CHAPTER – II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, the researcher has summarized the literature relevant to the research problem by providing an overview of the empirical studies concerning the research study namely various factors connected with women leadership and issues pertaining to women leadership in administration of institutions of higher education.

2.1 CHANGING ROLE OF WOMEN IN WORKFORCE

Linda Marie Fedigan (1986) noted that there was a change in the structure of the family unit because of economic independence. We began to have more nuclear families. In such a step, the traditional role of women began to lose importance and both husband and wife have a role to play and start living on equal terms. But, at the same time, trade unions began to fight for equal wages and such demands were backed up by feminist movements, fighting for equal rights. There were mainly sexist laws that are to the detriment of emancipation of women, the authorities concerned were pressurized to change those obsolete laws and replace them with ones that are equal. Hamamsy (2009) discussed the waves of feminism, though, allowed for the introduction of women entering the workforce in large numbers, but this trend was in no way exclusively occurring in the United States. Around the world, as feminism became a stronger driving force and often due to looming economic pressures, women became united and fortified and became more involved and accepted in work and activities outside the home.

In India after independence, much emphasis was laid on industrialization. Industrial zones were being set up and incentives were given for foreign investment. Manpower was greatly needed to work in factories, because of the extensive use of machines particularly in the field of textile and clothing, thus,
female labour was absorbed by this industry (Evea Dayan, 2007). In the early seventies, many women began to leave their homes and start working, thus adding to the monthly income of the family. Today more than 75% of women work in textile factories, as a result, women began to enjoy economic independence, their status in society rose and they enjoyed more dignity. The whole approach towards women changed. Women today are no longer regarded as the inferior sex and enjoy more equality (Chakrapani, 1994).

Nancy Goldman (1973) traced Americans and the members of other Western countries are accused of being ethnocentric by assuming that the increase of women in the workplace is unique to them and their countries; but in reality, this is not true. In Africa, where what is called Third-World feminism became a phenomenon, women were slowly becoming more involved in activities and jobs outside their traditional roles of mothers and housewives. Changes in education are allowing for women who may previously have not attended school, to be educated in the ways that are necessary for them to contribute effectively in their jobs. The countries of Latin America had limited, if any, access to social programs such as resources of education, and positions and participation in politics. They experienced an imbalanced division of labor, eventually, in the 1980's and 1990's due to empowerment programs of different organizations they were slowly becoming more involved in the workforce and slowly acquired more jobs outside the home (Barbara, 1990). Europe had its own waves of feminism that led to different countries allowing and enabling more women to become an integral part of the workplace. Poland, for example, began experiencing feminism as early as 1800, and although women did not necessarily get jobs and leave their traditional functions right away, the groundwork was being laid.
Ghosh (1997) stated that United Kingdom began its change of dynamics in the 19th century. Revisionism, the period of adjustment whereby society began to change its fundamental structures, brought with it the concept that minorities including women should become more involved and integral in society. World War I, was closely related to the influx of women in the workforce as well as in women being hired for jobs that were normally performed by men. Since, many of the men were involved in the actual fighting; there was a deficit of workers on the home-front to get involved in the industrial production that was so badly needed. Out of desperation, perhaps, but also because it was becoming more accepted that women can perform jobs that men used to do, women were hired in great numbers to become employees of industries and departments from which they were previously shunned. In America, feminism and women in the workforce were, as is to be expected, not always accepted as they are today. Partially due to the religious beliefs of those who first came to America from Europe, women were domestic creatures and were expected to be subservient to their husbands. They had no ownerships rights to property, were not allowed to sue, and were not given jobs outside the home. It is clear that women's roles have changed over time largely due to feminism but also due to economic pressures, although how much and to what extent is not obvious. Throughout the world, it was predominantly assumed that the role of the woman is to stay home and raise their children. This practice has been done for thousands of years, and although some women distinguished themselves and acted outside the social norms, the majority of women still remained subservient and domestic (Indu Agnihotri & Vina Mazumdar, 1995).

Barbara (1990) stated, over the time, the passing of centuries always brings with it different movements, transformations, and revolutions that create an atmosphere allowing modifications to take place and to hopefully remain. Additionally, wars and periods of economic difficulties also allowed for changes. It
is during these and other times, that feminism and its ideas of equality for women grew in strength and determination, allowing for the transition of women from the home-place to the work place to take root. However, just because women began taking on new roles does not mean that they were completely accepted and were given equal opportunities as men. Even today, there are situations where women performing the exact duties as men are paid less.

2.2 HISTORICAL AND SOCIO-CULTURE CONTEXTS OF WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION

According to scholars (Altbach, 1999) the system of Higher education was borrowed from the European university model, which was designed by and for men only. In the history of women in higher education, the entrance of women into colleges and universities is quite late in comparison with college men. Moreover, it was a long-term development and fights for equality and freedom of the female students in higher education. Women students came into higher education with many difficulties and female students in minority groups were even later in entering higher education. The process of establishing women colleges/universities and institutions was very slow and the students were much diversified.

In the 17th century, women were perceived as intellectually inferior to men and as incapable of being educated. Chliwniak (1997) & Rudolph (1968) noted that during colonial times, a common belief about a woman was that “Her faculties were not worth training. Her place was in the home, where man had assigned her a number of useful functions”. This type of statements reflected only the male’s negative beliefs about women’s abilities and their absolute dominance over women. In 17th century unlike their male counterparts, women were excluded from political, economic, and social activities and were limited to domestic responsibilities such as housekeeping, childrearing, sewing, and cooking (Nidiffer, 2003).
During the 18th century, (Glazer-Raymo, 2002) although a few women were inspired and demanded higher education for women, their voices never received any attention. Consequently, some women reformers started a very small number of respectable schools and female academies similar to today’s high school. The resistance against women’s higher education, once again, had to do with the widely held belief about where women belong and about womanhood in the society. The socio-cultural norms required women to be submissive daughters, wives, and mothers. Giving them more education than needed was viewed not only as wrong but also as possibly offensive to men who loved “a learned scholar, but not a learned wife”. Obviously, not only were women’s identities, worth, and social functions defined by men, but their access to education was still under men’s control. Women’s education did not receive much attention until the quality of men’s lives was affected. The disparity between women and men’s experiences in the academy had not abridged until the 1930s and 1940s when women filled the space left by men who were drawn to the battlefields during World Wars I and II (Glazer-Raymo, 2002). In fact, women’s higher education reached its first golden age during this period, with women representing more than 40% of the undergraduate study body (Nidiffer, 2003). However, women experienced setbacks by the 1950s because returning veterans were given priority for higher education demonstrating again that society still valued men’s education more than women’s.

Hargreaves (1994) traced that early in the 19th century, men recognized the need for more educated women to assist men for material advancement, handle the housework, and educate their children; at that point, women’s illiteracy became a problem. As a result, common schools were opened to women so that the illiteracy gap between men and women could be reduced and so that women could become better part to develop the societal value, unfortunately this beginning stage of women’s education was restricted to basic literacy training and domestic studies.
They noted, a big gap continued to exist between men and women’s educational experiences during 18th century. Very few women had the option of attending coeducational universities, which were considered superior to women’s colleges. Besides, while male students could choose to major in a variety of fields ranging from political science to economics, law, divinity, and medicine, most female students were funneled into “women’s” fields such as teacher education, home economics, and social science. Only in 19th century, women were inspired and encouraged to opt, explore the fields of their wish, and dream. So the educational system opened more avenue in all the fields and more of humanities too.

According to Suma Chitnis (1989) in India, traditions denied women access to gainful employment, and were further reinforced by their exclusion from formal education. It was a known fact that, the right to education in Hindu society was traditionally defined by caste. Each caste group was allowed the education appropriate to its status, and relevant to the occupations it was permitted to follow. The exclusion of women from education was more secular and less categorical in character; nevertheless, it has been firm and long-standing. Early in the Vedic times (2000 B.C. - 1500) the country did produce learned women scholars. Women’s access to education subsequently declined so miserably that, by 200 B.C., Manu the law giver had given them untouchable castes and declared them to be unfit for learning. Feminist research now reveals that despite this, women from some scholarly Brahmin and powerful Kshatriya families, particularly royal families, were often learned. But, these were rare exceptions, and women’s access to formal education remained very poor. By the time the British were established as rulers in India, women were not only excluded from education, but subject to oppressive practices like Sati, female infanticide, child marriage and the denial of remarriage to widows. The education and the employment of women in India changed through British rule. Christian missionaries were the first to attempt to educate Indian
women. To start with, they educated women and converted to Christianity. Initially, they were unsuccessful, but, by the second and third decades of the nineteenth century, they found support from an unexpected quarter. As Western educated Indian men started to recognize that their access to the inner social circle of British society would improve if their wives spoke English and acquired European manners, they turned to the missionaries to tutor their women. Gradually, European women from the laity also stepped forward to take advantage of the opportunity to serve as governesses and teachers. In addition, the practice of private tuition or instruction to small groups of women in what came to be known as ‘Zenna’ schools crept into a culture which had, for centuries, denied women formal education. However, the nineteenth century movement for social reform made the real dent in traditions denying women education. This movement which gained momentum in the 1840s had two major thrusts: first, an organized effort to obtain legislation against Sati, child marriage, female infanticide and the denial of remarriage to widows; and second, a firm and steady campaign for the education of women. This campaign was largely confined to the former British provinces of Bengal, Bombay and Madras. But, the advance of the education of women in this sector of the Indian population was significant. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, social reformers ventured further to provide widows and other marginalized women with education that would equip them to earn for themselves, and to become self-reliant and independent. In this phase, nursing and school-teaching, seen as nurturing occupations, that society then, grudgingly, accepted as permissible for women. Since health services for women and schools for girls were being set up, there was a steady demand for nurses and for women school teachers. Those who were willing to work were readily absorbed. A few women did nevertheless enter the professions of law or medicine or take up school or university teaching, not out of necessity but for
self-realization. These were bold exceptions to the rule. Moreover, they generally had to opt out of marriage in order to realize their aspirations.

Venkatasubramanian (2001) traced that when Gandhi drew women into the movement, at the beginning of the twentieth century, for freedom he specifically affirmed that their education was vital, both for the success of the movement and for the development of the country as a strong nation after freedom had been won. The education of women had an important place in the agenda that the Congress party spelt out for the tasks to be accomplished after the country acquired independence. However, surprisingly societal attitudes to their employment remained largely unchanged until the decade of the forties. During the Second World War a shortage of manpower, combined with an unprecedented rise in the cost of living forced middle-class families in cities like Bombay and Calcutta to accept the employment of their educated women. In 1916, Maharshi Karve, established a University for Women, known as the Women’s National University and it was subsequently renamed as Shrimati Nathibai Damodar Thackersey Women’s University. Today this is one of the leading Universities in the country and provides graduate and post-graduate education in diverse fields. After independence, both the education and the employment of women gained a fresh boost. The Constitution of independent India underlined their equal status as citizens. Meanwhile, both the concept of women’s right to work and the actual employment of educated women received a massive push from the feminist movement that had been gathering strength through the International Women’s Decade between 1975 and 1985. By the Sixth Plan period, official documents were beginning to talk about the ‘empowerment’ of women and their right to equal opportunity to work.

According to Josefina and Susan (2012), the nineties were predicted to be the decade in which women in the India would move in large numbers to positions at the
top of organizations. Between 1972 and 2002, the percentage of managerial jobs held by women in this country increased from 20 to 46 percent. The 20th century with a newly developed educational system and policy of 100% literacy women are more encouraged to take part in each field of education, politics and business. Although women seemed to be capable of handling the strain of serious study, opponents of women’s higher education did not stop searching for reasons to limit women’s access to higher education. Now they claimed that a college education for women and more participation in work force dilutes the system of family. Women become more economically independent, with the increase of their number in work force, which reflects badly within the system of marriage and family and increased divorce rate. The opponents also feel that the social value decreased due to more of feminized policy. They also implied the intellectual training would make unstable marriage, trigger more women’s infertility, distract men and produce domestic problems.

As long as the traditional values and belief systems about men’s and women’s places as well as roles in the society remain unchanged, men and women will continue to have gendered experiences in higher education and in the workplace. Since work has traditionally been the center of men’s lives (Kimmel, 2004), women who are trying to expand their boundaries by working in historically “men’s fields” will be perceived as a threat to men and, thus, will face more scrutiny and resistance.

2.3 LEADERSHIP IN SIGNIFICANCE OF THE EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT

English (2002) explained that educational management as a field of study and practice was derived from management principles first applied to industry and commerce. Theory development largely involved the application of industrial
models to educational settings. As the subject became established as an academic field in its own right, its theorists and practitioners began to develop alternative models based on their observation of, and experience in, schools and colleges. By the 21st century the main theories, featured here, have either been developed in the educational context or have been adapted from industrial models to meet the specific requirements of schools and colleges. Educational management has progressed from being a new field dependent upon ideas developed in other settings to become an established field with its own theories and research.

Tan (2006), asserts “the application of theories by practicing administrators is a difficult and problematic undertaking. Indeed, it is clear that theories are simply not used very much in the realm of practice.” This comment suggests that theory and practice are regarded as separate aspects of educational leadership and management. Academics develop and refine theory while managers engage in practice. Leadership and management are often regarded as essentially practical activities. Practitioners and policy-makers tend to be dismissive of theories and concepts for their alleged remoteness from the “real” school situation.

Susan (2012) explored and said that there is no single all-embracing theory of educational management. This reflects the astonishing diversity of educational institutions, ranging from small rural elementary schools to very large universities and colleges. It relates also to the varied nature of the problems encountered in schools and colleges, which require different approaches and solutions. Above all, it reflects the multifaceted nature of theory in education and the social sciences: “Students of educational management who turn to organisational theory for guidance in their attempt to understand and manage educational institutions will not find a single, universally applicable theory but a multiplicity of theoretical approaches each jealously guarded by a particular epistemic community”
2.4 THEORIES OF EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT

The existence of several different perspectives (Bolman & Deal, 1991) describe as “conceptual pluralism: a jangling discord of multiple voices.” Each theory has something to offer in explaining behaviour and events in educational institutions. The perspectives favoured by managers, explicitly or implicitly, inevitably influence or determine decision-making. Griffiths (1997) provides strong arguments to underpin his advocacy of “theoretical pluralism.” “The basic idea is that all problems cannot be studied fruitfully using a single theory. Some problems are large and complex and no single theory is capable of encompassing them, while others, although seemingly simple and straightforward, can be better understood through the use of multiple theories. Particular theories are appropriate to certain problems, but not others”.

Several writers have chosen to present theories in distinct groups or bundles but they differ in the models chosen, the emphasis given to particular approaches and the terminology used to describe them. Two of the best known frameworks are those by Bolman and Deal (1997) and Morgan (1997).

According to Bush (2006), the main theories are classified into six major models of educational management. All these models are given significant attention in the literature of educational management and have been subject to a degree of empirical verification. By his management model has formal, collegial, political, subjective, ambiguity and cultural and the leadership model has managerial, participative, transactional, post-modern, contingency and moral. The links between management and leadership models are given extended treatment to educational management. Theories of educational management are often based on observation of practice in educational institutions. English (2002) says that observation may be used in two ways. First, observation may be followed by the development of concepts, which then become theoretical frames. Such perspectives based on data
from systematic observation. Because such approaches are derived from empirical inquiry in schools and colleges; they are more likely to be perceived as relevant by practitioners. Secondly, researchers may use a specific theoretical frame to select concepts to be tested through observation.

Kathryn and Dana (2008) review the significance of managerial leadership as “Traditionally, the principal’s role has been clearly focused on management responsibilities”. Managerial leadership is focused on managing existing activities successfully rather than visioning a better future for the school. Dressler’s (2001) speaks on collegial model, which assume that organizations determine policy and make decisions through a process of discussion leading to consensus. Power is shared among some or all members of the organization who are thought to have a shared understanding about the aims of the institution. And he says that “collegiality can broadly be defined as teachers conferring and collaborating with other teachers”. Little (1990) explains, “The reason to pursue the study and practice of collegiality is that, presumably, something is gained when teachers work together and something is lost when they do not”. Collegial models assume a common set of values held by members of the organization. These common values guide the managerial activities of the organization and are thought to lead to shared educational objectives. The common values of professionals form part of the justification for the optimistic assumption that it is always possible to reach agreement about goals and policies he further, goes in referring to the importance of “shared vision” as a basis for collegial decision-making.

Lindsay and Kecia (2012) makes a more fundamental criticism by arguing that it is being espoused by official groups in order to secure the implementation of national or state policy. According to him, collegiality has these features: administratively regulated rather than spontaneous, compulsory rather than
discretionary, geared to the implementation of the mandates of government or the principal, fixed in time and place, designed to have predictable outcomes. Webb & Vulliamy (1996) argue that collegial frameworks may be used only to the institutions owned by the state. Another leadership model most closely aligned with political models is that of transactional leadership. “Transactional leadership is leadership in which relationships with teachers are based upon an exchange for some valued resource. To the teacher, interaction between administrators and teachers is usually episodic, short-lived and limited to the exchange transaction” (Miller & Miller, 2001). This exchange process is an established political strategy. As noted earlier, principals hold power in the form of key rewards such as promotion and references. However, they require the co-operation of staff to secure the effective management of the school. An exchange may secure benefits for both parties to the arrangement. The major limitation of such a process is that it does not engage staff beyond the immediate gains arising from the transaction. Transactional leadership does not produce long-term commitment to the values and vision promoted by academic leaders.

2.5 ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP AND EMPOWERMENT

Bush (2003) discussed that Academic leaders experiences tension between competing elements of leadership, management and administration. Irrespective of how these terms are defined, academic leaders experience difficulty in deciding the balance between higher order tasks designed to improve staff, student and school performance (leadership), routine maintenance of present operations (management) and lower order duties (administration).

According to Hargreaves (1999) Leadership means influencing others actions in achieving desirable ends. Managing is maintaining efficiently and effectively current organisational arrangement, both managing and leading and
attach no special value to either since different settings and times call for varied response and administration is simple application of rules. Leadership and management need to be given equal prominence if educational institutions are to operate effectively and achieve their objectives. “Leading and managing are distinct, but both are important. The challenge of modern organisations requires the objective perspective of the manager as well as the flashes of vision and commitment wise leadership provides”.

Scoot (2004) states that all other players, namely, administrators, curriculum specialists, parents and learner, institutionally control classroom teachers. Hawkins (2004) postulates that empowerment, a buzzword in corporate and educational circles, is essential for learners, teachers, school managers and support staff. It can only have a lasting effect if it is transacted, not as a conflict of control and demand, but rather as a sharing of tools between trustworthy and responsible stakeholders.

Michele and Browne (2000) found that empowerment "is the foundation stone upon which radical reform can be built". The task of management at all levels in the education system is to create and sustain conditions under which teachers and learners are able to achieve learning. The question arises: To what extent is empowerment being filtered down through the educational hierarchy? The literature (Enderlin-Lampe, 2002 & Sandy, 2004) emphasises that there has been a growing international trend towards decentralisation of academic management, with calls for more autonomy. Hurley (2004) and Glasspool (2007) are of the opinion that empowerment can only succeed in an environment where the desire for empowerment is greater than the desire for power. Empowerment has been over-promised too many times and using it as a 'quick-fix' does not solve any problems in the educational sector. The successful implementation of empowerment mechanisms is a process, not a single event. Palmleaders (2004) further states that many new
projects in academic administration include a hive of activities, but the change is at a superficial level. Empowerment is a process that facilitates deep fundamental change at the core of the system.

Kimmel, (2004) comments that gender stereotypes can negatively affect both men and women. For instance, while women are expected to be the source of strength for successful men, acting as catalysts for successful women is not so easy for men. In fact, intelligent and successful wives today are often perceived more as a threat than a blessing. Moreover, as part of the socialization process, women generally feel obligated to assume more family responsibilities than men. Although women today can pursue their own careers, they are still expected to put their families first because no matter how good they are in the workplace, home is still “their” primary job. In any case, “Women who hold policy-making positions in an institution of higher education generally are required by society to be model mothers and spouses, concerned citizens involved in civic activities, good teachers, authors of renown, and exceptional managers”. Studies have showed that, given the demands placed upon women leaders, they were more likely to suffer from “mommy guilt,” marital instability, role conflicts, health problems, and stress unless they have reliable and quality support systems.

2.6 ACADEMIC PROFESSION FOR WOMEN

UNESCO report, which found that the global picture is one of men outnumbering women at about five to one at middle management level and at about twenty to one at senior management level. In terms of administrative positions, and study on academia found that women are more likely to succeed as registrars, librarians or heads of department, than if they aspire to be vice chancellors or even deans of faculties. To conclude that women deans and professors are a minority group and women vice-chancellors and presidents are still a rarity.
The academic profession is a profession more of choice than of chance (Eagly & Hohannesen, 2001). As has been mentioned earlier, school teaching and nursing were the occupations first permitted to middle and upper class and caste women in the Indian society. School teaching was particularly preferred, possibly, because it carried the special respect that Indian society has traditionally accorded to occupations involving knowledge and teaching. As documented previously, senior women leaders in higher education still operate in a male-dominated environment. The majority of board members, line administrators, and faculty leaders are white males. Women in leadership positions are not only the minority but also are often viewed as “outsiders.” Therefore, they are challenged with complex institutional barriers of great magnitude and profundity. The remaining questions are: Do women leaders find it easy to establish themselves as legitimate leaders? Do they find it easy to function effectively? What barriers have they experienced as they step into a predominantly “man’s” world?

According to the recent India’s HRD report, nominations for leadership and career advancement opportunities are still low on Women in Higher Education. It states, only 12% of women participation in higher ranks of the university, 16% of principles are women in college, 13% of head of the departments are women, and 25% of administrative officers are women and very few Vice-chancellors Yet, women comprise more than 52% of the current academic population and still colleges and universities are dominated by male leadership.

As state by Evans (2002), when women entered university teaching, their status was significantly higher than that of school teachers. Although women now have access to practically every profession, to independent business, and several other avenues of employment that are highly prestigious and lucrative, there are many who prefer the academic profession. Since most positions in the management
of higher education are given to academics who make a mark as researchers, scholars or teachers it is important to understand this preference and to look at how women who enter academe perform. The data available on the issue indicate that there are some committed scholars and researchers who enter academe because they believe that it is the only place where they can seek self-fulfilment. But, they also reveal that many women join the academic profession for the simple reason that it combines more easily than any other occupation with their responsibilities as home-makers. Schools and colleges have long vacations, and they are able to use these vacations to catch up with pending home-making tasks. Moreover, it is helpful to have the same work hours and vacations as the children.

Daniel Pinnow (2011) discussed that women who enter the academic profession are well-qualified, often better qualified than their male colleagues, at the point at which they enter the profession. But, very few are able to do research, or writing, acquire doctoral or post-doctoral degrees or other academic distinctions required to be elevated to positions of management. The burden of carrying, simultaneously, their responsibilities as mothers and home-makers makes it difficult, some times impossible, for them to make the extra investment required. Moreover, even those who acquire additional qualifications are not always willing to move from a purely teaching or research position to one involving administrative responsibilities because these involve more time on the job.

Jayaram (2003) stated that the basic problem thus seems to be that most women in the academic profession consider their role as professionals or as earners secondary to that of the men in the family, and therefore, lack the drive to move up. In addition to this, the advance of those who venture to move up is often restricted because they are unwilling and unable to do the pushing and politicking that is now increasingly required to advance, to senior positions in the management of higher
education. Representatives from many prestigious institutions of higher learning called for greater utilization of women’s talents, particularly in academic science and engineering. Together they stressed, “Institutions of higher education have an obligation, both for themselves and for the nation, to fully develop and utilize all the creative talent available”.

Dr. Meinam Binota (UGC sponsored workshop, January 20, 2011, Impala) said that there are now 22 women rulers in the world today and India has also got the first woman President and first woman Speaker of Lok Sabha. As many as nine women personalities are heading the corporate world of India. There are nine women vice-chancellors against the total number of 70, two pro vice-chancellors against 24, two proctor/rector against 19, 50 deans against 367, six registrars against 77, 27 deputy registrars against 298, 67 assistant registrars against 504, five controller of examination against 57, three finance officers against 66, nine librarians against 51, 723 academic council members against 42167, 31 members of finance committee against 400 and 31 members of finance boards against 400 in Indian universities.

The first ever study conducted by the University Grants Commission (UGC) to know the position of women as regards managerial posts reveals that out of 431 recognised universities in India, only 13 universities have women vice-chancellors. Of these, six are women universities. According to the study, South India still shows a better record of women vice-chancellors with Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Mumbai having women vice-chancellors. However, none of the university in the North India till 2007 ever had a woman vice-chancellor, except for Punjabi University.

Prof Poonam Dhawan Director of Women Studies is the co-ordinator for north-west region of commented on her study and said, “This is a fight against tokenism of women on decision-making posts in the higher education. This is not
about gender bias but about sensitization of the fairer sex. The social or personal responsibilities that keep women at a distant from aiming at the decision-making posts.

### 2.7 WOMEN IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

According to Eagly and Hohannesen (2001), the historical truth is despite government interventions in promoting women education, women empowerment, women leadership, gender ratio, and women are, still under-represented in academic leadership positions in Indian higher education institutions, and tend to be clustered in the lower ranks. The academic profession is a profession more of choice than of chance. When asked to report their reasons for choosing an academic career, about three – fourths of faculty members indicate that they were attracted by the opportunity to teach others. The fact that the academic profession also provides for great autonomy, freedom, and flexibility is an added attraction to people who choose academic careers. As discussed in the previous chapter the administration of institutions of higher education is a very complex, challenging and in many instances, frustrating undertaking. The administrator must deal with many groups, such as students, faculty, other administrators of state and local governing agencies, accreditation agencies, business and professional organizations.

Many research members felt that future development in higher education depends upon the inclusions of women talents and its full utilization of women. Indeed, because of some pioneer women leaders’ success as well as scholars’ (Eagly & Carli, 2003; Helgesen, 1990 & Glasspool, 2007) advocacy of “the female advantage,” more institutions have started using women as senior decision-makers. Every time a woman was chosen for a historically male position, special attention and scrutiny from the media was automatic (Nidiffer, 2001). While the media and many people tend to overestimate women’s success in higher education, a closer
look at their experiences at work as well as the makeup of the positions women occupy often reveal a different story.

Acker (2004), for instance, stated, “In all institutions that have been developed by and are dominated by men, women hold subordinate positions.” Institutions of higher learning are no exception. As the major beneficiaries of the male-dominated higher education system since the beginning, men usually find it natural and easy to fit into the academic environment. Most of them often have difficulty in recognizing that the academy is not as gender neutral as they think, not to mention putting themselves in women’s positions. Consequently, even in American society where women are independent and well recognised, gender-biased language was not removed from the “Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure” by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges until 1990 (O’Neil, 1999). For women who must compete with men for survival, recognition, or promotions, the often unchallenged traditional standards have proved to be problematic. For instance, women leaders have suffered from problems such as narrowly defined leader image, gender stereotypes, double standards, exclusion from informal networks, negative attitudes and “chilly climate,” and lack of work-related assistance or mentoring (Bond, 2000; Currie & Thiele, 2001 & Noel, 2009).

Zemsky (2001) stated, Higher education’s challenge is to develop a culture that yields to women the same recognition and rewards that it has always yielded to men – and to do so in such a way that the result is a wide variety of roles, responsibilities, and models of leadership reflective of the gender diversity that has come to characterize the academy. Even after women enter the predominantly male upper echelon in the academy, where male norms and practices have been the “taken for granted” standards, they face the pressure of “fitting in” and adapting to the
masculine leader image and management culture (Kanter, 1980, 1993). Unlike the male counterparts, women leaders face the additional requirement of coping with cultural expectations of being “feminine” while projecting a masculine leader image (Kellerman; Mandel; Powell; Graves & Rhode, 2003). The problem is that such unchallenged, contradictory roles and expectations benefit men more than women.

Continual improvement of higher education, nevertheless, relies on the utilization of all the best possible leadership and talents available. Moreover, the underutilization of women’s strengths and talents impedes not only women’s contributions to their institutions but also higher education’s vitality and development.

Among the specific research undertaken about higher education in which the role of women has analysed, the most well known and which clearly supports the perspective of ours, is probably Denise Kingsmill’s review of Women’s Employment and Pay, in which she praises the work of the Equality Challenge Unit, which is sponsored by the UK’s higher education funding councils and the Standing Conference of Principals, and is hosted by Universities UK. The result of this research is that the world has changed, so that individuals are empowered due to Improvements in standards, Improvements in legislation, and Improvements in expectation. In this changed environment, standards and expectations of fairness and equality of opportunity have been raised.

Josefina and Susan (2012) commented effective leaders had these characteristics: strong and clear visions and commitments, holistic thinking processes, ability to work with teams, outstanding management skills, knowledge of when and how to delegate, highly sophisticated communication and public relations skills, political competence, energy, sense of humor, and charisma. Similarly, Flanagan (2002) described fear of success and fear of failure as “two sides of the same coin”. She believed that since women are not socialized to compete and stand
out (positively or negatively), they have more to deal with, win or lose. Since women usually take their jobs more seriously than men do, they frequently have difficulty separating failure of a task from failure as a person. As the eight women leaders Flanagan interviewed challenged the status quo by leading differently, they admitted experiencing fear when strongly resisted. Senior women leaders interviewed reported the issue of isolation for women occupying top leadership positions as well.

2.8 WOMEN LEADERSHIP ISSUES IN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

2.8.1 Women in Academic Leadership - Professional Strategies, Personal Choices

Diane, Susan and Jeanie (2009) their study states, Colleges and universities benefit from diversity in their leadership roles. Yet why do women remain under-represented in top academic leadership positions and in key positions along the academic career ladder? Why don’t they advance at a rate proportional to that of their male peers? How do internal and external environmental contexts still influence who enters academic leadership and who survives and thrives in those roles? Women in Academic Leadership complement its companion volumes and it argues that leadership, the academy, and the nexus of academic leadership, remain gendered structures steeped in male-oriented norms and mores. The authors pose questions about how women leaders negotiate between their public and private selves. They consider how women develop a vital sense of self-efficacy along with the essential skills and knowledge they need in order to lead effectively; how they cultivate opportunity; and how they gain legitimacy and maintain authenticity in a male-gendered arena.
Susan Bracken (2009) said, despite good intentions and selected interventions by leaders in higher education, women are still significantly under-represented in academic leadership positions. She discussed the tangible manifestations of gender-based obstacles, i.e., lower salary, appointment at lower rank, slower rate of promotion, lower recognition through awards, and not being retained, have been described extensively. For women in academia, time tables for tenure decisions often coincide with optimal childbearing year, requiring women to individually resolve the conflicts between their biological and career clocks. One possible manifestation of this conflict is that tenured women in academic science are twice as likely as tenured men to be single. Women academics who have children still shoulder the majority of domestic responsibilities. Women with children of pre-kindergarten age are less likely to be in a tenure track job than their male counterparts. Again she said, While the above manifestations of gender-based obstacles have been consistently observed at many universities, businesses, and governmental organizations, there are no qualitative evaluations that have formally probed the experiences of and reported the composite opinions of senior women faculty leaders on the root causes of under-representation of women in leadership positions.

Susan Bracken (2009) conducted a study with Twenty-seven senior women faculty with primary appointments in all the major divisions of the University participated in five focus groups, where the following questions were asked, in a semi-structured interview: What are the characteristics that identify a leader in academia? What do women need to know about leadership? Are women faculty attracted to leadership positions, as currently designed? Do women have access to an environment (mentoring and access to information) that is conducive to their growing into leaders? What is it about leadership roles in our institution that could be problematic for women? And this study gave an insight to the various issues
faced by the women faculty to identify themselves as leader and also this study emphasized that they had to work above the rules to changing nature of academia.

### 2.8.2 Women’s Perception of Leadership in Academia

Venkatasubramanian (2001) observed that literacy and employment rates among women had improved over the nineties however, their role in family decision-making continued to remain low. By exploring women's place in higher education institutions, the lack of women's leadership should be analyzed to determine for the gap and persistence factors in maintaining the gap. According to him women perceive their career in administration of academia by understanding their leadership capacity, capability and leadership role. He also referred another researcher view (Getskow, 1996) that women holding leadership and administrative positions in academia, usually believe that the success and failure depends upon, how they face the problem on various administrative as well as academic issues, and the ways in which they can promote future opportunities for women in their institutions.

Aguirre (2000) argued every women in academicians should possess certain leadership qualities and skill when they aspire to lead effectively and also to maintain success of their leadership. Some women leaders face barriers in the academic workplace that question their legitimacy as academics and their access to institutional resources that promote professional socialization.

Rumble (2000) attributed that the educational processes consists of student services and staff training, and support. He said that the educational process has six areas: vision and plans, curriculum, staff training and support, student services, student training and support, and copyright and intellectual property. Rogers (2000) says that the transition of learning, primarily driven by social change, is creating a
paradigm shift in the way colleges are viewing teaching and learning and the colleges will need to reassess their programs from simple teaching to well planning on the curriculum development. Administrators, faculty, staff, and students should realize that in order to successful they should concentrate on staffs and students support and training, mentoring and facilitating student services. Candice and Sarah (2012) made it clear that when college faculty, staff, and administration start with a vision, it is necessary for them to understand that this vision will result in a change in the organizational culture. organizational culture in which administrative and support systems were built, should focus on the traditional administrative support structures, student services, technology support, and faculty training and support and this need to be analyzed and perhaps changed in order to successful (Miller, 1998).

According to Care and Scanlan (2001) and Mills and Paul (1993), the academic administrators must provide the guidance and leadership to develop the institution and sustain their success. They should provide a Strategic planning which is proactive, dynamic, and directed toward a culture of change. The processes involved in planning need to be led by administrators whose job it is to facilitate change.

Suzanne Lavy (2004) discussed the satisfaction in sustaining the success depends upon the leadership qualities and skills in administrating the academia. The women leaders parallel with administration they have to concentrate on the academic growth and their career growth. So automatically should develop their leadership capacity every day.

Powell, (1990) specified that, to be successful, women leaders need a wide range of personal, professional, organizational, and community experiences as well as skills, such as communication, consensus-building, collaboration, fundraising, budgeting, personnel management, public relations, and networking skills. Common
personal characteristics shared by successful women in the profession range from confidence, high aspirations, risk taking, strong vision and commitment, to humor, enthusiasm, positive attitudes, and integrity. Finally, given the demanding nature of executive positions in higher education, success will be impossible without delegation, personal and professional support networks, attending to the big picture, and strategic moves.

2.8.3 Belief towards Leadership Quality & Skills and Leadership Role required in Administration of Academia

Nallini Ravinder (2007) states Leadership programmes in higher education institutions share in common a focus on skills development, on recognition of existing strengths and capacities, on increasing numbers of women in leadership roles, of visibility and support networks. There was also a consciousness of transforming cultures and gaining organisational support. Most aimed to both enhance participants' skills and experience professional development/leadership potential; and build a culture and structure in the organisation that encouraged women's full participation. She said every women leader in academia should excel in leadership role and listed leadership roles as planner, designer, guide, mentor, facilitator and supporter.

Osumbah Amondi (2011) noted that Skills and personality characteristics important for Top Educational Management and Leadership Positions were Decisiveness, self confidence, listening and honesty, emotional stability, objectivity, empathy, consistency, attention to detail nurturing, and analytical, formulating policies, decision making, delegating and sharing power and information.

Suma Chitins (2011) argues, the administrative issues reflects mainly on women leaders and their success and failure depends upon how these women face
their issues in administrating the academia. She narrow downs certain issues such as lack self-confidence in ability to do the job, inadequate skills and knowledge, have difficulty in disciplining subordinates, unable to influence and persuade people, lack of confidence in putting forward my point of view, react too emotionally to a work problem, unable to cope well in conflict situations, feel to perform better at my job than colleagues of the opposite sex.

2.8.4 Under-representation in Leadership Position

Candice and Sarah (2012) said women still continues to under represent at senior levels. Yet the correlation between women’s leadership styles and characteristics and those which organisations need to face the challenges of the new globalised context has not translated into an advantage either for our universities or in terms of the position of women in them.

UNESCO study conducted in both public and private organisations in developed countries found a direct and consistent correlation between higher productivity and higher levels of gender equity, and concomitantly lower productivity with greater gender inequality. And if women were found in equal numbers and proportions at more senior levels, the higher education sector, our universities, and the students studying in them would benefit from the different perspectives and experiences as well as the additional educational leadership and administrative management abilities and experience which women as well as men can contribute. Indeed the ongoing wastage of management and leadership talent which arises from and is perpetuated by the current marked under representation of women at the senior levels of universities seriously undermines their ability to respond to change and threatens their future viability and vitality in the face of the global challenges.
Susan (2012) said that different studies identified and analysed the causes of the significance under representation of women at senior and leadership levels of educational institutions, despite the legislative sanctions against sex discrimination in employment and education. Laden (1996) said, the barriers preventing the achievement of equality between men and women at the highest levels of organisations, are two distinct differences in these gendered opportunity contexts: women’s unequal share of domestic, particularly child rearing responsibilities, responsibilities and men’s greater access to mentoring, patronage through informal systems of information and other career advantaging benefits. Susan (2012) studies, have revealed that academic women’s lower classification levels and therefore lower remuneration is enhanced by their failure in getting a doctoral degree than male academics. This is the main the career impacts of child bearing and rearing. According to recent UGC report identified that 36% of women compared with 56% of male academics had a PhD. These outcomes arise from the gender related pattern that women academics tend to have more career interruptions than male academics, a pattern directly related to child bearing and women’s greater responsibility for child rearing, and also due to other family related purpose such extended family disturbances, their husband’s career growth or transfer. The next barrier is women’s exclusion from networks. This revolves around women’s lack of knowledge of and opportunity to enter the informal systems for career advancement.

Dana Christmas (2012) commented, institution of academia have few women who occupy leadership positions. This due to isolation and due to their lack of a critical mass, which also means that they lack mentors and role models. Some of these women report when they rise in their organizational hierarchies, their peer support falls away and they become isolated from other women. Another issue for women in leadership positions is that they continually have to establish and re-establish their credibility, not only with their peers but also with subordinates and
supervisors, which drains morale and threatens productivity. Dohrmann and Martia (1982) reviewed in their research, investigating why women are underrepresented in college and private organizational administrative positions. It was found that the differential rate of women in administrative positions is not due to their lack of proper credentials. Other reasons that have been cited are: typical female characteristics make it impossible for women to be effective in a leadership position; sex-role stereotypical attitudes cause discriminatory behavior; and the structure of organizations forms a barrier to the entry and advancement of women. In studying the proposition that “female” characteristics hinder women in leadership positions, most research has dealt with the measurement of leadership styles, with attention to consideration towards followers and initiation of task structure. Dana Christmas (2008) further said Leadership styles and attitudes of women in traditional and nontraditional occupations have been compared. Her research considered the effect of sex-role stereotyping on personnel decisions, leadership style, and discriminatory hiring practices. The way that the organizational structure itself can form barriers on job entry and advancement of women has been studied with special reference.

2.8.5 Gender justice and Eliminating Gender Disparities

Chliwniak (1997) stated in US, the first American higher education institution, Harvard College, was founded in 1636, women were excluded from state universities until 1855. Therefore, the system of higher learning, from the governing board to the student body, remained completely male for more than 200 years. He pointed out that power in society is “still conceived in mostly masculine terms and surrounded by male images”. Scholars in leadership have also underscored that the image of a good leader or a promotable manager has been associated with masculine characteristics (Appelbaum & Shapiro, 1993; Bass, 1990). Acker (1992), in his book on leadership, despite the fact that the concepts of power and leadership are
gendered, some talented women have managed to carve out their own niche to be accepted as legitimate leaders.

Sandra (2010) stated, “In all institutions that have been developed by and are dominated by men, women hold subordinate position and Institutions of higher learning are no exception”. As the major beneficiaries of the male-dominated higher education system since the beginning, men usually find it natural and easy to fit into the academic environment. Most of them often have difficulty in recognizing that the academy is not as gender neutral, consequently, gender-biased language was not removed (O’Neil, 1999). For women who must compete with men for survival, recognition, or promotions, the often unchallenged traditional standards have proved to be problematic. Women leaders have suffered from problems such as narrowly defined leader image, gender stereotypes, double standards, exclusion from informal networks, negative attitudes and “chilly climate,” and lack of work-related assistance or mentoring.

Cassandra (2004) stated that the gendered socialization process has encouraged females to play the supportive and nurturing roles instead of the competitive and aggressive roles, not to mention being trained to master skills needed to play political game. Thompson Stacy (1995), for instance, found that women tend to perceive politics negatively and, thus, feel uncomfortable talking about politics or strategies. However, Cantor and Bernay (1992), contended that for women to succeed as senior leaders in the political environment of higher education, being politically astute was an inevitable and indispensable requirement. Women cannot passively rely on affirmative action or institutional intervention programs to improve their status in the profession. The best way to eliminate irrelevant gender-based challenges is to acquaint current and aspiring women leaders with strategies learned from women who have already achieved success in top leadership positions.
within the academy (Bond, 2000; Chamberlain, 2001; Flanagan, 2002; Mark, 1981 & Ronning, 2000). The overall objective of Gender Management System in institution of higher education is to ensure gender sensitivity in the governance and administration. The process has analysed the issues that have given rise to concerns about gender inequality in university governance, management and administration. The process explored women- specific issues in diagnosing gender inequality, developed an appropriate action plan for a gender management system to support the mainstreaming of gender. Future action will include establishment and strengthening of gender-sensitive policies with regard to admission, administration and academic management of the university. Cassandra (2004) again said further for encouragement and establishment of gender-inclusive extra-curricular activities, the programmes could include specific provision for social and career guidance to ensure that women students and staff are fully integrated in the university. The lack of transparency and accountability in hiring and promotion procedures allows male managers freedom to reproduce the institution in their own image. Sound personnel policies are therefore needed to increase number of women as academics and administrators.

Suma Chitnis (2009) states gender policies and legislation are assured of greater success with the establishment of mechanisms and support structures. Support structures that are helpful are: preparation and distribution of clear guidelines on gender related topics; the setting up of clear reporting procedures; the establishment of a monitoring and reporting agency; the establishment of equal opportunity offices; the setting up of special agencies and commissions to assist with achieving set objectives and targets. Providing proper provision and appropriate legislation is a tangible expression of organisational recognition and undoubtedly can make a great difference to the capacity of women to redress gender disparities. The United Nations (1979) Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of
Discrimination against Women provides for equal rights for women in political and public life, equal access to education and the same choice of curricula and non-discrimination in employment. The Commonwealth Plan of Action in Gender and Development identifies for planners and implementers fifteen areas considered desirable for achieving gender equality. To overcome prolonged deprivation, the 1986 National Education Policy in India accorded women the privileges of free education and reservation in educational institutions. The objectives by 2000 were to enroll women in various professional degree courses so as to increase their number in medicine, teaching, engineering and other fields substantially. The legislation outlined four areas for review: recruitment and selection, promotion and transfer, training and development and conditions of employment. The Constitution was amended to mean that individuals cannot be discriminated on the basis of “gender” in addition to race and religion. A Cabinet Committee on Gender Equality chaired by the Prime Minister has been formed to oversee policies for effecting the constitutional change. The gender balance in most countries is being corrected at the undergraduate levels but there is still a paucity of women at the postgraduate levels, where a critical mass needs to be created to seek employment in colleges and universities. Measures to overcome this situation may include making special provision for women to obtain scholarships and awards. The Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan (CSFP) has adopted a deliberate policy to encourage countries to nominate women. Over the last 40 years of the Plan the percentage of women receiving awards has increased from 10% to 40%. Much attention also needs to be focused on the conditions of study in Ph D programmes that are not women-friendly. Diana Leonard (1997) argues strongly that commitment to improving conditions for postgraduate women is a vital step towards improving women's participation in academia.
Sunday and Gayle (2001) Glass Ceiling, this term refers to many barriers that can exist to thwart a qualified woman’s rise to the top management of an organization. These barriers are artificial and invisible, providing a view to the top, but also providing a ceiling on how far a woman can go. When a glass ceiling exists, men occupy a disproportionately high percentage of the higher ranks in a career field, while women tend to be overrepresented in its lower ranks (Sincoff, et al., 2006). Therefore the ‘Glass-Ceiling’ is the most important reason for women’s under-representation in leadership-positions (Ernest, 2003). Glass ceiling is therefore an effect of individual, organizational and socialization barriers and exists in its strongest forms denying women opportunities to gain access into top management positions. While it is true that more women, now than ever before, are slowly chiseling through the glass barrier to take on leadership positions, one can hardly claim to hear glass ceilings shattering around us (Cubillo & Brown, 2003).

2.8.6 Frustration towards Barriers in Administration and Advancement in Academia

In institutions of higher education, women work force more than men but still they dominate the higher positions with the greatest power, pay, and prestige (Smith-Doerr, 2004; Blackman, 2000 & Fauth, 1984).

Yoder and Schein (2001) their research literature reveals several different obstacles for women’s lack of success in entering administration. These obstacles can be categorized into two groups: Internal and External obstacles. Internal obstacles include: sex-role stereotyping, lack of aspiration, role conflict, and low self-esteem. External obstacles include: lack of encouragement, family responsibilities, lack of mobility, and hiring and promoting practices (Nan-Chi Tiao, 2006). This study helps us to understand the barriers. This will then lead to the
development of strategies to address these barriers and thus result in better representation of women in leadership positions in educational institutions.

Gerdes (2003), Walton and McDade (2001), Flanagan (2002), Rosynsky (2002) and Mahshid Pirouznia (2009) in their study found other barriers, other than balancing family and career are; Geographic Immobility - Few women have the chance of relocating in order to attain job advancement. Therefore, limited mobility and career choices, colleges and universities are seldom in close proximity to allow convenient commuting and Limited bargaining power - being confined to one location; women usually have little or no bargaining power in negotiating for position advancement. Individual barrier looks to women as the cause of their under-representation because it argues that women are not assertive enough, don’t want power, lack self confidence, are unwilling to play the game or work the system, don’t apply for jobs and even when in a job, they don’t apply for line positions. Another individual barrier is other directedness. Women are generally more concerned than are men about how they are perceived by others in their group. Other individual barriers include: the tendency among women to avoid where they risk facing criticism or receiving negative feedback; fear of failure and hence a reluctance to voice their opinions; excess responsibilities and fear of conflict and loneliness; self-doubting; and a different (feminine) style of management. However research Neidhart and Carlin (2003), suggested that some women in management carefully assess career decisions in the light of their own values and beliefs. For these women the barrier was not lack of confidence, but rather an informed choice based on knowledge of what is important to them personally and the extent to which they are authentic.

Tripses (2004) and Mahshid Pirouznia (2009) Organizational barriers include: entrenched cultures and norms; the way power is defined and exercised;
selection procedures; lack of appropriate mentor schemes; exclusion from informal networks; failure of senior leaders to assume accountability for women’s advancement; job requirements; facilities; organizational climate; and placement. The cultures of organizations have been shaped by men (Neidhart & Carlin, 2003) while there are differences among societies and culture, in all cultures men and women divide labor on the basis of their sex and male tasks are more valued than female tasks. This male elevates masculine pursuits to ideal, while female values, experiences and behaviors are viewed as inferior. The resultant is that men are considered experts while women have to prove that they are experts (Ernest, 2003). The way power and authority are defined and exercised in organizations are related to the andocentric world.

Livingstone (2004), Socio-Cultural Barriers Women’s identities and roles have traditionally been associated with parenting and caring, while men’s have been associated with paid employment as well as becoming public and industrial managers. The socialization process therefore structures and equips men and women to enact their respective and different roles. Domestic duties that women are still expected to do for their families take significantly more time and energy than those that most men expect and want to do. He adds that this inequity is the chief persistent disadvantage that women suffer in seeking opportunities for advanced education and career advancement. Nonetheless, socialization process results in boys and girls conforming to the socially determined behavior (Otieno, 2001). Girls learn to be feminine while boys learn to be masculine. While femininity is associated with submissiveness, gentleness, emotional dependence and not quite good at decision making and tactfulness, masculine characteristics are dominance, aggressiveness, not emotional, blunt, independence, very good at decision making etc (UNESCO, 2000). Women who get into leadership are in trouble. In particular, strong women are labeled difficult and dangerous because they trouble dominant masculinities and
modes of management by being different (Cubillo & Brown, 2003). This ‘masculine woman’ is described as a ‘monster’ with gender problems and a risk to assumed stable identities, social roles and positions in the hierarchy of professions. The fear of losing femininity therefore becomes widespread and real (Ernest, 2003).

Rowe, (2007) identified first type of barriers, structural barriers, include sex segregation in occupations, promotions, positions, and earnings, among others; these barriers are more obvious and can be more easily measured. He used the Duncan segregation indexes to analyze the College and University Personnel Association’s 1998 and 2005 annual compensation data. As they examined the hiring patterns, they found that some positions in colleges and universities were segregated by gender. To produce gender integration in 1998, 42% of the men and women in higher education administration had to change jobs. Five years later, that percentage dropped slightly to 37%. They also found that women were more likely to be hired for lower-paying and lower-level jobs.

Other scholars reported gender stratification of college and university employees as well (Acker, 1992 & Sagan, 1998). After conducting a national study on male and female administrators in institutions, Sagan reported that “Women...seem to be able to build careers in some tracks more easily than in others” that they were less likely to be promoted as principal line administrators. After reviewed the literature available at that time, she concluded that most women administrators in higher education were still doing “women’s work” and that they were “far more likely to be assistants to, assistants, or associates than they were to be directors, deans, vice presidents, provosts, or presidents”.

As to the effect of gender on administrative promotion patterns and outcomes, Radtke, (1991) conducted a three-year study on men and women administrators in a large research university and found that women gained
significantly less return from administrative promotions than men administrators did. A further analysis of the same data set by Van, (1993) showed that gender had both an initial and a subsequent negative impact on the status and responsibility of employees even though females in the study had equivalent education and more experience than their male counterparts. They handled measurably more job responsibilities with significantly lower salaries. To make matters worse, the stratification and wage gap was perpetuated and widened over time. Many women executives interviewed by Thompson-Stacy (1995) in her dissertation study also reported being paid less than men for comparable work.

In addition to visible structural obstacles, women leaders experienced more intangible cultural bias in the workplace. Socio-cultural barriers such as gender stereotypes, negative attitudes about women in leadership positions, or an inhospitable organizational climate are often products of the widely accepted traditional ideas about men, women, and leadership. In (Chakrapani, 1994) qualitative study, for instance, women leaders in university described the negative impact that the traditional masculine leader image has on female leaders. According to Chakrapani, women leaders promoted a participatory leadership style to empower others, but male-dominated board members and faculty leaders (including males and females) did not support such a style because they expect strong, assertive, and aggressive traditional leaders. While male leaders can simply “be themselves” and easily establish their legitimacy, female leaders have to struggle between two incompatible roles and find a way to balance skillfully between them. The last category of obstacles emerged from the struggle over power and status between men and women. Political conflicts over positions, ranks, resources, influence, information, and alliances between men and women are often hidden. In terms of frequency, the two most commonly experienced barriers were having to work twice as hard and less access to power. With less access to power, information, and
recognition or resources, these women felt they had to work much harder to be effective or to survive.

Zanville (2001) analyzed 298 questionnaires received from government, business, professional, education, and community leaders in Texas to determine whether men and women leaders have different workplace experiences. When these men and women leaders were asked if their superiors treated them fairly, their responses differed consistently. While most men believed that their superiors’ behaviors were fair, about 30% of the women leaders reported being treated differently in the credence given to their opinions, performance judgment, promotional opportunities, and advice given. Slightly more than half of these women leaders felt that they were treated unequally in at least one of the four areas. In brief, since leadership and management are still considered male domains, women today continue to be at a disadvantage and are still facing visible and invisible obstacles that hinder them from achieving success easily. Most men are unaware of such differences because the higher education system was designed and maintained based on their strengths, life style, and “ways of doing things."

Kathryn & Dana (2008) stated that it was apparent that many of the men in both mid-level and senior management are struggling to accept women as peers on multiple levels of consciousness, these women were never wholly part of the group, and they were well aware of it. To make matters worse, some women leaders get tired of playing the political game and resent the tremendous amount of responsibilities, demands, and stress placed on them. As a result, they leave the executive positions or even the education profession.

After conducting a comprehensive literature review on various issues on women leadership in institution of higher education, the researcher found that most of the studies are focused on career path of women leaders and gender bias in
academic leadership. When compared to male counterparts women leaders in academia had received much less attention. The studies on women’s representation reveals there are less representation of women in academia and mostly they are under-represented when it comes to higher the hierarchy. Various studies confirms that this due to gender disparities experienced by women academicians. Many authors felt that the barriers in academic administration, affect the career advancement in the institutions of higher education. While different experiences at work for men and women continue to attract the attention of scholars and practitioners, the question of what women can do to handle such problems has been raised repeatedly. Given the lack of adequate answers to this critical question, this researcher decided to conduct a qualitative inquiry on strategies senior women leaders use to confront problems created in a gendered working environment that then will lead to success in leadership posts within the academy.

So, the researcher decided to focus and bring conclusive findings on what the perception of women leaders towards their leadership, which makes them to less advance in their leadership positions and various strategies they employed to overcome the barriers to success.

Having reviewed selected literature on the topic, the following chapter gives an overview of the research methodology adopted for carrying out the study.