valued higher education; very often such women were both gifted and the only children of encouraging fathers" (6). Today women typically outnumber and outperform men on college campuses. However, women who work in the higher education setting still suffer from what Nijole Benokraitis refers to as "microinequities," or small, minor ways in which women are treated differently, and thus disadvantaged (8). She claims some of the most common microinequities are the questioning of female faculty member's authority, using different titles for females that connote less respect, giving females less institutional resources, and giving women more comments on personal appearance (8-9). In addition, Benokraitis noted that students often addressed women faculty more informally, by using their first names or "Ms.," "Mrs.," or "Miss" rather than "Professor" or "Dr." (9).

In addition, Laura Pena asserts that women continue to be underrepresented in the top tenured and high-ranking faculty positions, especially women who are married and women who have children (277-278). Besides under-representation, women faculty

also get paid less than men. The American Association of University Professors released a report in 2006 that claimed a significant gap in salaries and in the percentages of faculty members in the senior ranks of universities, especially doctoral universities (1). Women's wages were below men at all ranks, and was largest for non-tenure track (2).

This is not to say that women have not come a long way – they have. Thanks to the strong women of yesteryear who paved the way for today's women much has changed. Margaret Madden refers to these women pioneers in higher education as the "Predecessors," the "Instigators," and the "Inheritors" (4). The "Predecessors" were women who lived in the years after the Great Depression and during World War II, who stressed the importance of education and its ability to create equality for women (4). The 1960s saw the "Instigators," who were the leaders in the feminist, civil rights, and anti-war movements (4). These women focused on the opportunities (or lack thereof) women had in education and the workforce. Finally, the "Inheritors" were the women who reaped the benefits of the efforts of the women who had gone before them – these are the women who became leaders in the 1990s (4).

Although women's opportunity for higher education and leadership has improved, there are still disturbing discrepancies. Women who desire to lead in higher educational situations have had to fight against policies that in many cases are based on decisions made over a hundred years ago by rich, white, college-educated men who had good wives at home who took care of everything needing attention, including the children. Madden maintains:

Although it is simplistic to equate hierarchical and masculine values, traditional hierarchical management is characterized as a ‘military model’ designed to control the role of emotion and caring in organizations [...] Male dominance has been treated as too obvious to discuss, leading to failure to thoroughly analyze how deeply embedded gender constructs are in organizations. (5)

It Starts at the Beginning: Society and the Subordination of Women

Is it merely coincidence that so many women in history only worked in a subordinate role? Did these women never aspire to be anything more than a secretary, waitress, teacher, or librarian? Many scholars claim that these women did not simply have low career aspirations, but rather, were socially conditioned from the moment they drew breath to want, and expect, nothing more than to serve and be subordinate to men. Astin asserts that “women, as a result of their socialization, lack strong expectations for personal efficacy in relationship to many career-related behaviors, and thus fail to fully realize their capabilities and talents in career pursuits” (118).

Parents, whose influence has a profound impact upon the development of their children’s internal belief systems, often pass on the same messages they received about what it means to be feminine and masculine. This means that some women, although they might possess the talents and skills required to lead, may never even pursue a leadership position. Pigford avers that “whether by accident or design, the socialization of males prepares them to be leaders, while the socialization of females prepares them to be helpers” (10). In addition, Bukatko states “girls show a heightened sensitivity to emotions compared with boys [...] observations of parents’ behaviors suggest that

many of these sex differences that appear later in childhood may be taught or modeled directly in interactions that begin in infancy but are especially apparent in the preschool years” (311). In addition to differences in emotions, oftentimes girls are conditioned to behave dependently and boys independently:

In her review of research on children’s household chores, Jacqueline Goodnow observed that, in addition to being given chores that emphasize their dependence, girls are also assigned chores that must be performed on a more routine basis, such as cooking and cleaning. Boys’ chores, while encouraging their independence, also tend to involve less frequent tasks such as washing the car, shoveling the snow, and taking out the garbage. (Babcock and Laschever 46-47)

Thus it seems that many girls are socialized from birth to depend on others. However, this dependence is not only reinforced through the assignment of household chores. This concept is reinforced in children through observation of the behavior of the men and women around them, especially parents. At the dinner table, men usually remain seated and women serve, suggesting “men are the ‘bosses’ and women are the ‘workers’ in the household – men are in control and women do their bidding” (28). Researchers also call attention to gender behavior in the car - when both parents are in the car, men drive more than women. Even marriage is unequal; men rarely change their names when they get married, but many women do. In addition, an abundance of research has shown women do a considerable amount of housework, much more than men (28). Furthermore, on average, women take more responsibility for caring for their children than men do. Research shows that “today’s employed mother spends as much

time on child care as the non-employed mother of 1975” (Martin 91). Furthermore, married women are responsible for much more household work - “[Women] who work for pay average about thirty-three hours of housework per week – about two-thirds of the total household work. Married men who are employed do fourteen to eighteen hours of housework per week” (Babcock and Laschever 180). This unequal division of labor costs women – costs married women in terms of the extra stress and burden placed upon them, and costs the young female children of the families in terms of them being socially brainwashed into thinking housework, along with other menial duties, are a woman’s job -

The impact of this unequal division of household labor is substantial and measurable. Research has shown that women with families who work full-time experience far higher levels of stress than their male counterparts, and that their excessive stress is due not to demands of their employment but to the weight of their responsibilities at home.

(181)

Moreover, as the number of women working outside of the home has increased, so has the pressure to be everything to everyone – a devoted mother, a doting wife, an obedient daughter, a generous friend, and to top it all off, a dedicated, motivated employee. As Feuers states, “women have to be willing to pay the price that men pay. They have to be willing to work extra hours, to travel, perhaps to stay away from home for extended periods. They have to be able to take pressure, be willing, if necessary, to work some distance from their homes, or if need be, to pick up and move to new jobs”

(10). Women may indeed pay this price, but there are still more barriers they must overcome – both internal and external barriers.

External barriers include unfair policies and regulations, such as unfair hiring practices. Martin states, “though discrimination is generally less blatant today, women are still treated unfairly, often due to prejudice and stereotypical thinking” (90).

Internal barriers include the often impossible demands placed on working women and mothers, and the conviction of impressionable young girls that they are violating the “natural order” of the universe (men lead and women follow) by exerting their own independence. Indeed, some children are conditioned to believe that not only do men and women have very separate jobs and responsibilities, but they also have very different inherent characteristics -- men are supposed to be “assertive, dominant, decisive, ambitious, and self-oriented, whereas women are thought to be warm, expressive, nurturing, emotional, and friendly” (Babcock and Laschever 62). Children constantly observe that the world is controlled by men, and so integrate this basic idea into the gender schemas they form, concluding this is not simply the ways things are, but the way they should be (28).

So what impact does this all have on potential women leaders? If this is true, then although more women leaders exist than ever before, many more should, but have been conditioned from birth to believe that they are not capable of performing, or should not pursue a leadership position; “Many women do not aspire to administration, or the level of administration they are capable of, because of the conflicts involved and the perceived costs to themselves and their personal goals in life, and the additional difficulties they face” (123). Considering the fact that on top of these detriments to

attaining leadership, some women decide to not participate in the workforce at all, it is no surprise that there is a scarcity of women in the top leadership positions.

As Table 1 illustrates, the number of males who participate in the work force as full-time workers, both salaried and hourly, no matter what age, is much larger than the number females who participate, even in 2005. We have a long way to go to assist women in mustering the self-confidence to pursue employment and, once there, to pursue leadership positions.

Table 1

Number of Full-time Wage and Salary Workers (in number of people), 2000-2005

Characteristic	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Males (total)	57,107,000	56,835,000	56,345,000	56,227,000	57,001,000	58,406,000
16-24 years old	6,770,000	6,555,000	6,317,000	6,158,000	6,243,000	6,396,000
25 years and up	50,337,000	50,279,000	50,027,000	50,069,000	50,758,000	52,010,000
Females (total)	44,103,000	44,206,000	43,737,000	44,076,000	44,223,000	45,154,000
16-24 years old	5,094,000	5,033,000	4,804,000	4,632,000	4,633,000	4,711,000
25 years and up	39,009,000	39,172,000	38,933,000	39,444,000	39,590,000	40,443,000

Source: United States. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Full-time Wage and Salary Workers

– Number and Earnings, 2000-2005. Bulletin 2307. 16 October 2007.

<http://www.bls.gov/cps/home.htm>

Furthermore, Pigford asserts that:

While external barriers have certainly affected the representation of women in administration, internal barriers have also played a major role. Socialized to be followers, many women have developed self-limiting

beliefs about their roles and abilities [.. causing] them to restrict their professional choices to roles viewed as “gender appropriate.” (6)

She goes on to state that “given their socialization and the fact that a leader is defined using what are generally considered ‘masculine’ traits, women seeking positions of leadership may find themselves in a quandary. They can be either women or leaders; to be both is generally viewed as contradictory” (10).

This leaves women with two options: “1. to redefine leadership to include a “feminine” perspective 2. to be resocialized” (10). It may be more realistic for women currently seeking leadership positions to attempt to be resocialized - “Women [must] blend the characteristic male qualities, such as decisiveness and toughness, with the female qualities of warmth and inclusiveness” (90). As Joan Acker states, “the most powerful organizational positions are almost entirely occupied by men, with the exception of the occasional biological female who acts as a social man” (139). Gardiner et al. agree, adding, “women administrators have additional difficulty learning their administrative role because there are conflicting attitudes about the stereotype of what it means to be female and what it means to be an administrator” (8).

Unfortunately, many women remain disinclined to obtain, or even attempt to obtain, leadership positions because they consider the pursuit to be unfeminine, unladylike, and/or pushy. In addition, Kessler-Harris claims “until late in the 1960s, and perhaps even after, most men and women tended to agree that the normal order of family life properly subsumed women within its boundaries, rendering their needs and desires, as well as rights and obligations, secondary to those of husbands and children”

(3). According to Albino, women who “have moved upward upset the power balance and sometimes embarrass and threaten men – and even other women” (49).

Why is it so alarming that women may not choose to go into leadership, even though they are perfectly capable? One main reason is because leadership positions afford leaders a tremendous influence and range of power; that is, women leaders can affect a large circle of influence on other women. Madsen explains:

The role and leadership abilities of university presidents or chancellors is of particular importance in higher education because of the influence and power these leaders have on the direction and strategy of their institutions and also the relationships they have with government officials, board of regents, legislatures, business and community leaders and members, and their own faculty, staff, and administrators. (571)

Yet, Pigford asserts that women who might aspire to become a leader are often unwilling to risk negative reactions from both men and women, and so feel forced to “keep their aspirations a secret. Fearing that they will be perceived as ‘pushy’ if they take the initiative to apply for a position, women usually wait to be asked to do so” (11). In fact, Babcock and Laschever note that “proper” women typically should wait to be asked to do almost anything: “Until quite recently, women were taught that they needed to wait for men to ask them to dance, to go out on dates, and to marry them, and the influence of this idea persists to this day” (25).

Even on edgy sitcoms such as the smash hit *Friends*, the occurrence of the strong, outspoken character of Monica proposing to her boyfriend, Chandler, was met with raised eyebrows. Women simply do not do those types of things, such as paying

for dinner, proposing marriage, earning more than their husbands – or at least, they shouldn't. And this perception of women goes back much further than recent history. As far back as Homer, women who were strong or wise often had to disguise those traits, because those traits have historically been attributed only to men. For example, Gardiner et al. relate the origin of the word “mentor”:

According to Homer's tale of the adventures of Odysseus, the Greek goddess of wisdom Athena is responsible for the mentoring of the youth Telemachus while his seafaring father Odysseus is away. Disguised as Mentor, a loyal friend of Odysseus, Athena aids and guides the young man. She acts as trusted friend and counselor in all aspects of the boy's life. Thus, originates the English word “mentoring.” (169)

Here we must note that the only way Athena can acceptably provide guidance for a male is to become male herself, much as many women who strive to attain leadership positions must take on qualities usually defined as ‘male.’

How, then, do women manage to obtain and maintain positions of leadership? For many, it means breaking the glass ceiling, or the invisible barrier that exists for many women in the workforce, that enables them to climb only so far up the career ladder, where they then must stop and watch their male counterparts climb higher. Gardiner et al. discuss the glass ceiling as “a term that has been applied to explain the under-representation of women and minorities in leadership as a result of the presence of informal barriers that impose a ceiling on achievement” (5).

Jacobsen notes that several ways to break through the glass ceiling have been developed. “Various programs have been suggested for trying to help women ‘crack the

glass ceiling.’ They include reducing workloads after they give birth and offering training sessions to promote leadership development” (207). Furthermore, holding onto positions of leadership seems a particularly daunting task for women especially since, as Albino points out, “when a woman is the only one (or one of very few women) in a work setting, she generally is scrutinized more closely, pressured to side with the majority against other women, and expected to conform to stereotypes. Thus, there is an extraordinary pressure on women not to make mistakes” (48).

However, some claim that the glass ceiling is an outdated concept, because there are laws protecting the equal rights of women to advance as high as their talent can take them. Janeen Baxter and Erik Wright, in their study in 2000, state “that while there is strong evidence for a general gender gap in authority—the odds of women having authority are less than those of men—there is no evidence for systematic glass ceiling effects in the United States” (275). Yet Gardiner et al. disagree: “The number of women in educational leadership has increased, yet the glass ceiling has not been broken” (5). Babcock and Laschever disagree as well, claiming “women’s progress into positions of leadership in professions that were previously closed to them has also been far from complete” (xii). Judith Albino states “I have proved time and time again that I can work as long, as hard, and as well at my job as any man. But there is a point at which something else is required to get ahead” (47).

Despite the fact that barriers to women’s advancement in the workforce still exist, talk of women’s equality has sharply declined in the last decade. This might be because women today have come an astoundingly long way in the last century, not only by acquiring the right to vote, but also by taking their place in the work force alongside,

and sometimes even supervising, men. Perhaps much of the discussion about women's equality has quieted as a result of the enormity of these changes, perhaps this silence represents a recuperative period in which women are adjusting to the new possibilities open to them, or perhaps the perception exists that women have finally "caught up" with men in terms of education, pay, and advancement.

Pigford does not agree that women have achieved equal footing with men, arguing that although the times have changed, many of the barriers confronting women have not (4). And once barriers have been broken in order to obtain a position of importance, and/or leadership, some women are able to hold on to those positions only by blending in - by causing no waves in the workplace, and not calling attention to themselves. Gardiner et al. state that "women also are sometimes succeeding by fitting in and placing no special demands on the organization, and this comes at a cost to women individually and collectively" (103). Furthermore, they continue, "women seeking inclusion have had to negotiate the conflicting demands made upon them by their dual role as best they could on an individual basis" (103).

However, this does not mean that a woman can rest on her laurels once she has achieved a leadership position; she must constantly wage battles against false stereotypes and perceptions in order to maintain her status as a leader. For instance, Gardiner et al. note that although perceptions have changed somewhat, it is still a widely accepted notion that men are more rational beings, while women are much more emotional (105). They go on to assert that "perceptions of difference, different experiences or styles of leadership is not the problem; it is prevailing attitudes and assumptions concerning women in leadership" (8).

Moreover, many of the barriers women face are not just concerned with pay or stereotypes, but also with opportunities - such as the opportunity to be mentored. Mary Gardiner, Ernestine Enomoto, and Margaret Grogan state “the underrepresentation of women in high-level leadership positions is thought to be connected to mentoring. Mentoring and role modeling are essential for success in educational administration and women have limited access to both” (6).

Mentoring

In much of the literature, including Egan’s work and that of Gardiner, Enomoto and Grogan, mentoring is listed as an essential ingredient for keeping a position once it is obtained, and also, therefore, a key to career success. “There is probably no other single relationship that can be instrumental in enhancing an administrative career in higher education than a quality mentoring relationship” (Gardiner et al. 5-6). When quality mentoring is provided, it can serve as a means to create opportunities for success and advancement. Gardiner et al. note:

D.J. Levinson and his colleagues, as early as 1978, reported that mentorship was critical for men’s advancement in educational administration. Typically, mentorship is the special and favored relationship that is cultivated whereby the mentor counsels, guides, and helps the protégé to develop both personally and professionally. (5)

Even beyond the actual mentoring process, relationships and networks created through the mentoring relationship can be essential to a woman’s success - “Knowing the right people is still one of the quickest ways to career advancement. For women in particular, having contacts or mentors can be critical” (Pigford 28). Furthermore,

Gardiner et al. assert “success often depends not only on what you know but whom you know – not only on hard work, but also on encouragement, support and advocacy from those who are already established in the system” (5).

But what exactly is a mentor? Pigford defines a mentor as “a more experienced person at a higher level in your organization who takes a promising younger person under his or her wing as a protégé” (28). Gardiner et al., however, believe that mentors serve additional purposes:

Mentors have the special capacity to help women to garner the political support that they need from others, by sharing the inside information about the organization. They can help protégés to keep their own identities and selves, not to prostitute themselves to organizational cultures. (27)

Moreover, they emphasize good mentors are “passionately committed to social justice and equality, and therefore purposefully mentor women into leadership positions” (62).

Mentors also provide a variety of functions for their protégé - they provide feedback, appraisal, and perhaps most importantly, support. Good mentors encourage on-going reflection and self-evaluation. They also “advise you of potential job vacancies. They serve as role models. They introduce you to the ‘right’ people” (Pigford 29). “All new administrators need to develop expertise in tasks such as budgeting, personnel administration, legal, and student issues. Mentors can support protégés by providing management training, as well as enabling and encouraging their protégés to assume such tasks” (Gardiner et al. 76).

The question arises, then, if mentoring is so critical to administrative success, why is it often so unavailable to women and minorities? Gardiner et al. postulate that it is unavailable because of where mentoring grew from – the “old boy network.” On the very first page of their book, they state:

We argue that the dominant culture of educational administration is androcentric, meaning informed by white, male norms. Mentoring has been a part of this androcentric culture of educational administration. Women have been, and still are in many respects, on the borders, with ‘outsider’ status in educational leadership. They may have gained entry into educational administration, but they are still seen as new and different. However, women are in a position as newcomers, to transform leadership through mentoring. (1)

In tune with this assertion, Kathryn Egan maintains that quality mentoring, resulting in meaningful relationships, is essential for a woman’s success in achieving leadership. Egan dedicated her research to identifying a woman’s epistemological perspective in order to provide for a more meaningful mentoring experience.

The Wage Gap

Although, as stated earlier, a large number of women still report homemaking as their occupation, more and more women are participating in the work force. From the year 2000 to 2005, the number of women holding full-time jobs rose from 44,103,000 to 45,154,000, an increase of over a million (Bureau of Labor Statistics 1). And just what do these women in the job market have to look forward to? According to Murphy, they can look forward to a wage gap: “Women today are stuck making almost a quarter

less than men. Why? Because of unfair treatment on the job – unfair treatment that may not always be intentional, but it is so deeply ingrained that it will continue unless we act” (7).

The wage gap starts immediately upon a woman’s entrance into the work force, and continues to grow over time. According to Christine Laine and Barbara Turner, full-time female physicians made only 63 cents for every dollar earned by their male peers in 2004 (238). In addition, they state that “women started out with a salary deficit that they never recouped over time; the salary differential increased as seniority increased” (238).

Dr. Carol Williams-Nickelson, author of Women and Money, states that, according to recent research, women who have been out of college for one year only earn 80 cents to their male peers’ dollar (46). In addition, “research indicates that one-quarter of the pay gap remains unexplained and is likely due to gender discrimination ... [and] this pay gap exists despite the fact that women outperform men in school, earning slightly higher GPAs in every college major, including science and mathematics” (46).

Gardiner, Enomoto, and Grogan add that even though the number of women who have been successful in attaining positions of leadership in education has increased, the glass ceiling still has not been broken (5). In fact, 23 percent of American CEOs are women – but there is still such a long way to go (Martin 90). According to the U.S. Census Bureau, in March 2005 there were 8,982,000 women in “management, business, and financial occupations” with an earnings median of \$39,714, compared to 11,635,000 men in the same category, with an earnings median of \$57,739 (Table

PINC-06). Furthermore, Table 2 exemplifies the median weekly earnings of each group – and there is a 19 percent difference between males (total) and females (total) in 2005.

Table 2

Median Weekly Earnings (in Dollars) of Full-time Wage and Salary Workers, 2000-2005

Characteristic	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Males (total)	641	670	679	695	713	722
16-24 years old	375	391	391	398	400	409
25 years and up	693	720	732	744	762	771
Females (total)	493	512	529	552	573	585
16-24 years old	344	353	367	371	375	381
25 years and up	516	543	568	584	599	612

Source: United States. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Full-time Wage and Salary Workers – Number and Earnings, 2000-2005. Bulletin 2307. 16 October 2007.

<http://www.bls.gov/cps/home.htm>

It seems alarming, then, with this wage gap, or discrepancy between men’s and women’s earnings in the same jobs, there is not more dialogue about the issue.

However, unending changes in the roles women play at home and at work, force them to manage “a clamor of conflicting commitments in their lives” (Babcock and

Laschever x). With everything that women are inclined to juggle, many simply do not spend time thinking about how much they are paid compared to their male colleagues.

Others feel pressured, or are conditioned, to take what they are given, because asking

for more would be unladylike. Babcock states “women don’t ask. They don’t ask for raises and promotions and better job opportunities. They don’t ask for recognition for the good work they do. They don’t ask for more help at home” (ix).

Kathryn Egan’s Theory

Since the survey used in this study was the same used in Kathryn Smoot Egan’s study (with the exception of an added demographics section) in her research on women in business, it is pertinent to discuss her research and theory on women and mentoring. The intent of her research was to “help women define what they require in a mentor in order to achieve success” (Flexible Mentoring 401). She conducted this research because although functions of a mentor have been defined, how the mentor and protégé find the right fit has been left entirely unexplored.

According to Egan, “mentoring functions recognized and valued by the woman [protégé] will depend upon her worldview” (Flexible Mentoring 421). This means that recognizing a female protégé’s worldview, or how she views herself, her workplace, and her work, is an important step in the mentoring process. By taking time to understand the protégé’s perceptions, the mentor then has a context in which to frame the woman, which can help increase effective communication and can also help the mentor better support the protégé. Egan maintains that if the mentor identifies the protégé’s worldview, the mentor can then present guidance, projects, and specific learning experiences in ways that the protégé can identify and accept. This means that rather than some “cookie cutter” mentor program or relationship, the protégé can experience a mentoring relationship that is customized to meet her individual needs:

“Quality mentoring focused on the needs of the individual offers the possibility for women to be administrators and leaders in their own right” (203).

Tailoring the mentoring relationship to fit the needs of the protégée is indeed key, especially when considering that most high-level mentors – the sort that can help a woman achieve a top position – are white males. Gardiner et al. explain: “An invisible network of older professionals have groomed their protégés, younger versions of themselves, for top-level positions. They have largely been white men, who promoted younger white men, who have been expected to maintain their [mentors’] leadership styles, standards, and cultural mores” (5). If this cycle of male to male mentorship is to be broken, the step of worldview identification is critical, because women’s worldviews so often differ from men’s. Egan states:

Traditionally, success in terms of salary, promotion, and other markers has depended on the woman learning coping behaviors in a hierarchical workplace defined by white men, who perceive the world as competitive, in which people are either one-up or one-down. A woman's perception of the workplace as a community rather than hierarchical social order contributes to her worldview and to her perception of her efficacy in the work environment. A woman's worldview will affect her recognition of a mentor, her ability to function as a protégée in order to learn skills, and her ability to pursue coping behaviors for her own, self-defined "success." (Flexible Mentoring 403-404)

Egan formed her theory by borrowing from research conducted in 1986 by Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger and Tarule, who wrote Women's Ways of Knowing. They identified a 5-level hierarchy of developmental stages women go through during their lifetime. These five levels are (from least desirable to most desirable): Silent, Received, Subjective, Procedural, and Constructivist (Flexible Mentoring 404). A woman classified as having a Silent worldview “has no voice and no mind of her own. She is the subject of whims, the victim of authority that defines her existence according to external rules” (404). A Received woman is a “repository for external knowledge, can reproduce ideas from external authority, but does not produce any of her own.” A Subjective worldview entails that the woman possesses personal and intuitive knowledge, but lacks objectivity because of her preoccupation between self and other. A woman who has a Procedural worldview invests “in learning and applying objective procedures to obtaining knowledge. However, her thinking is encapsulated within a system, so that she can criticize the system, but only in the system's terms” (404).

Interestingly, Proceduralists often will not have a mentor, as they do not seek one out, possibly regretting their unwillingness later on in life (Lash 44). Moreover, a woman who has a Proceduralist worldview is successful because she is a hard worker and a rule-follower (44). Additionally, “a Proceduralist is dedicated to her career and will place it before relationships. Although a Proceduralist may not want a mentor, she is the type of protégé that many mentors seek out. The hard work and dedication demonstrated by the Proceduralist reflects positively on the mentor” (Lash 45).

Finally, a woman with a Constructivist worldview “views all knowledge as contextual. She is a creator of knowledge and values both subjective and objective

strategies for knowing. She speaks in her own authentic voice” (Flexible Mentoring 404).

According to Egan, the Constructivist worldview is the model for success in mentoring. She reports that in her research of women in the broadcasting industry, most women were Constructivists, Proceduralists, or Subjectivists. She avers that “women in broadcasting are assumed to be at least at a subjective level, from which a woman perceives knowledge as personal and intuited” (405). She also suggests that women who see themselves as successful, or at least as becoming successful, are most likely to be Constructivists. Women who adhere to the rules tend to be Proceduralists (405).

Egan’s study was replicated in 2000 by Christine Lash. She, like Egan, used a national organization to pull the names of women who were asked to participate in the study. Egan’s study was conducted with members of the American Women in Radio and Television (AWRT), while Lash’s study was conducted with women from the National Institute for Leadership Development (NILD). Egan conducted her research over a two year period, with 454 women respondents, which was a 35 percent response rate, with the responses not being anonymous. Lash, on the other hand, conducted her study in less than one year’s time, with 118 respondents and a response rate of 40 percent, with responses being anonymous.

Summary

This chapter reviewed the literature that investigates why women in leadership positions are still underrepresented and under-compensated. Furthermore, an attempt was made to look back at historical trends in regards to women’s participation and experience in the workforce, the socialization patterns of females to become

subordinates, career mentoring, the wage gap, and women's ability to negotiate and/or ask for what they want/deserve. The next chapter will describe the methodology used in this study, including the research perspective and design, the population, the variables, the data collection procedures, the statistical analysis used, reliability and validity, and a summary.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study expands the work begun by Kathryn Smoot Egan in 1994, which she revisited in 1996, and which was replicated by Christine Lash in 2000. Egan and Lash attempted to classify women's worldviews and mentoring styles using Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule's theory of women's cognitive development from 1986. The purpose of this study is to gather information about the perceptions women leaders have toward their workplace, their work, themselves, and career mentoring or, in the words of Kathryn Egan, women's worldview or epistemologies.

This study seeks to determine what commonalities exist among the women who have successfully attained leadership positions at accredited, private four-year colleges and universities in Kansas and Missouri. Furthermore, it seeks to follow up Egan's work on examining how women protégés learn from and relate to their mentor. Kathryn Smoot Egan's study, published in The Journal of Business Communication, aimed to specifically measure the mentor-protégé relationship in a business context, while this study seeks to explore whether the same results are true for the field of education.

Research Hypotheses

The researcher formulated three research hypotheses. They were:

Research Hypothesis One: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of self as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

Research Hypothesis Two: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of the workplace as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

Research Hypothesis Three: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of self in relation to the workplace as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

Research Design

This study contains both qualitative and quantitative elements, and was conducted using a descriptive approach. The study utilized Kathryn Egan's 1994 survey in an electronic format, with a demographics section added to the beginning.

Survey research entails collecting information about the participants' experiences, perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs. This information is collected through a survey instrument, with the participants answering a series of questions. The study utilizes a cross-sectional design, meaning that one or more samples were drawn from the population at one time (Shaughnessy et al. 140). Each "sample" came from each university or college on the list. The focus of this type of design is its ability to describe "the characteristics of a population or the differences among two or more populations at a particular point in time" (140). The independent variable was job title, and the dependent variables were perceptions of self, perceptions of workplace, and perceptions of self in relation to workplace.

Population and Participants

The population in this study was a group of women leaders. A **leader** (or **position of leadership**) shall be defined as any woman who is a college or university president, vice-president, chancellor, vice-chancellor, executive director, dean, assistant dean, associate dean, or a department chair at an accredited, private four-year college or university in Kansas and Missouri. Therefore, all women who fit these criteria were sent an electronic invitation to participate in this study. There were 232 email invitations sent to women in Kansas, and 423 invitations sent to women in Missouri, for a total of 655 women invited to participate. 324 women responded, with 312 finishing the survey.

Research Instrument

As stated earlier, the research instrument used in this study was the survey created by Kathryn Smoot Egan in her research on women in the radio and broadcasting industry. Her study was based on the work of Belensky et al. and also Gail Sheehy. Her work was replicated by Christine Lash in 2000. Lash, like Egan, used a national organization to pull the names of women who were asked to participate in the study. Egan's study was conducted with members of the American Women in Radio and Television (AWRT), while Lash's study was conducted with women from the National Institute for Leadership Development (NILD). Egan conducted her research over a two year period, with 454 women respondents, which was a 35 percent response rate, with the responses not being anonymous. Lash, on the other hand, conducted her study in less than one year, with 118 respondents, for a response rate of 40 percent, and the responses being anonymous.

The women invited to participate in this study were not members of national organizations; rather, they were women leaders at private colleges and universities in the states of Kansas and Missouri. The women who were invited to participate met the definition of “leader” that the researcher devised.

Data Collection Procedures

The data were collected through the use of the Egan survey with an added demographics section. This survey was administered online through SurveyMonkey.com. First, the researcher obtained a master list of all accredited, private four-year colleges and universities in the states of Kansas and Missouri. This information was obtained from a published directory of private colleges and universities and from the online directory at the Missouri Department of Higher Education’s website (<http://dhe.mo.gov>).

The researcher searched the web site of each institution found on the master list, identifying the women who fit this study’s definition of a leader. Their names, titles, and email addresses were recorded into a database. Next, Kathryn Egan’s survey was typed into a Word document, and a demographic section was added at the beginning. The researcher purchased a subscription to SurveyMonkey.com, and converted the survey to a series of online pages. Once this process was completed, an electronic invitation was sent, via email, to all the women on the database. Since this invitation to participate was sent electronically, the body of the email served as the cover letter, explaining the purpose of the study and the informed consent piece. Four additional reminders were sent over the course of three months. These women participants were able to click the link provided in the email invitation, and respond anonymously.

Finally, the survey was closed, and the researcher downloaded the results into the Statistical Program of the Social Sciences (SPSS) software for data analysis.

Statistical Analysis

To begin the analysis all three measures of central tendency (mean, median, mode) and standard deviation were calculated for each item on the survey (except the two open-ended questions). Women were placed into groups, according to the position they held (presidents, vice-presidents, chancellors, vice-chancellors, executive directors, deans, assistant deans, associate deans, and department chairs).

Women were also classified as either a Constructivist or as a Proceduralist. Egan indicated that within the survey questionnaire women who responded “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” were Constructivists, while women who responded “Disagree” and “Strongly Disagree” were Proceduralists (Women Who Succeed 964, Table 2). Lash indicated that these responses were only on 12 key questions (see Appendix G). Therefore, the responses each woman gave on the 12 key items were grouped, and an overall mean on those questions was calculated. Any woman with a mean up to and including 4.0 was classified as a Constructivist. Likewise, any woman with a mean of 4.1 or greater was classified as a Proceduralist. In addition, a mean was calculated from the responses on the three perception scales to use in an analysis of variance (one-way ANOVA). A one-way ANOVA was performed on each scale to determine if any differences exist between the different groups of women (based on positions held), based on their perceptions of self, of workplace, and self in relation to workplace.

Bias and Error

According to Haller and Kleine, survey research has two specific features that could make a survey study vulnerable – question wording and participant sample (97). Oftentimes survey questions are leading; meaning that the participant can detect what answer is most acceptable to the researcher (96).

Moreover, the sample of people that take the survey is extremely important, because the sample should be representative of the general population in order to be considered applicable to others. Even the people who choose not to respond or participate are important (96). In addition, Gall et al. caution researchers and consumers of research to beware of sampling bias, or response bias, which occurs when the response rate is low (180). A low response rate may inhibit a sample's ability to be considered a representation of the general population as a whole.

Furthermore, because survey research is based on self-reporting, it is crucial to know whether or not the respondents answered truthfully or, if you are unable to tell, to understand that they may not have answered truthfully. Gall et al. assert that “respondents can conceal information that they do not want others to know. Also, even if respondents want to give accurate information, they may not have the self-awareness to do so. For these reasons, the data obtained through survey research are likely to be distorted or incomplete to an unknown degree” (180).

The researcher addressed these issues by delimiting the study to women leaders within the scope of private, 4-year colleges and universities in Kansas and Missouri. As stated earlier, these results may not be reflective of the general population. The survey wording was out of the control of the researcher because the instrument was created by

Egan and backed by her two articles, so the researcher left it as Egan originally wrote it. As far as truth in responding, the researcher had no way of knowing whether participants responded truthfully, and therefore made truth in responding an assumption of the study.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability is the consistency of a study. This study used a survey that asked for demographic data, personal history, and past experience, therefore it is difficult to directly address reliability, since each woman answered the questions according to her situation at that moment in time – should the survey be re-administered, the participants might answer very differently. Therefore, test-retest reliability does not make sense in this case. In addition, split-half reliability cannot be looked at either, because the survey does not ask duplicate questions. When looking at Egan's original research and the duplicate study by Lash in 2000, no mention is made as to reliability.

Validity reports if a test measures what it is supposed to measure. Again, in the case of this survey, validity is difficult to address because of the personal information/opinion nature of what the questions ask the participant.

Summary

This chapter addressed the methodology used in this study, including the research perspective and design, and the research hypotheses, the population, the variables, the data collection procedures, the statistical analysis used, and reliability and validity. The next chapter will focus on reporting the results of the 312 surveys that were completed.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if differences in perceptions exist between women in various leadership positions at colleges/universities in regard to self, the workplace, and self in relation to the workplace. The responses from the participants were collected to identify the perceptions of women in each job title position (president, vice-president, dean, assistant/associate dean, director, and department chair). This chapter presents the results obtained from these responses. It should be noted that due to the enormity of the information collected, only the information pertinent to perceptions of self, workplace, and self in relation to the workplace is presented here. Additional supportive data on demographics and mentoring are reported in the appendices (Appendix K and Appendix L). The data in the appendices is addressed in Chapter Five as recommendations for future research.

The first section contains the epistemological views of women. All women were categorized as either a Proceduralist or a Constructivist, based on the work of Kathryn Egan (which was centered on Belensky et al.'s Women's Ways of Knowing). In addition, each group (by job title) of women was analyzed in terms of the similarities and/or differences in responding to a series of questions regarding their perceptions of self, their workplace, and self in relation to the workplace. Results from three separate one-way analysis of variances (ANOVAs) are presented to assist in understanding the

differences between the groups of women as designated by job title. Finally, results from the mentoring portion of the survey are expounded.

Research Hypotheses

The researcher formulated three research hypotheses. They were:

Research Hypothesis One: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of self as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

Research Hypothesis Two: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of the workplace as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

Research Hypothesis Three: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of self in relation to the workplace as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

Methodology Summary

The researcher created a master list of all accredited, private four-year colleges and universities in the states of Kansas and Missouri (Tables 3 and 4). From this list, the researcher accessed each institution's web site, identifying the women in leadership roles as defined by the researcher. The name, title, and email address of each woman was recorded into a database. All the data collected on perceptions of self, the workplace, and self in relation to workplace were downloaded into SPSS software for data analysis.

Table 3

List of Private, 4-year Colleges and Universities in Kansas and Location

Name of Institution	Location (Main Campus)
Baker University	Baldwin City, Kansas
Barclay College	Haviland, Kansas
Benedictine College	Atchison, Kansas
Bethany College	Lindsborg, Kansas
Bethel College	Newton, Kansas
Central Christian College of KS	McPherson, Kansas
Donnelly College	Kansas City, Kansas
Friends University	Wichita, Kansas
Haskell Indian Nations University	Lawrence, Kansas
Kansas Wesleyan University	Salina, Kansas
Manhattan Christian College	Manhattan, Kansas
McPherson College	McPherson, Kansas
MidAmerica Nazarene University	Olathe, Kansas
Newman University	Wichita, Kansas
Ottawa University	Ottawa, Kansas
Southwestern College	Winfield, Kansas
Sterling College	Sterling, Kansas
Tabor College	Hillsboro, Kansas
University of Saint Mary	Leavenworth, Kansas

Source: Kansas State Department of Education. "2006-2007 Kansas Educational Directory." September 2006, 273-277.

Table 4

List of Private, 4-year Colleges and Universities in Missouri and Location

Name of Institution	Location (Main Campus)
Avila University	Kansas City, Missouri
Central Methodist University	Fayette, Missouri
College of the Ozarks	Point Lookout, Missouri
Columbia College	Columbia, Missouri
Culver-Stockton College	Canton, Missouri
Drury University	Springfield, Missouri
Evangel University	Springfield, Missouri
Fontbonne University	St. Louis, Missouri
Hannibal-Lagrange College	Hannibal, Missouri
Lindenwood University	St. Charles, Missouri
Maryville University	St. Louis, Missouri
Missouri Baptist University	St. Louis, Missouri
Missouri Valley College	Marshall, Missouri
Park University	Parkville, Missouri
Rockhurst University	Kansas City, Missouri
Saint Louis University	St. Louis, Missouri
Southwest Baptist University	Bolivar, Missouri
Stephens College	Columbia, Missouri
Washington University	St. Louis, Missouri
Webster University	St. Louis, Missouri
Westminster College	Fulton, Missouri
William Jewell College	Liberty, Missouri
William Woods University	Fulton, Missouri

Source: Missouri Department of Higher Education. Online Directory. 17 January 2007.

<http://dhe.mo.gov>

Population and Participants

The population analyzed in this study consisted entirely of women leaders. A **leader** (or **position of leadership**) is defined as any woman who is a college or university president, vice-president, chancellor, vice-chancellor, executive director, dean, assistant dean, associate dean, or a department chair at an accredited, private four-

year college or university in Kansas and Missouri. A total of 655 electronic invitations (232 from Kansas and 423 from Missouri) were sent to women who met the specified criteria for a “**leader**” (or “**position of leadership**”). Of the 655 women invited to participate, 324 women responded, with 312 finishing the survey, resulting in a 49.5 percent response rate. However, 39 of the women who responded reported having job titles that did not match the researcher’s definition (i.e. one reported she was an administrative assistant, several others reported that they were associate professors, etc., and 3 of those 39 women did not report any title). Therefore, these 39 responses were removed from the database. Consequently, 273 women are considered the “participants” in this study, resulting in a 41.7 percent final response rate. Of those 273 women, six were presidents, 32 were vice-presidents, 155 were directors, 24 were deans, 16 were assistant/associate deans, and 40 were department chairs (Table 5).

Table 5

Job Titles of Participants

Job Title	Frequency	Percent of Total	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Presidents	6	1.9	2.2	2.2
Vice-President	32	9.9	11.7	13.9
Director	155	47.8	56.8	70.7
Dean	24	7.4	8.8	79.5
Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	4.9	5.9	85.3
Department Chair	40	12.3	14.7	100.0
Total (n=273)	273	84.3	100.0	

Epistemological Results

Egan borrowed from the research conducted in 1986 by Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger and Tarule, who wrote Women’s Ways of Knowing, to create her theory.

Belenky et al. identified a 5-level hierarchy of developmental stages women go through during their lifetime, shifting from one to another as they have various life experiences. These five levels are (from least desirable to most desirable): Silent, Received, Subjective, Procedural, and Constructivist (Egan Flexible Mentoring 404). Egan concentrated on the top two developmental levels of Proceduralists and Constructivists, claiming that for a woman to have obtained positions of leadership she would have to be no less than a Proceduralist. According to Egan, the Constructivist worldview is the model for success in mentoring.

Twelve questions were aimed to identify the participants' classification as either Constructivists or Proceduralists. Table 6 shows that of the 273 participants, there were 48 Proceduralists and 223 Constructivists. Two participants were removed from the group because they responded to just two of the twelve epistemological questions.

Table 6

Epistemological Results: Constructivists and Proceduralists by Group^a

Group	N	Group Mean	Standard Deviation	Const. (N)	Proc. (N)	Percent Const.	Percent Proc.
President	6	3.5133	1.05603	6	0	100.0	0.00
Vice-President	32	3.7963		22	10	68.75	31.25
Director	154	3.5677		132	22	85.71	14.29
Dean	24	3.6329		21	3	87.50	12.50
Assistant/Associate Dean	16	3.6031		12	4	75.00	25.00
Department Chair	39	3.6454		30	9	76.92	23.08
Subtotal	271	3.6265		223	48	82.29	17.71
Discarded	2						
Total	273						

^a Constructivist is abbreviated to "Const." and Proceduralist is abbreviated to "Proc."

Perceptions Results

Seven statements were grouped together to indicate the participants' perceptions of themselves (Table 7). The mean response for each group (by job title) is listed in Appendix H. The largest Standard Deviation, 2.16795, occurred on statement one, with the group of presidents. The smallest Standard Deviation, 0.0, occurred on statement 4 with the group of presidents as well. One participant did not respond to the statements in this section.

Table 7

Perceptions of Self Statements

1. The best way for me to have power in my workplace is to acknowledge my weaknesses to my coworkers.
2. A person whose family responsibilities sometimes interfere with work should not expect the same career rewards (such as promotions and salary increases) as others.
3. Once I achieve a certain level in my career, I'll be able to do what I most want to do.
4. I have traded a lasting relationship for my career.
5. To balance career and family, I sacrifice leisure time.
6. I am personally responsible for the way my life has turned out.
7. To be successful in a career a person should make her/his own rules outside the system.

Table 8 displays the results from the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) performed on the group of statements relating to the perceptions of self. As the significance column shows, there was no significance at the 0.05 level, meaning the researcher must accept the Research Hypothesis One: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of self as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

Table 8

One-Way ANOVA on Perceptions of Self Statements

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	1.419	5	0.284	0.538	0.748
Within Groups	140.968	267	0.528		
Total	142.387	272			

In addition, another group of statements was aimed primarily at identifying the participants' perceptions of the workplace (Table 9). There were six statements in this group. The largest Standard Deviation, 2.27669, occurred on statement one, with the group of assistant/associate deans. The smallest Standard Deviation, 0.81650, occurred on statements six and three, with the group of presidents. Two participants did not respond to the statements in this section.

Table 9

Perceptions of Workplace Statements

1. To have her ideas listened to by others, a women must have it voiced by a man.
2. Men are paid more than women around here for the same work.
3. Men and women are treated equally where I work.
4. Where I work, women are treated better than men when it comes to advancement.
5. I have less opportunity than a man for the top-level positions at my institution.
6. My present position is the result of luck.

Table 10 shows the results of the one-way ANOVA ran on the perceptions of workplace statements. The significance column shows that there was no significance at the 0.05 level, meaning the researcher must accept the Research Hypothesis Two: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university

leadership on their perception of the workplace as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

Table 10

One-Way ANOVA on Perceptions of Workplace Statements

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	5.377	5	1.075	0.665	0.650
Within Groups	429.927	266	1.616		
Total	435.304	271			

The final cluster of statements grouped together dealt with the participants' perceptions of themselves in relation to the workplace (Table 11). The largest Standard Deviation, 2.50998, occurred on statement six, with the group of presidents. The smallest Standard Deviation, 0.54792, occurred on statement three, with the group of presidents as well. One participant did not respond to the statements in this section.

Table 11

Perception of Self in Relation to the Workplace Statements

1. Being physically attractive is an advantage in my job.
2. Developing relationships is the best way to gain power.
3. Being single is an advantage in my career.
4. Others believe my ability to do my job will lessen as I get older.
5. I feel physically fit.
6. Being married is a plus for career advancement in a position such as mine.

Results from the one-way ANOVA (Table 12) indicated there was no significance between groups at the 0.05 level. Therefore, the researcher must accept Research Hypothesis Three: There is no difference between women in various positions

of college/university leadership on their perception of self in relation to the workplace as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

Table 12

One-Way ANOVA on Perceptions of Self in Relation to the Workplace Statements

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	2.384	5	0.477	0.712	0.615
Within Groups	178.823	267	0.670		
Total	181.207	272			

Mentoring Results

In this section, women responded to statements on the Egan survey questionnaire about career mentoring. Only selected responses are listed below. The complete results can be found in Appendix L. As presented in Table 13, 43 women (of the 273 who responded to the question) reported not having a mentor, which represents 15.8 percent of the respondents; 131 women reported having one or two mentors (48 percent); and 87 reported having three or more mentors (31.9 percent). Twelve participants did not respond to the statements in this section.

Table 13

Mentoring Results: Number of Mentors

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Had No Mentor	43	15.8	16.5	15.3
1-2 Mentors	131	48.0	50.2	69.0
3+ Mentors	87	31.9	33.3	100.0
Subtotal	261	95.6	100.0	
Didn't Respond	12	4.4		
Total (n=273)	273	100.0		

Table 14 reveals that presidents strongly disagreed that they could have gotten where they are without their mentor, with a mean of 6.00. Vice-presidents, deans, associate/assistant deans, and department chairs all had means in the middle - ranging from 4.0370 to 4.6471. Directors were slightly below the middle of the Likert scale, with a mean of 3.9126. In response to the statement “My mentor gave me emotional support,” presidents again had the highest mean - 3.50 - with all other groups’ means falling in the 2 to 3 point range (Table 15). Seventy-six participants did not respond to the statements in Table 14, and 77 participants did not respond to the statements in Table 15.

Table 14

Mentoring Results: “I could have gotten where I am without my mentor.”

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Minimum	Maximum
President	4	6.0000	1.15470	0.57735	5.00	7.00
Vice-President	27	4.0370	1.84977	0.35599	1.00	7.00
Director	103	3.9126	2.04894	0.20189	1.00	7.00
Dean	17	4.6471	1.76569	0.42824	1.00	7.00
Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	4.4286	1.60357	0.42857	2.00	7.00
Department Chair	32	4.1875	2.08586	0.36873	1.00	7.00
Total	197	4.1168	1.97473	0.14069	1.00	7.00

Table 15

Mentoring Results: "My mentor gave me emotional support."

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Minimum	Maximum
President	4	3.5000	2.38048	1.19024	1.00	6.00
Vice-President	27	2.8519	1.95534	0.37631	1.00	7.00
Director	102	2.7745	1.72292	0.17059	1.00	7.00
Dean	17	2.5882	1.58346	0.38405	1.00	7.00
Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	2.7143	1.20439	0.32189	1.00	5.00
Department Chair	32	2.6563	1.91108	0.33783	1.00	7.00
Total	196	2.7602	1.74198	0.12443	1.00	7.00

In terms of the length of the longest mentoring relationship, under half of the women had a mentoring relationship over 5 years long, while just 10 women had a mentoring relationship less than a year long (Table 16). Several women indicated they had a mentoring relationship that lasted for 16, 18, 20, and even 27 years. One hundred six women did not respond to the statements in this section.

Table 16

Mentoring Results: Length of Longest Mentoring Relationship

Length of Longest Mentoring Relationship	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
N/A	7	2.6	3.2	3.2
Less than 1 year	10	3.7	4.6	7.8
1-2 years	31	11.4	14.2	22.0
2-5 years	51	18.7	23.4	45.4
5+ years	119	43.5	54.6	100.0
Subtotal	218	79.9	100.0	
Didn't Respond	55	20.1		
Total	273	100.0		

Summary

This chapter presented the results from this study, reviewed the methodology and data collection procedures, and identified the population and participants. The research hypotheses were tested. As a result of the one-way ANOVAs, no differences were seen between groups at the 0.05 level. Therefore, the researcher accepted Research Hypothesis One: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of self as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance; Research Hypothesis Two: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of the workplace as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance; and Research Hypothesis Three: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of self in relation to the workplace as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance. In addition, results also included a summary of mentoring experiences of the participants.

Chapter Five, the final chapter, will analyze and discuss the results obtained from the survey, including examining the contributions of this study, along with recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER FIVE

INTERPRETATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter discusses the results obtained from this study. Since the purpose of this study was to determine if differences in perceptions exist between women in various leadership positions at the college/university in regard to self, the workplace, and self in relation to the workplace, results presented in Chapter Four will be interpreted and discussed in this chapter. Once again, it should be noted that due to the vastness of the information collected, only the information pertinent to perceptions of self, workplace, and self in relation to the workplace was presented in Chapter Four. Additional supportive data on demographics and mentoring are reported in the appendices (Appendix K and Appendix L).

Summary of Results

As stated earlier, the responses from the participants were collected to identify the perceptions of women in each job title (president, vice-president, dean, assistant/associate dean, director, and department chair). All participant responses were downloaded into SPSS for analysis. Since each of the three scales had either six or seven statements, a mean was calculated for each scale. A one-way ANOVA was conducted on the means to determine if any difference within or between groups existed (Tables 8, 10, and 12). As Table 8 shows, the significance between groups on the perception of self statements was 0.748, which is not statistically significant.

Therefore, the researcher must accept Research Hypothesis One: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of self as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

In addition, another one-way ANOVA was conducted on the data from the perceptions of workplace statements. The significance between groups was 0.650, which was not significant (Table 10). Therefore, the researcher must accept Research Hypothesis Two: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of the workplace, as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

Finally, a one-way ANOVA was run on the data from the perception of self in relation to workplace statements (Table 12). Results from the one-way ANOVA indicated the significance between groups was 0.615, which was not statistically significant. Therefore, the researcher must accept Research Hypothesis Three: There is no difference between women in various positions of college/university leadership on their perception of self in relation to the workplace, as measured by the Egan Questionnaire at the 0.05 level of significance.

Discussion of Results

As mentioned in the previous section, the researcher accepted Research Hypothesis One, Two and Three. There was no significance between groups at the 0.05 level. This seems surprising since, according to Egan's theory, women in higher positions would tend to be more fully developed on the hierarchy, and therefore would hold different perceptions of self and self in relation to workplace. One possible

explanation for the lack of statistically significant differences between groups could be that the group of presidents was not large enough, as there were only six. Another possible explanation could be that Egan obtained her results from the media field, with women in national organizations, while this study had participants only from the states of Kansas and Missouri in the field of education.

The results could also be viewed from a different perspective. Egan's findings suggest that women in high levels of leadership would be expected to be more highly developed on the epistemological hierarchy than women in lower levels of leadership. It could be argued that the sample population in this study is comprised of high-level leaders, and therefore there should be no statistically significant differences between the groups. However, it is important to note that this perspective is not as strong as the first, since women in this sample were both Constructivists and Proceduralists, and since women were from both epistemological categories, differences should be expected.

Relationship of Results to Theory

Research on the socialization of women speaks to the fact that although more women leaders exist than ever before, many more should, but have been brainwashed from birth to believe that they are not capable of performing, or should not pursue, a leadership position: "Observing that much of the world is controlled by men, children incorporate this information into their gender schemas and conclude that this is not merely the way things are, but the way things should be" (Babcock and Laschever 28). However, it was found that women in different places on the leadership hierarchy had no significant differences in their epistemological hierarchy or on their perceptions of

self, the workplace, and self in relation to the workplace. It is possible, however, these results are due to the study only including participants who had already achieved leadership positions, whereas the literature may be found to be more relevant concerning women who have never achieved leadership positions.

Egan conducted her research in order to “help women define what they require in a mentor in order to achieve success” (402), since prior research determined that mentoring is one of the biggest determiners of women’s success as leaders. Identifying a woman’s perceptions, then, is key to customizing the mentoring relationship, and thereby maximizing the effectiveness of mentoring. However, since no statistically significant differences between groups were found, it is difficult to see how this questionnaire could help tailor mentoring relationships.

Summary and Conclusion

Research Hypothesis One, Two and Three were accepted. It seems surprising that statistically significant differences did not occur between groups. However, the small number of presidents could have been responsible for the outcome, as well as the geographic location and field in which this sample was taken – which was different from the sample Egan tested. Moreover, since neither Egan nor Lash reported validity and reliability measures, it is difficult to discern if the questionnaire accurately measures epistemological views and perceptions.

Implications for Further Research and Practice

A lot more analyses could be performed with the data collected in this study. Since such an enormous amount of data was collected, only the data dealing directly

with perceptions of self, workplace, self in relation to workplace and mentoring were examined for the purpose of this study. It would be interesting to group the women by epistemological category (Constructivists and Proceduralists) and examine if any significant differences exist between those 2 groups on top of the 6 groups of job titles. A study of this design could be a way of testing Egan's theory that women who are more highly developed on the epistemological hierarchy are able to climb to higher leadership positions. Furthermore, it would also be interesting to calculate a correlation coefficient between women's perceptions and their demographic data, such as race, marital status, birth order, and conditions growing up. Some research suggests marital status, birth order and conditions growing up, such as having a well-educated mother and supportive father, can contribute to encouraging women to pursue leadership. According to Kondrick, "Parental influence and socio-economic status of the home environment have been found to have a profound effect upon the development of internal belief systems" (9). Moreover, being married has been shown to be negatively correlated with persistence (5).

In addition, future researchers could focus on establishing reliability and validity data for Egan's questionnaire, since this information is not available in Egan's work, or Lash's research. Determining if this instrument actually does measure a woman's epistemological development is essential to taking the next step of linking this development to the mentoring relationship. This will further Egan's work to customize the mentoring relationship to each woman's developmental level, with the purpose of maximizing the effectiveness of the mentoring relationship and also in attempting to

assist the woman to develop into the highest epistemological category possible according to Belenky et al. – the Constructivist.

Moreover, research could be conducted that focuses on the education preparation potential women leaders receive while at college and graduate school. Are these women groomed and primed to become leaders? Are colleges actively recruiting women for leadership programs?

Although some might believe the status of women is less than desired, and perhaps even that the future looks dim for equality in the workplace, others, this researcher noted, retain an optimistic view. However, as Aburdene and Naisbitt claim:

The remnants of male domination – from religious fundamentalism to the U.S. Supreme Court – may well be trying to set women back 200 years or 2,000. They will enjoy small, ill-gotten victories, but they will never succeed for long. And the reason is critical mass – what it takes to get a movement going and self-sustaining. There are simply too many powerful women with too many male allies. (*xxii*)

Aburdene and Naisbitt caution, however, “those who seek to dominate are not about to ‘give up’ the abuse of power; sexual harassment, sexist institutions and the horrifying violence against women tell us the quest for women’s rights will continue for some time” (*xv*). It is the researcher’s hope the quest continues on.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

IRB APPLICATION

APPENDIX A

IRB APPLICATION

IRB Review Form

I. Research Investigator(s) (students must list faculty sponsor first)

Department(s) Education

Name Hollie Becker

Signature

1. Dr. Susan Rogers (check if faculty sponsor) **Signature**
Associate Professor of Education
Baker University

2. Dr. Willie Amison
Assistant Professor of Education
Baker University

3. Dr. Marc Carter
Assistant Professor of Psychology
Baker University

4. Dr. Sandra Vanhoose
Academic Dean and Vice President of Academic Affairs
University of Saint Mary

Principal investigator or faculty sponsor contact information:

1. Dr. Susan Rogers
Associate Professor of Education, Baker University
8001 College Blvd., Suite 100
Overland Park, KS 66210
913-491-4432, ext. 554
srogers@bakeru.edu

2. Hollie Becker
Graduate Student
hmbecker@spgsmail.bakeru.edu

Expected Category of Review: Exempt Expedited Full

II. Protocol Title

Women in Leadership in Private Four-year Colleges and Universities in Kansas and Missouri and Their Perceptions of Workplace Culture, including Career Mentoring

III. Summary:

The following summary must accompany the proposal. Be specific about exactly what participants will experience, and about the protections that have been included to safeguard participants from harm. Careful attention to the following may help facilitate the review process:

In a sentence or two, please describe the background and purpose of the research.

The purpose of this study is to gather information about the role of epistemology on the perceptions toward the workplace, their work, themselves and career mentoring of women in leadership positions at private 4-year colleges and universities in Kansas and Missouri. Women still have tremendous odds to overcome to secure leadership roles. Women seeking mentors encounter obstacles that men do not, because there are significantly fewer females that have been successful in obtaining leadership positions that are available to guide or advise other women. Egan, in her research, indicates that “Research focused on women in mentoring relationships provides evidence that one or more mentoring relationships result in the same benefits for women as for men -- benefits such as greater job success and job satisfaction and perceptions of having personal power and influence within their organizations” (401). Moreover, she purports that women have a unique need to balance career and family relationships, while at the same time needing to achieve the goals they have set for themselves. Her intent in creating this study was to “help women define what they require in a mentor in order to achieve success” (402), since research states that mentoring is one of the biggest determiners of women’s success as leaders. This study seeks to determine what commonalities exist among the women successful in becoming leaders. Furthermore, it seeks to follow up Egan’s work on examining how women protégés learn from and relate to their mentor. Kathryn Smoot Egan’s survey, published in *The Journal of Business Communication*, was conducted relating to the business field, and the researcher would like to see if the same results are true for education.

Briefly describe each condition or manipulation to be included within the study.

Kathryn Smoot Egan’s survey, published in *The Journal of Business Communication* in October 1996 v33 n4 p401(25), will be used to measure the role of epistemology on the perceptions toward the workplace, their work, themselves and career mentoring of women. The author has granted written permission (via email) to the researcher to use the survey.

What measures or observations will be taken in the study? If any questionnaire or other instruments are used, provide a brief description and attach a copy.

In order to determine attitudes toward self, the workplace, and career mentoring, a list of every woman in a leadership role in all private, 4-year colleges and universities in Kansas

and Missouri will be created. "Leadership role" shall be defined as college and university presidents, vice-presidents, executive directors, deans, and department chairs. Every woman leader on that list will be asked to complete Egan's survey, most likely online. (attached)

Will the subjects encounter the risk of psychological, social, physical or legal risk? If so, please describe the nature of the risk and any measures designed to mitigate that risk.

No, the women will not encounter the risk of psychological, social, physical, or legal risk. The survey is anonymous, and they will not be identified.

Will any stress to subjects be involved? If so, Please describe.

No, no stress to subjects will be involved.

Will the subjects be deceived or misled in any way? If so, include an outline or script of the debriefing.

No, subjects will not be deceived or misled in any way.

Will there be a request for information which subjects might consider to be personal or sensitive? If so, please include a description.

Egan's survey asks for information in an anonymous way so as to allow complete honesty.

Will the subjects be presented with materials which might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading? If so, please describe.

No, the subjects will not be presented with any material that could be considered to be offensive, threatening or degrading.

Approximately how much time will be demanded of each subject?

The survey will take approximately 35 minutes to complete.

Who will be the subjects in this study? How will they be solicited or contacted? Provide an outline or script of the information which will be provided to subjects prior to their volunteering to participate. Include a copy of any written solicitation as well as an outline of any oral solicitation.

A list of every woman in a leadership role in all private, 4-year colleges and universities in Kansas and Missouri will be compiled, and those persons will be contacted, either via phone or email, and asked to participate in this study. Most likely the researcher will make the survey available online. If that is not feasible, then the researcher will mail a hard copy to all of the women on the list.

What steps will be taken to insure that each subject's participation is voluntary? What if any inducements will be offered to the subjects for their participation?

The women will be asked to participate; No inducements will be offered.

How will you insure that the subjects give their consent prior to participating? Will a written consent form be used? If so, include the form. If not, explain why not.

No consent form is needed, as it is not an on-going treatment, and the individual will not be identified.

Will any aspect of the data be made a part of any permanent record that can be identified with the subject? If so, please explain the necessity.

No data collected by the researcher will be made part of any permanent record.

Will the fact that a subject did or did not participate in a specific experiment or study be made part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher or employer? If so, explain.

No, the researcher will only note in the study how many women did and did not choose to participate.

APPENDIX B

IRB LETTER OF APPROVAL

APPENDIX B

27 March 2007

Hollie Becker
Graduate School of Education
Baker University

Dear Ms. Becker:

The Baker University IRB has reviewed your research project application (M-0039-0307-0327-G) and **approved** this project under Exempt Review. As described, the project complies with all the requirements and policies established by the University for protection of human subjects in research. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date.

The Baker University IRB requires that your consent form must include the date of approval and expiration date (one year from today). Please be aware of the following:

1. At designated intervals (usually annually) until the project is completed, a Project Status Report must be returned to the IRB.
2. Any significant change in the research protocol as described should be reviewed by this Committee prior to altering the project.
3. Notify the OIR about any new investigators not named in original application.
4. Any injury to a subject because of the research procedure must be reported to the IRB Chair or representative immediately.
5. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents for at least three years past completion of the research activity. If you use a signed consent form, provide a copy of the consent form to subjects at the time of consent.
6. If this is a funded project, keep a copy of this approval letter with your proposal/grant file.

Please inform Office of Institutional Research (OIR) or myself when this project is terminated. As noted above, you must also provide OIR with an annual status report and receive approval for maintaining your status. If your project receives funding which requests an annual update approval, you must request this from the IRB one month prior to the annual update. Thanks for your cooperation. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Marc L Carter, PhD
Chair, Baker University IRB

CC: Susan Rogers; file

APPENDIX C

EMAIL FROM KATHRYN EGAN GRANTING PERMISSION TO USE SURVEY

APPENDIX C

EMAIL FROM DR. KATHRYN EGAN GRANTING PERMISSION TO USE SURVEY

From: kathrynegan@comcast.net [mailto:kathrynegan@comcast.net]

Sent: Mon 1/22/2007 2:51 PM

To: Hollie M. Becker

Subject: Re: Permission to use your survey

Hello Hollie--Yes, you have my permission to use the survey instrument from my research on women in leadership/management positions. Kathryn S. Egan, Ph.D.

----- Original message -----

From: "Hollie M. Becker" <hmbecker@spgsmail.bakeru.edu>

> Hi, Dr. Egan,

>

> It is Hollie Becker again. Thank you for taking time to speak with me Saturday
> on the telephone, and thank you as well for giving me permission to use your
> survey in my dissertation research. As I stated on Saturday, I am sending a
> follow-up email, so that I may obtain written permission from you, via email.
> Please reply at your convenience.

>

> Thanks again!

> Sincerely,

> Hollie Becker

>

> P.S. I have not heard back from Christine yet as to obtaining a clean copy of
> the survey, but I will let you know when I find out if she has one.

APPENDIX D

EMAIL INVITATION SENT TO WOMEN LEADERS

APPENDIX D

EMAIL INVITATION SENT TO WOMEN LEADERS

Dear _____,

My name is Hollie Becker and I am a doctoral student at Baker University. I am conducting a research study titled The Perceptions of Women in Leadership Positions at Private, 4-year Colleges and Universities in Kansas and Missouri Toward the Workplace, Their Work, Themselves and Career Mentoring. Since you have attained a position of leadership at your current university/college, I would like you to participate. I have a survey available online at _____. It takes about 35 minutes to complete, and is completely anonymous. It will ask you for information about your background, both personal and educational, your experience as a working professional, and your experience with career mentoring.

By participating, you will assist me and other researchers in understanding what commonalities exist among the women successful in becoming leaders at private colleges and universities, and in examining how women protégés learn from and relate to their mentor(s).

If you have any questions or if you would like a copy of the results of this study, you may contact me via email at hmbecker@spgsmail.bakeru.edu.

Thank you so much for your time.

Sincerely,
Hollie Becker

APPENDIX E

EGAN'S SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX E

EGAN'S SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

For each of the following statements, Please circle the number (1 to 7) of the response that most represents you.

1 = strongly agree 7 = strongly disagree

N/A on some questions = Not applicable

(All questions apply to the institution where you are now working. If the statement is not relevant to your institution, please indicate your response to the general situation.)

SA=1

SD=7

1. To have her ideas listened to by others, a women must have it voiced by a man.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I defined my career goal and I am achieving it.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Men are paid more than women around here for the same work.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. My expertise gives me power in my workplace.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. Men and women are treated equally where I work.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. The best way for me to have power in my workplace is to acknowledge my weaknesses to my coworkers.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. Where I work, women are treated better than men when it comes to advancement.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. Being physically attractive is an advantage in my job.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. Developing relationships is the best way to gain power.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. A person whose family responsibilities sometimes interfere with work should not expect the same career rewards (such as promotions and salary increases) as others.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. If I am successful at my work, it is due to luck, not because of something I had control over.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I have less opportunity than a man for the top-level positions at my institution.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. Once I achieve a certain level in my career, I'll be able to do what I most want to do.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. I can find ways to make the system work to meet my own objectives.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. Being single is an advantage in my career.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. To succeed in my career, I am going to have to compromise what I would most like to do and do what I must.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. My present position is the result of luck.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. I go after opportunities.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. I have identified the barrier(s) to achieving my goal.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. Others believe my ability to do my job will lessen as I get older.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. I feel physically fit.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. I prepared for what I am doing now.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. Being married is plus for career advancement in a position such as mine.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. Earlier I pictured myself succeeding at what I do now.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. I have traded a lasting relationship for my career.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. To balance career and family, I sacrifice leisure time.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. I am personally responsible for the way my life has turned out.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

28. I never had clear career aspirations.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29. To be successful a person must comply with externally defined rules and guidelines, but so do according to her own life goals and priorities.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

30. To be successful in a career a person must measure up to external standards, in the same way she did as a 'good student.'

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

31. I will probably never achieve my goal.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

32. To be successful in a career a person should make her/his own rules outside the system.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

The following questions pertain to mentoring. A mentor is defined as a more experienced professional serving as a teacher, sponsor, or advisor to a less experienced person (protégé).

33. Some people have had mentors or career helpers. If you have had such a person, or persons, in your life, please indicate: I have had:

1. no mentors _____ 2. 1-2 mentors _____ 3. 3 or more mentors _____

IF YOU HAVE HAD A MENTOR(S), PLEASE SKIP QUESTIONS #34-36 AND GO ON TO #37.

34. Do you regret not having a mentor? 1. yes _____ 2. no _____

SA=1

SD=7

35. I deliberately avoided mentoring.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

36. I had no mentor(s) because there were none available to me.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

(IF YOU HAVE NEVER HAD A MENTOR, SKIP TO QUESTION #58.)

The following is a list of roles mentors sometimes have in the lives of their protégés. For each item, please indicate how important the mentoring role was in your relationship with your *primary* mentor.

1 = most important 9 = least important

37. Role modeling (protégé observes mentor interacting with significant others, dealing with conflict, balancing personal and professional demands).

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

38. Encouraging (mentor provides positive feedback, emotional support, motivates to do one's best).

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

39. Counseling (mentor discusses protégé's fears, anxieties, uncertainties).

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

40. Transitioning (mentor moves from being a superior to a friend or colleague).

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

41. Educating (mentor teaches, challenges and evaluates the protégé).
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
42. Consulting (mentor acquaints protégé with political dynamics or informal power structures of a community. Provides information about occupational values, norms and resources).
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
43. Sponsoring (mentor provides good press for protégé by discussing accomplishments with colleagues, provides visibility, establishes contacts, accompanies protégé to significant professional events).
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
44. Coaching (mentor clarifies protégé's goals, dreams and methods of implementing them; enables protégé to develop a set of personal and professional standards).
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
45. Protecting (mentor shields protégé from negative publicity, from damaging contacts; may take the blame for some of protégé's own mistakes).
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements pertaining to your primary mentor.

SA=1

SD=7

46. I could have gotten where I am without my mentor.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
47. My mentor gave me emotional support.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

For items 48-50, please check the items that apply:

48. I chose my mentor _____.
49. My mentor was assigned to me _____.
50. My mentor was a colleague _____.

For items 51-53, please check the items that apply:

51. My mentor defined what I needed to do to be successful in my career.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

52. My mentor provided mostly technical support.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

53. My mentor provided personal support.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

54. Length of my longest mentoring relationship was:

1. less than 1 yr. _____ 2. 1-2 yrs. _____ 3. 2-5 yrs. _____
 4. 5+ yrs. _____

55. How similar to yourself is your primary mentor with respect to the following characteristics? Please circle your response:

	Very Similar = 1				Very Dissimilar = 7		
a. physical appearance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. intelligence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. personality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. approach to solving problems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
e. background, personal history	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
f. activities pursued outside work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
g. family life cycle	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
h. ambition	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
i. education	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
j. race or ethnic group	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
k. religion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
l. gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
m. age	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

56. My mentor was or is my spouse.

1. _____ yes 2. _____ no

57. My mentoring relationship resulted from a formal mentoring program.

1. _____ yes 2. _____ no

APPENDIX F

DEMOGRAPHIC SECTION ADDED TO SURVEY

APPENDIX F

DEMOGRAPHIC SECTION ADDED TO SURVEY

Personal Information

Year of Birth _____

Which most describes the situation in which you grew up?

Residence: City Suburb Rural Other (please specify)

Socio-economic class: Upper Middle Lower Other (please specify)

How many sisters do you have? _____ Brothers? _____

What is your birth order? _____ (ex. Oldest, youngest, 3rd of 5, etc.)

Did you grow up in a 2-parent home? Yes No

If no, with what parent did you reside?

Mother Father Other (please specify)

What was the occupation of your father while you were growing up?

What was the occupation of your mother while you were growing up?

What most describes your father's education?

Some high school HS diploma Technical certificate

Bachelors Masters Doctorate Other (please specify)

What most describes your mother's education?

Some high school HS diploma Technical certificate

Bachelors Masters Doctorate Other (please specify)

While growing up, did you identify with one parent more than the other? Yes No

If so, which one? Mother Father Other (please specify)

What is your ethnicity? (circle all that apply)

Native American Caucasian/White African American Asian/Pacific Islander

Hispanic Other (please specify)

Are you: Single Married Divorced Widowed

Do you have children? Yes No
If so: How many girls? _____ How many boys? _____

Education

What is your highest degree? Bachelors Masters Doctoral

Where is it from? _____

In what year did you earn it? _____

Did you have a specialization/particular area of interest? Yes No

If yes, what was it? _____

Current Job

What is your current job title? _____

How long have you been in this position? _____

Before being in this position, did you hold any other job(s) at the same institution?
Yes No

If yes, what was your former title(s)? _____

Miscellaneous

Can you think of particular factors in your life that helped to make you successful? If so, please share them.

Is there anything else you would like to share?

APPENDIX G

EPISTEMOLOGICAL STATEMENTS

APPENDIX G

EPISTEMOLOGICAL STATEMENTS

1. I defined my career goal and I am achieving it.
2. My expertise gives me power in my workplace.
3. If I am successful at my work, it is due to luck, not because of something I had control over.
4. I can find ways to make the system work to meet my own objectives.
5. To succeed in my career, I am going to have to compromise what I would most like to do and do what I must.
6. I go after opportunities.
7. I have identified the barrier(s) to achieving my goal.
8. I prepared for what I am doing now.
9. Earlier I pictured myself succeeding at what I do now.
10. I never had clear career aspirations.
11. To be successful a person must comply with externally defined rules and guidelines, but so do according to her own life goals and priorities.
12. I will probably never achieve my goal.

APPENDIX H

PERCEPTIONS OF SELF FULL DATA TABLE

APPENDIX H

PERCEPTIONS OF SELF FULL DATA TABLE

Statement	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	President	6	4.5000	2.16795
	Vice-President	32	4.9375	1.58496
	Director	155	5.0065	1.74511
	Dean	24	4.6250	1.92946
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	5.2500	1.48324
	Department Chair	40	5.6750	1.55889
2	President	6	6.3333	.51640
	Vice-President	31	4.8710	1.83924
	Director	155	4.7935	1.76803
	Dean	24	5.4583	1.71893
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	5.1250	1.78419
	Department Chair	40	5.2000	1.84252
3	President	6	2.8333	1.72240
	Vice-President	31	3.4194	1.72770
	Director	154	3.9870	1.72254
	Dean	24	3.9583	1.68056
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	3.8750	1.85742
	Department Chair	39	3.4872	1.74525
4	President	6	7.0000	.00000
	Vice-President	32	6.1250	1.86219
	Director	153	6.0654	1.66098
	Dean	24	6.2500	1.39096
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	5.7500	1.91485
	Department Chair	40	6.3750	1.37165
5	President	6	2.8333	1.47196
	Vice-President	32	3.0938	1.32858
	Director	150	3.1067	1.80658
	Dean	24	2.8750	1.96297
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	15	2.5333	1.95911
	Department Chair	40	3.1250	1.93732
6	President	6	2.0000	1.54919
	Vice-President	32	2.4063	1.70122
	Director	153	2.1569	1.40074

	Dean	24	2.2917	1.26763
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	2.0000	.81650
	Department Chair	40	2.2500	1.56484
7	President	6	4.5000	1.37840
	Vice-President	32	5.1875	1.57475
	Director	152	4.5855	1.57145
	Dean	24	5.0000	1.47442
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	5.0625	1.23659
	Department Chair	40	4.6500	1.76214

APPENDIX I

PERCEPTION OF WORKPLACE FULL DATA TABLE

APPENDIX I

PERCEPTION OF WORKPLACE FULL DATA TABLE

Statement	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	President	6	6.5000	0.83666
	Vice-President	32	5.9375	1.50134
	Director	155	5.5226	1.74451
	Dean	24	5.7500	1.62186
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	4.8750	2.27669
	Department Chair	40	5.4000	1.66102
	Total	273	5.5568	1.72287
2	President	6	5.5000	2.07364
	Vice-President	32	4.7188	2.18845
	Director	155	3.8839	2.12577
	Dean	24	3.1667	2.01444
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	3.1250	1.66833
	Department Chair	40	4.0250	2.10600
	Total	273	3.9304	2.12969
3	President	6	1.6667	0.81650
	Vice-President	32	2.6563	1.73409
	Director	155	3.4839	1.83881
	Dean	24	3.0417	1.73153
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	3.9375	1.84278
	Department Chair	40	3.3500	1.76214
	Total	273	3.3150	1.81993
4	President	6	5.0000	1.54919
	Vice-President	32	5.5625	1.36636
	Director	155	5.2452	1.66063
	Dean	24	5.2083	1.64129
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	5.1250	1.50000
	Department Chair	40	5.8250	1.35661
	Total	273	5.3516	1.57676
5	President	6	6.1667	1.16905
	Vice-President	32	5.8125	1.65466
	Director	154	4.3052	2.09677
	Dean	24	4.7500	2.09035
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	4.2500	1.80739

	Department Chair	40	4.9500	1.99936
	Total	272	4.6544	2.06134
6	President	6	6.3333	0.81650
	Vice-President	31	5.6452	1.76160
	Director	153	5.6601	1.56509
	Dean	24	6.1667	1.16718
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	5.1250	1.85742
	Department Chair	39	6.2051	1.28103
	Total	269	5.7658	1.54080

APPENDIX J

PERCEPTIONS OF SELF IN RELATION TO WORKPLACE FULL DATA TABLE

APPENDIX J

PERCEPTIONS OF SELF IN RELATION TO WORKPLACE FULL DATA TABLE

Statement	Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	President	6	4.3333	1.86190
	Vice-President	32	4.1250	1.62143
	Director	155	4.2194	1.76647
	Dean	24	3.9583	1.75646
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	4.5625	1.78769
	Department Chair	40	4.4750	2.02532
	Total	273	4.2454	1.78284
2	President	6	2.5000	1.04881
	Vice-President	32	2.6250	1.75518
	Director	155	2.3484	1.36083
	Dean	24	2.1667	1.16718
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	2.3750	1.40831
	Department Chair	40	2.3000	1.34355
	Total	273	2.3626	1.38413
3	President	6	6.5000	0.54772
	Vice-President	31	5.1290	1.85727
	Director	154	4.4091	2.00852
	Dean	24	4.5833	1.71735
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	4.3750	1.82117
	Department Chair	40	4.5750	2.22903
	Total	271	4.5756	1.99090
4	President	6	5.1667	1.32916
	Vice-President	32	5.3125	1.57475
	Director	154	5.0519	1.92266
	Dean	24	5.2917	1.80529
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	5.6875	1.49304
	Department Chair	40	5.6750	1.32795
	Total	272	5.2353	1.76575
5	President	6	2.3333	1.03280
	Vice-President	32	3.0000	1.72271
	Director	153	2.9477	1.52949
	Dean	24	2.7083	1.33447
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	15	3.4667	1.50555

	Department Chair	40	2.8000	1.55580
	Total	270	2.9259	1.52856
6	President	6	2.5000	2.50998
	Vice-President	32	3.9688	1.67495
	Director	153	4.4379	1.57208
	Dean	24	3.7917	1.55980
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	16	4.5625	1.54785
	Department Chair	40	4.3250	1.81712
	Total	271	4.2731	1.66421

APPENDIX K

FULL DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

APPENDIX K

FULL DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Because of the vast amount of data that was collected, the researcher was forced to focus on the results that were pertinent to the three research hypotheses. Because of this, the demographic data is reported below. This data could be very useful for future researchers looking to see if a connection or relationship exists between women's backgrounds and their status as a Constructivist or Proceduralist. Of the 324 women who started the survey, all responded to the demographic portion. 312 continued on to answer the questions taken from Kathryn Egan's survey, and of those 273 fit the researcher's definition of a leader.

Demographic Results: Residence Growing Up

Residence	Number in Each Category	Percent of Total
City	77	23.8
Suburb	71	21.9
Small Town	106	32.7
Rural	56	17.3
Subtotal	310	95.7
"Other"	14	4.3
Total (n=324)	324	100.0

Demographic Results: Socioeconomic Status Growing Up

SES	Number in Each Category	Percent of Total
Upper	22	6.8
Middle	236	72.8
Lower	64	19.8
Subtotal	322	99.4
No response given	2	0.6
Total (n=324)	324	100.0

Demographic Results: Number of Sisters

Number of Sisters	Number in Each Category	Percent of Total
0	104	32.1
1	109	33.6
2	71	21.9
3	22	6.8
4	9	2.8
5	6	1.9
6	1	0.3
Subtotal	322	99.4
No response given	2	0.6
Total (n=324)	324	100.0

Demographic Results: Number of Brothers

Number of Brothers	Number in Each Category	Percent of Total
0	97	29.9
1	127	39.2
2	64	19.8
3	23	7.1
4	5	1.5
5	6	1.9
Subtotal	322	99.4
No response given	2	0.6
Total (n=324)	324	100.0

Demographic Results: Birth Order

Birth Order	Number in Each Category	Percent of Total
Only Child	16	4.9
Oldest	126	38.9
Middle	67	20.7
Youngest	112	34.6
Subtotal	321	99.1
No response given	3	0.9
Total (n=324)	324	100.0

Demographic Results: “Did you grow up in a two-parent home? Yes or No.”

Two-parent Home	Number in Each Category	Percent of Total
Yes	288	88.9
No	33	10.2
Subtotal	321	99.1
No response given	3	0.9
Total (n=324)	324	100.0

Demographic Results: “If no, with what parent did you reside?”

Resided With _____	Number in Each Category	Percent of Total
Mother	26	89.7
Father	2	6.9
Both, at different times	1	3.4
Total (n=29)	29	100.0

Demographic Results: Father’s education

Father’s Education	Number in Each Category	Percent of Total
Elementary school	10	3.1
8 th grade	13	4.0
Some high school	33	10.2
High school diploma	80	24.7
Technical Education	28	8.6
Some college	23	7.1
Associates degree	4	1.2
Bachelor’s degree	57	17.6
Master’s degree	40	12.3
Doctoral Degree	32	9.9
Subtotal	320	98.8
No response given	4	1.2
Total (n=324)	324	100.0

Demographic Results: Mother's education

Mother's Education	Number in Each Category	Percent of Total
Elementary school	7	2.2
8 th grade	7	2.2
Some high school	22	6.8
High School Diploma	116	35.8
Technical education	28	8.6
Some college	18	5.6
Associates degree	8	2.5
Bachelor's degree	80	24.7
Master's degree	31	9.6
Doctoral degree	3	.9
Subtotal	320	98.8
No response given	4	1.2
Total (n=324)	324	100.0

Demographic Results: "While growing up, did you identify with one parent more than the other?"

Identified More With One Parent	Number in Each Category	Percent of Total
Yes	191	59.0
No	133	41.0
Total (n=324)	324	100.0

Demographic Results: "If so, which one?"

Identified More With ____	Number in Each Category	Percent of Total
Mother	105	55.0
Father	85	44.5
Grandma	1	0.5
Total (n=191)	191	100.0

Demographic Results: Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Number in Each Category	Percent of Total
Native American	7	2.2
Caucasian	293	90.4
African American	9	2.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	0.9
Hispanic	3	0.9
“Other” - Jewish	1	0.3
“Other” – South African	1	0.3
Subtotal	317	97.8
No response given	7	2.2
Total (n=324)	324	100.0

Demographic Results: Marital Status

Marital Status	Number in Each Category	Percent of Total
Single	37	11.4
Married	238	73.5
Divorced	28	8.6
Widowed	6	1.9
“Other” - Separated	2	0.6
“Other” – Partnered/ Domestic Partnership	5	1.5
“Other” - Nun	4	1.2
Subtotal	320	98.8
No response given	4	1.2
Total	324	100.0

Demographic Results: “Do you have children?”

Have Children	Number in Each Category	Percent of Total
Yes	217	67.0
No	103	31.8
Subtotal	320	98.8
No response given	4	1.2
Total (n=324)	324	100.0

Demographic Results: Highest Degree

Highest Degree Earned	Number in Each Category	Percent of Total
Bachelor's degree	45	13.9
Master's degree	136	42.0
Doctoral degree	133	41.0
"Other" - ABD (All but dissertation)	3	0.9
"Other" - High school	1	0.3
"Other" - Associates degree	1	0.3
Subtotal	319	98.5
No response given	5	1.5
Total (n=324)	324	100.0

Demographic Results: Tenure in Current Position

Length of Time in Current Position (in years)	Number in Each Category	Percent of Total
Under one year	26	8.0
1 - 3 years	105	32.4
3-5 years	54	16.7
6-8 years	42	13.0
9-10 years	27	8.3
11-15 years	30	9.3
16-19 years	16	4.9
20+	13	4.0
Subtotal	313	96.6
No response given	11	3.4
Total (n=324)	324	100.0

Demographic Results: "Before being in this position, did you hold any other job(s) at the same institution?"

Held Other Jobs	Number in Each Category	Percent of Total
Yes	179	55.2
No	141	43.5
Subtotal	320	98.8
No response given	4	1.2
Total (n=324)	324	100.0

APPENDIX L

FULL MENTORING DATA

APPENDIX L

FULL MENTORING DATA

Once again, due to the vast amount of data that was collected, the researcher was forced to focus on the results that were pertinent to the three research hypotheses.

Because of this, much of the mentoring data is reported below.

Mentoring Results: “I deliberately avoided mentoring.”

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1.00	7	2.2	2.5	2.5
2.00	8	2.5	2.8	5.3
3.00	5	1.5	1.8	7.0
4.00	10	3.1	3.5	10.6
5.00	20	6.2	7.0	17.6
6.00	62	19.1	21.8	39.4
7.00	172	53.1	60.6	100.0
Total	284	87.7	100.0	

Mentoring Results: “I had no mentor(s) because there were none available to me.”

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1.00	33	10.2	11.6	11.6
2.00	19	5.9	6.7	18.2
3.00	12	3.7	4.2	22.5
4.00	19	5.9	6.7	29.1
5.00	12	3.7	4.2	33.3
6.00	35	10.8	12.3	45.6
7.00	155	47.8	54.4	100.0
Total	285	88.0	100.0	

	Department Chair	32	1.7500	1.04727	0.18513	1.00	5.00
	Total	199	1.8090	1.19921	0.08501	1.00	7.00
3: Counseling	President	4	2.2500	0.95743	0.47871	1.00	3.00
	Vice-President	27	3.2222	1.84669	0.35540	1.00	7.00
	Director	105	2.5048	1.51355	0.14771	1.00	7.00
	Dean	18	2.5556	1.58011	0.37243	1.00	6.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	15	3.0667	1.62422	0.41937	1.00	6.00
	Department Chair	33	3.0909	1.89347	0.32961	1.00	7.00
	Total	202	2.7376	1.64376	0.11565	1.00	7.00
4: Transitioning	President	4	3.2500	2.62996	1.31498	1.00	7.00
	Vice-President	27	3.2593	2.06793	0.39797	1.00	7.00
	Director	104	2.9808	1.60691	0.15757	1.00	7.00
	Dean	18	2.8889	1.60473	0.37824	1.00	7.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	15	3.2000	1.47358	0.38048	1.00	6.00
	Department Chair	33	3.2727	1.89197	0.32935	1.00	7.00
	Total	201	3.0796	1.71861	0.12122	1.00	7.00
5: Educating	President	4	2.0000	1.41421	0.70711	1.00	4.00
	Vice-President	27	2.6667	1.66410	0.32026	1.00	7.00
	Director	103	2.1650	1.42868	0.14077	1.00	7.00
	Dean	18	2.0000	1.32842	0.31311	1.00	6.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	15	2.3333	1.39728	0.36078	1.00	6.00
	Department Chair	33	2.6364	1.67366	0.29135	1.00	7.00
	Total	200	2.3050	1.49437	0.10567	1.00	7.00
6: Consulting	President	4	1.7500	0.95743	0.47871	1.00	3.00
	Vice-President	26	2.3077	1.66779	0.32708	1.00	7.00
	Director	105	2.6476	1.70396	0.16629	1.00	7.00
	Dean	18	2.2222	1.16597	0.27482	1.00	5.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	15	1.8667	0.91548	0.23637	1.00	4.00
	Department Chair	33	2.3030	1.33428	0.23227	1.00	7.00
	Total	201	2.4328	1.54813	0.10920	1.00	7.00
7: Sponsoring	President	4	2.0000	1.15470	0.57735	1.00	3.00
	Vice-President	27	2.7778	1.84669	0.35540	1.00	7.00
	Director	105	2.6762	1.62016	0.15811	1.00	7.00
	Dean	18	3.1111	1.77859	0.41922	1.00	6.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	15	2.1333	1.18723	0.30654	1.00	5.00
	Department Chair	33	2.9091	1.50756	0.26243	1.00	7.00
	Total	202	2.7129	1.61360	0.11353	1.00	7.00
8: Coaching	President	4	1.5000	0.57735	0.28868	1.00	2.00
	Vice-President	27	2.8889	1.55250	0.29878	1.00	7.00

	Director	105	2.4667	1.53213	0.14952	1.00	7.00
	Dean	18	2.3333	1.41421	0.33333	1.00	6.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	15	2.5333	1.30201	0.33618	1.00	5.00
	Department Chair	33	2.8182	1.53000	0.26634	1.00	7.00
	Total	202	2.5545	1.49942	0.10550	1.00	7.00
9: Protecting	President	4	4.5000	2.38048	1.19024	2.00	7.00
	Vice-President	27	4.1481	2.23097	0.42935	1.00	7.00
	Director	105	4.1333	1.89161	0.18460	1.00	7.00
	Dean	18	4.1667	2.03643	0.47999	1.00	7.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	15	4.0667	1.79151	0.46257	1.00	7.00
	Department Chair	33	4.1818	2.02260	0.35209	1.00	7.00
	Total	202	4.1485	1.95158	0.13731	1.00	7.00

Mentoring Results: "I chose my mentor."

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	132	40.7	59.5	59.5
No	90	27.8	40.5	100.0
Subtotal	222	68.5	100.0	
Didn't respond	102	31.5		
Total	324	100.0		

Mentoring Results: "My mentor was assigned to me."

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	21	6.5	9.5	9.5
No	201	62.0	90.5	100.0
Subtotal	222	68.5	100.0	
Didn't respond	102	31.5		
Total	324	100.0		

Mentoring Results: "My mentor was a colleague."

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	131	40.4	59.0	59.0
No	91	28.1	41.0	100.0
Subtotal	222	68.5	100.0	
Didn't respond	102	31.5		
Total	324	100.0		

Mentoring Results: “My mentor defined what I needed to do to be successful in my career.”

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Minimum	Maximum
President	4	2.5000	0.57735	0.28868	2.00	3.00
Vice-President	27	3.7778	1.82574	0.35136	1.00	7.00
Director	103	3.3010	1.55194	0.15292	1.00	7.00
Dean	17	3.2941	1.49016	0.36142	1.00	7.00
Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	3.5000	1.22474	0.32733	2.00	6.00
Department Chair	32	3.4375	1.84806	0.32669	1.00	7.00
Total	197	3.3858	1.60147	0.11410	1.00	7.00

Mentoring Results: “My mentor provided mostly technical support.”

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Minimum	Maximum
President	4	3.7500	1.25831	0.62915	2.00	5.00
Vice-President	26	5.0000	1.81108	0.35518	2.00	7.00
Director	102	4.9510	1.84754	0.18293	1.00	7.00
Dean	17	4.6471	1.76569	0.42824	2.00	7.00
Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	5.0714	1.77436	0.47422	2.00	7.00
Department Chair	32	4.9063	1.88986	0.33408	1.00	7.00
Total	195	4.9077	1.81679	0.13010	1.00	7.00

Mentoring Results: “My mentor provided personal support.”

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Minimum	Maximum
President	4	2.0000	0.81650	0.40825	1.00	3.00
Vice-President	27	2.6667	1.77591	0.34177	1.00	7.00
Director	103	2.7282	1.74443	0.17188	1.00	7.00
Dean	17	2.4706	1.32842	0.32219	1.00	7.00
Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	2.6429	1.27745	0.34141	1.00	6.00
Department Chair	32	2.4688	1.56544	0.27673	1.00	7.00
Total	197	2.6345	1.63458	0.11646	1.00	7.00

Mentoring Results: “How similar to yourself is your primary mentor with respect to the following characteristics?” (Very similar =1 very dissimilar = 7)

		N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Min.	Max.
1: Physical Appearance	President	4	5.2500	2.06155	1.03078	3.00	7.00
	Vice-President	27	5.2593	1.45688	0.28038	2.00	7.00
	Director	103	5.2718	1.77783	0.17517	2.00	7.00
	Dean	17	5.7647	1.48026	0.35902	3.00	7.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	5.7143	1.68379	0.45001	2.00	7.00
	Department Chair	32	4.6875	2.29217	0.40520	1.00	7.00
	Total	197	5.2487	1.81098	0.12903	1.00	7.00
2: Intelligence	President	4	2.2500	1.25831	0.62915	1.00	4.00
	Vice-President	27	2.4444	1.50214	0.28909	1.00	6.00
	Director	102	2.7353	1.46866	0.14542	1.00	7.00
	Dean	17	2.3529	1.41161	0.34237	1.00	6.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	3.3571	1.49908	0.40065	1.00	6.00
	Department Chair	32	2.5000	1.48106	0.26182	1.00	7.00
	Total	196	2.6582	1.47126	0.10509	1.00	7.00

3: Personality	President	4	3.0000	1.63299	0.81650	1.00	5.00
	Vice-President	27	3.3333	1.30089	0.25036	1.00	6.00
	Director	103	3.7379	1.68593	0.16612	1.00	7.00
	Dean	17	3.5882	1.46026	0.35416	2.00	7.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	3.7857	1.62569	0.43448	1.00	7.00
	Department Chair	32	3.1563	1.64825	0.29137	1.00	7.00
	Total	197	3.5635	1.60747	0.11453	1.00	7.00
4: Approach to Solving Problems	President	4	2.5000	1.00000	0.50000	2.00	4.00
	Vice-President	27	2.7407	1.40309	0.27002	1.00	6.00
	Director	103	3.4175	1.56884	0.15458	1.00	7.00
	Dean	17	3.0000	1.32288	0.32084	1.00	6.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	3.4286	1.74154	0.46545	1.00	7.00
	Department Chair	32	2.8438	1.24717	.22047	1.00	6.00
	Total	197	3.1777	1.49622	0.10660	1.00	7.00
5: Background, Personal History	President	4	4.5000	2.08167	1.04083	2.00	7.00
	Vice-President	27	4.1852	1.73287	0.33349	1.00	7.00
	Director	103	4.2524	1.85619	0.18290	1.00	7.00
	Dean	17	4.0588	1.95162	0.47334	1.00	7.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	4.6429	1.73680	0.46418	2.00	7.00
	Department Chair	32	3.7500	1.52400	0.26941	1.00	7.00
	Total	197	4.1777	1.78540	0.12720	1.00	7.00
6: Activities Pursued Outside Work	President	4	2.2500	1.25831	0.62915	1.00	4.00
	Vice-President	26	4.4231	1.52769	0.29961	1.00	7.00
	Director	103	4.7379	1.65068	0.16265	1.00	7.00
	Dean	17	4.0588	1.91933	0.46551	1.00	7.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	5.2857	1.72888	0.46206	2.00	7.00

	Department Chair	32	4.0938	1.94039	0.34302	1.00	7.00
	Total	196	4.5204	1.75253	0.12518	1.00	7.00
7: Family Life Cycle	President	4	6.5000	1.00000	.50000	5.00	7.00
	Vice-President	27	4.6296	1.75736	0.33820	1.00	7.00
	Director	103	4.9223	1.84545	0.18184	1.00	7.00
	Dean	17	4.7647	1.71499	0.41595	2.00	7.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	5.0714	1.89997	0.50779	1.00	7.00
	Department Chair	32	3.8750	1.96337	0.34708	1.00	7.00
	Total	197	4.7411	1.87055	0.13327	1.00	7.00
8: Ambition	President	4	1.7500	.50000	0.25000	1.00	2.00
	Vice-President	27	2.2222	1.15470	0.22222	1.00	6.00
	Director	102	3.0588	1.77342	0.17559	1.00	7.00
	Dean	17	2.7059	1.49016	0.36142	1.00	7.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	3.2857	1.32599	0.35438	1.00	6.00
	Department Chair	32	2.8438	1.34667	0.23806	1.00	6.00
	Total	196	2.8673	1.58608	0.11329	1.00	7.00
9: Education	President	4	2.2500	1.25831	0.62915	1.00	4.00
	Vice-President	27	2.3704	1.52286	0.29307	1.00	6.00
	Director	103	2.7476	1.82423	0.17975	1.00	7.00
	Dean	17	1.5882	0.79521	0.19287	1.00	4.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	3.0000	1.51911	0.40600	1.00	5.00
	Department Chair	31	2.0000	1.12546	0.20214	1.00	5.00
	Total	196	2.4847	1.62505	0.11608	1.00	7.00
10: Race or Ethnic Group	President	4	1.2500	0.50000	0.25000	1.00	2.00
	Vice-President	27	1.8148	1.66496	0.32042	1.00	7.00
	Director	103	2.1748	1.98735	0.19582	1.00	7.00
	Dean	17	2.7059	2.25734	0.54749	1.00	7.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	2.8571	2.41333	0.64499	1.00	7.00
	Department Chair	32	1.3438	0.65300	0.11544	1.00	4.00

	Total	197	2.0660	1.86829	0.13311	1.00	7.00
11: Religion	President	4	3.5000	1.73205	0.86603	1.00	5.00
	Vice-President	27	3.5926	2.27460	0.43775	1.00	7.00
	Director	103	3.7670	2.23257	0.21998	1.00	7.00
	Dean	17	4.0000	2.42384	0.58787	1.00	7.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	4.0000	2.07550	0.55470	1.00	7.00
	Department Chair	32	3.5938	1.86408	0.32953	1.00	7.00
	Total	197	3.7462	2.15864	0.15380	1.00	7.00
12: Gender	President	4	5.5000	3.00000	1.50000	1.00	7.00
	Vice-President	27	3.6296	2.88428	0.55508	1.00	7.00
	Director	103	3.4078	2.77396	0.27333	1.00	7.00
	Dean	17	4.1176	2.78124	0.67455	1.00	7.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	3.1429	2.68492	0.71757	1.00	7.00
	Department Chair	32	3.3125	2.77590	0.49072	1.00	7.00
	Total	197	3.5076	2.77676	0.19784	1.00	7.00
13: Age	President	4	7.0000	0.00000	0.00000	7.00	7.00
	Vice-President	27	3.7778	1.88788	0.36332	1.00	7.00
	Director	102	4.2549	1.92784	0.19088	1.00	7.00
	Dean	17	4.0588	2.07577	0.50345	1.00	7.00
	Assistant/ Associate Dean	14	4.1429	2.07020	0.55328	1.00	7.00
	Department Chair	32	3.8750	1.97974	0.34997	1.00	7.00
	Total	196	4.1582	1.96651	0.14047	1.00	7.00

Mentoring Results: "My mentor was or is my spouse."

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	11	3.4	5.0	5.0
No	211	65.1	95.0	100.0
Subtotal	222	68.5	100.0	
Didn't respond	102	31.5		
Total	324	100.0		

Mentoring Results: "My mentoring relationship resulted from a formal mentoring program."

Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	12	3.7	5.4	5.4
No	210	64.8	94.6	100.0
Subtotal	222	68.5	100.0	
Didn't respond	102	31.5		
Total	324	100.0		

WORKS CITED

- Aburdene, Patricia and John Naisbitt. Megatrends for Women. New York: Villard Books, 1992.
- Acker, Joan. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." Gender and Society: The Official Publications of Sociologists for Women in Society 4.2 (1990): 139-158.
- Albino, J.E. "Strategy: The Dirty Word That Women Must Learn." The Education Record 73 (1992): 47-51.
- Astin, Helen S. "The Meaning of Work in Women's Lives: A Sociopsychological Model of Career Choice and Work Behavior." The Counseling Psychologist 12.4 (1984): 117-126.
- Babcock, Linda, and Sara Laschever. Women Don't Ask: Negotiation and the Gender Divide. United States: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Baxter, Janeen, and Erik Wright. "The Glass Ceiling Hypothesis: A Comparative Study of the United States, Sweden, and Australia." Gender and Society 14.2 (2000): 275-294.
- Benokraitis, Nijole. "Working in the Ivory Basement: Subtle Sex Discrimination in Higher Education." Career Strategies for Women in Academe: Arming Athena. Eds. Lynn Collins, Joan Chrisler, and Kathryn Quina. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 1998.
- Betz, Nancy, and Louise Fitzgerald. The Career Psychology of Women. Orlando, Florida: Academic Press, Inc., 1987.

Bukatko, Danuta. Child and Adolescent Development: A Chronological Approach.

Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2008.

Degler, Carl N. At Odds: Woman and the Family in America from the Revolution to the

Present. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Egan, Kathryn Smoot. "Flexible Mentoring: Adaptations in Style for Women's Ways of Knowing." The Journal of Business Communication 33.4 (1996): 401-426.

Egan, Kathryn Smoot. "Women Who Succeed in Broadcast Communications Academe: A Feminist Success Story." Journalism Quarterly 71.4 (1994): 960-972.

Feuers, Stelle. "Women in Management: Two Points of View, Shortening the Odds." Community and Junior College Journal 52.2 (1981): 6-12.

Friedan, Betty. The Feminine Mystique. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1963.

Gall, Joyce P., M.D. Gall, and Walter R. Borg. Applying Educational Research: A Practical Guide. 5th ed. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc., 2005.

Gardiner, Mary E., Ernestine Enomoto, and Margaret Grogan. Coloring Outside the Lines: Mentoring Women into School Leadership. New York: State University of New York Press, 2000.

Goldin, Claudia. Understanding the Gender Gap: An Economic History of American Women. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Haller, Emil J. and Paul F. Kleine. Using Educational Research: A School Administrator's Guide. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc., 2001.

Jacobs, Jerry A. "Gender Inequality and Higher Education." Annual Review of Sociology 22 (1996): 153-185.

- Jacobsen, Joyce P. The Economics of Gender. 2nd ed. Oxford, England: Blackwell Publishing, Inc., 1999.
- Kessler-Harris, Alice. In Pursuit of Equity: Women, Men, and the Quest for Economic Citizenship in 20th-Century America. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Kondrick, Linda. "What Does the Literature Say about the Persistence of Women with Career Goals in Physical Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics?" Mid-South Educational Research Association, Biloxi, Mississippi. 5-7 November, 2003.
- Laine, Christine and Barbara J. Turner. "Unequal Pay for Equal Work: The Gender Gap in Academic Medicine." Annals of Internal Medicine 141.3 (2004): 238-240.
- Lash, Christine. Athena's Daughter's: Women's Perceptions of Mentoring and the Workplace. Diss. Arizona State U, 2000. Ann Arbor.
- Leatherman, Courtney. "Colleges Hire More Female Presidents, but Questions Linger about Their Clout." The Chronicle of Higher Education Nov. 1991: A19-A21.
- Madden, Margaret E. "2004 Division 35 Presidential Address: Gender and Leadership in Higher Education." Psychology of Women Quarterly 29 (2005): 3-14.
- Madsen, Susan R. "Learning to Lead in Higher Education: Insights into the Family Backgrounds of Women University Presidents." Academy of Human Resource Development International Conference (AHRD), Columbus, Ohio. 22-26 February, 2006.
- Martin, Sara. "The Labyrinth to Leadership." Monitor on Psychology 38.7 (2007): 90-91.
- Murphy, Evelyn F. Getting Even: Why Women Don't Get Paid Like Men – And What to Do About It. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2005.

- “New Measures for Gender Inequities.” InsideHigherEd.com 2006. 4 June 2007
<http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2006/10/26/salaries>
- “On Payday, It’s Still a Man’s World.” CNNMoney.com 2007. Cable News Network. 23
April 2007
<http://cnnmoney.printthis.clickability.com/pt/cpt?action=cpt&title=Study%3A+Gender+Gap>
- Perna, Laura. “Sex Differences in Faculty Tenure and Promotion: The Contribution of Family Ties.” Research in Higher Education 46.3 (2005): 277-307.
- Pigford, Aretha B. Women in School Leadership: Survival and Advancement Guidebook. Columbia, South Carolina; Technomic Publishing Company, Inc., 1993.
- Shaughnessy, John J., Eugene B. Zechmeister, and Jeanne S. Zechmeister. Research Methods in Psychology. 6th ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 2003.
- Steinem, Gloria. “Gloria Steinem Quotes.” Ed. Jone Johnson Lewis. 1 December 2007.
http://womenshistory.about.com/cs/quotes/a/qu_g_steinem.htm
- United States. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Full-time Wage and Salary Workers – Number and Earnings, 2000-2005. Bulletin 2307: Table 630. 16 October 2007.
<http://www.bls.gov/cps/home.htm>
- United States. Census Bureau. Workers with Earnings, by Occupation of Longest Job Held and Sex: 2004. Table PINC-06. 16 October 2007.
<http://pubdb3.census.gov/macro/032005/perinc/toc.htm>
- Williams-Nickelson, Dr. Carol. “Women and Money.” Monitor on Psychology 38.7 (2007): 46.