INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION LEADERSHIP

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

HEIDI A. KENNEDY
Norman, Oklahoma
2001

UMI Number: 3028800

UMI Microform 3028800

Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION LEADERSHIP

A Dissertation APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE COLLEGE

BY

Dr. Courtney Vaughn, Chair

Dr. Michael Langenbach

Dr. Irene Karpiak

Dr. Sandra Ragan

Dr. Pamela Fry

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the constant, unconditional love and support of my mother, Ursel. I owe my full experience to her belief that education was the best investment she could make for her children. Her guidance has always been balanced with the comedic and technical support provided by my brother, Peter Kennedy. My mother taught me to always be thankful. In that spirit, I offer thanks to the five gracious women who inspired this study. Thanks to Pam Fry, Irene Karpiak and Sandy Ragan for serving on my committee. Special thanks goes to Mike Langenbach for editorial advice and field trips. I am especially grateful for Courtney Vaughn's care beyond the call of duty and offering a surrogate family while I was so far from home. I continue to give thanks for my extended family of great friends and to my fellow travelers, Russ Claus and Vikkie McCarthy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWELDGEMENTS		iv
ABSTRACT		vii
Chapter		
I.	THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	1
	A. Background of the Problem	1
	B. Need for the Study	4
	C. Statement of the Problem and Research Questions	5
	D. Purpose, Scope, and Limitations of the Study	7
II.	CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM	10
	A. Organizational Culture	10
	1. Embedded Mechanisms	10
	2. Embedded Masculinity	11
	B. Organizational Change	13
	C. Organizational Life Cycle	15
	D. Theories of Social Change	17
	1. Tarde S-Curve	17
	2. Diffusion of Innovation	17
	a. Pioneers	19
	b. The context for social change	20
	E. Cross-Cultural Adaptation	21
III.	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	23
	A. Design of the Study	23
	B. The Methodology	24
	1. Participants	26
	2. Participant Privacy	27
	3. Role of the Researcher	27
	4. Trustworthiness, Threats, and Validity	28
	C. Data Analysis	29
IV.	CASES	31
	A. Tina	31
	B. Marilyn	34
	C. Cheryl	38
	D. Evelyn	41
	E. Barbara	44
V.	CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS: HISTORICAL DESCRIPTION	48
	A. The Committee for the Advancement of Women	48
	B. Meetings, Memberships, and Growth	53

Page

C. Progression and Reflection 55

VI. CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS WITH RELATION TO THEORY 60
A. The Context for Social Change 61
B. Pioneer Position 63
C. Increasing the Numbers 64
D. The Fertile Years and the Model of Professional Development 67
E. Equality of Condition: The "Twice-as-Good" Syndrome 70
F. Efforts to Promote Change 74
1. Financial Backing 74
2. Fiscal Training 76
3. Consciousness Raising 78
4. Mentoring 81
G. Reflection on Change 84
1. Inside/Outside Communication 84
2. Multiple Strategies 89
3. The Spiral of History 92
H. Reflection on Efforts to Promote Change 94

VII. CONCLUSION 98
A. Conclusion 98
B. The Spiral of Change 103
C. Implications for Leadership and Organizational Change 105

REFERENCES 109

APPENDIX A 116

APPENDIX B 117

ABSTRACT

THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION LEADERSHIP

Major Professor: Dr. Courtney Vaughn

Heidi Kennedy

Despite career development efforts for women in higher education leadership, women still lag behind men at the executive levels at U.S. colleges and universities. Balanced representation promotes a variety of effective leadership styles and lifestyles to students, faculty, and staff. As women are encouraged and supported to climb to higher levels of leadership, they may role model to future generations of men and women that opportunities for professional development are attainable and equitable in higher education today. The purpose of this study was to explore answers on the persistence of the gender gap and how to bring about organizational change. A phenomenological case study asked the research questions of a select group of individuals who worked to advance women in higher education.

A cross-case analysis was constructed based on interviews with five women who founded a committee in 1971 to advance women in higher education leadership. The members of the committee revealed that while they used their roles as change agents to help increase the numbers of women in higher education, their efforts were hindered by a perpetuated model of male professional development and a lack of equality of condition. The committee promoted change through educational efforts such as fiscal training, consciousness raising, and mentoring. In their reflection on the change process, they suggested that a success of a movement relied on effective use of inside/outside organizational communication and strategic multiple impacts.

The cross-case analysis is supported by literature on organizational culture, change and life cycle. The importance of pioneers and the context for social change are discussed along with their impact on the diffusion of innovation. The case study suggested that the factors of time and organizational culture act as barriers for organizational change. Without increased access to positions of power, women lack the critical mass to influence reiterated norms that better serve the community in a new social context. Leadership within colleges and universities must remain conscious of the status of women and be proactive in supporting their advancement to administrative positions.

THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION LEADERSHIP

CHAPTER I

The Research Problem

Background of the Problem

Despite career development efforts for women in higher education leadership, women still lag behind men at the executive levels at U.S. colleges and universities (Touchton, 1995). This leadership gap may be explained by the barriers of time and culture. Organizational culture and climate, as defined by embedded mechanisms and masculinity, perpetuate a chilly climate for women in higher education. The cultural shift over time that supports a balance of representation in higher education leadership competes with resistance to change and the lack of a "critical mass" of women in leadership positions.

Between 1970 and 1998 the proportion of women in the United States labor force increased from 43% to 60%. The percentage of women in management raised to 43. However, today, women in actual positions of power hovers in the range of 5 to 10% while only 3% of top-level executives are women (Bierema, 1998; Powell, 1999).

The representation of women in higher education leadership also lags behind that of men. Although more than half of the student population at colleges and universities is women, only 16% of college and university presidents are women as well as only 25% of chief academic officers (Chliwniak, 1997; Touchton, 1995). The American Council on Education (ACE) statistics define CEO's for its study as presidents and chancellors "but persons who function as CEO's--and are considered such by their peers-- sometimes have the

title of provost, campus executive officer, or campus dean" (Touchton, 1995, p.6). The ACE study also looked at representation in system offices. Women were counted if they were CEO of a college or university system, state commission or state department of higher education" (p.6). The representation of women at system offices in 1995 was 16%. The Association of Governing Boards' 1997 survey reported that 30% of board seats of public institutions and 26.4% of independent institution board seats were held by women (AGB, 2001).

According to a 1984 Carnegie Foundation study of 310 institutions, women faculty earned 25% less than their male colleagues. In 1995, women who were full-professors were earning 87% of what their male counterparts were payed (Chliwniak, 1997; Eggins, 1997). While 44% of doctorates are achieved by women only 25% of women are full-time professors. A 1995 American Council on Education report showed that only 18% of full professors were women. "Professors are the kings of academe, not the queens. Fewer than one in 10 professors worldwide is a woman. Within any academic system, the higher the prestige of an institution, the lower the proportion of professors who are women" (Bain & Cummings, 2000, p. 512). The barrier to tenure remains. Because tenure is "a strong predictor for chief academic officer and presidential positions" this is an important stumbling block of consideration (Chliwniak, 1997). Over a quarter of the women who reached the presidential office, did so after having been a chief academic officer (Walton & McDade, 2001).

Based on the statistics presented, progress has been made in the advancement of women's careers in higher education over the past 30 years. However, the situation remains far from equitable. On the whole, women still "lag behind men in pay, promotion, benefits, and other economic rewards" (Bierema, 1998, p.1). If the combined efforts of men and

women for balanced representation have been effective in producing these gains, albeit minimal, why is there still a significant gender gap? What is preventing the closing of that gap?

Powell (1999) listed the following societal factors that have contributed to the increase of women at various levels of the workforce: education, size of labor supply, social norms, fertility and divorce rates, expanding economy, shift of economy to information/service based versus manufacturing, legal actions, and overall perceptions based on increased representation. Chamberlain (1988) attributed the advancement of women in higher education administration to three factors: "affirmative action regulations," "career development and support programs," and "some increase in gender awareness and receptivity to women in academic life reflecting changes in society at large" (p. 329).

Powell also listed competing cultural factors that have prevented women from achieving a greater number of positions at executive levels:

> patriarchal social systems, direct discrimination by the dominant group,...stereotypes of effective managers,...decision makers' preferences to work with people like themselves and use of gender-based schema when making hiring and promotion decisions,...sex differences in task-oriented behavior, influence, and emergent leadership,...the effect of family responsibilities and corporate work-family initiatives...and challenges in personal support and access to mentoring. (p. 338)

These factors will continue to impede the cultural change process until there is the critical mass of women to be in a position to influence the system from the top down.

Need for the Study

The problem of the gender gap is important for the members of academe to consider as they may be missing out on a significant proportion of potential leaders who may best fit their institution. Chliwniak (1997) proposed that the gender gap is a potential leadership gap (based on research findings that men and women may lead differently). As long as the gap remains and higher education organizations are not working to balance their representation in leadership, they are missing out on opportunities for increasing their organizational effectiveness.

> Recent scholarship speculates how these gender differences impact on the values held by leaders and how these values influence institutional structures and infrastructures. If styles and approaches are indistinguishable between women and men, the gender gap is a numerical inequity and should be corrected for ethical reasons. But, if leadership approaches are different, the gender gap may represent an impediment to potential institutional improvements. (Chliwniak, 1997, p. ii)

Chliwniak (1997) further commented on what she calls "persistence factors," that perpetuate the gender gap: affirmative action/reaction, curriculum and scholarship, women faculty and tenure, women's studies and feminist scholarship, pedagogy, personal, family, and career issues, sexual harassment, and the wage gap. These are just symptoms, however, to the problem of underrepresentation of women in higher education leadership. These components all stem from and contribute to the gender gap caused by the reiterated norms that perpetuate the organizational culture over time.

Statement of the Problem and Research Questions

It took time for a significant number of women to enter the ranks of higher education therefore it will continue to take time for them to advance to positions of leadership. Much of women's underrepresentation in higher education administration may be attributed to a combination of factors. Bain and Cummings (2000) found that "cutting across societies and institutional types...two professional-organizational factors [inhibit] the advancement of women: experience and academic productivity" (p. 512). They further suggested that the real culprit for this deficiency is time. That is, time for women to rise in the ranks to positions of leadership. Time for the organizational culture to change under that leadership. Chliwniak (1997) addressed time as an adversary: "at the current rate of increase, it will take women 90 years to achieve equal representation to men on American campuses"(p. 22). Bain and Cummings (2000) further stated that the "number of women in academe is so few and the rate of opening of new positions is so slow that simulations suggest, other things equal, it will take several decades for women to achieve parity with men at the top...the relative brevity of the careers of academic women is the most important explanation for the scarcity of women making it through the glass ceiling, and it might seem that differences in experience could readily be reduced with the passage of time" (p. 512).

Lively (2000) expected a shorter waiting period based on the increasing number of women who are now provosts at Ivy League colleges as well as other prominent institutions in higher education. With "the growing numbers of female provosts, and their many accomplishments...experts...predict that elite universities will finally hire more women as presidents" (p.1). Lively noted that executive search firms predict that within five or six years the floodgates will open.

Time alone will not close the gender gap, rather it will take time matched with effort to consciously change the organizational culture. As Chliwniak (1997) stressed "...both the willingness to attempt to change and long-term success are positively related to cultural support. Therefore, to achieve sustained results, a long-term solution also must be a cultural solution" (Chliwniak, 1997, p. 42).

In order for a greater number of women to advance to executive positions, the climate and culture of an organization have to change in such a way that the embedded mechanisms, which will be examined later, are balanced with both male and female models as well as masculine and feminine norms. Martin (2000) likened women entering higher education to immigration. "Cultural assimilation is a matter of degrees, it is natural for immigrant groups to assume that if they just try harder to acquire the natives' cultural patterns, they can speed up the entire assimilation process" (p. 152). Martin called for organizational transformation (change involving all members) rather than assimilation (change through adaptation of a few members).

Similarly, Bernstein (1984) criticized the attempts made by women to increase their representation on college campuses. She examined the three strategies most commonly used to advance women in the field of higher education: identification, preparation, and promotion. She referred for example to the American Council on Education's National Identification Program, institutes like the Harvard Institute for Educational Management, and networking resources such as the Higher Education Resource Services.

These efforts have contributed to the increase of numbers of women achieving higher levels of position at the university. In spite of these successes, however, the gender gap remains "...because no-one has directly challenged the premise that women, rather than

institutional practices and the value of the academy, were responsible for the scarcity of female administrative officers. Either women were not visible enough, or they did not have the proper training, or they needed help to secure a job. Certainly, all these statements are true to some degree. However, the problem must be seen from another perspective if we are to develop more effective solutions" (Bernstein, 1984, p. 84).

Bernstein (1984) continued by faulting the different institutes that foster career development for women. She suggested that there has been a reinforced expectation that women hold the responsibility for their advancement rather than looking at how to change the system. "Women have been asking the wrong question. The question is not how women can adjust to a male culture but how to change the prevailing corporate culture so that glass ceilings are shattered for all groups" (Bierema, 1998, p. 36). How does one change the organizational culture, the system, without being in a position of power to do so? Thus, this case study addressed the following questions: Why does the gender gap in higher education leadership persist? How does one bring about organizational change?

Purpose, Scope and Limitations of the Study

As noted above, despite efforts like the ones initiated by the identification, preparation, and placement programs, there remains a gender gap within higher education leadership. The purpose of this study was to seek answers to the research questions through the perspective of five women who founded an organization to advance women in higher education leadership. The perspective of women who were involved in creating an organization working toward advancement may offer some explanation as to why the gap in higher education leadership remains in spite of political, societal, and organizational efforts.

This gap may be explained by time, the slowness of the change process in organizational cultures and lack of access to positions of power and newly reiterated norms.

The perspective of these women is an important piece to understanding the nature of organizational change as it played a part in their career development and the advancement and status of women in higher education. Several of the founders continue to work as activists for the advancement of women. They are leading and serving organizations for the equity of women. They continue to lecture, study and publish literature on issues that affect women. It is from these women we seek additional answers to the question of the persistence of the gender gap and the nature of change as it relates to higher education.

Limitations to the study are to be expected. The foremost limitation is the ability of the researcher to interpret and analyze the data sufficiently to answer the research questions. The researcher risks a certain distance to the answer because of the character of a phenomenological case study. Without being the participants one can never fully understand their experience. One can ask, seek clarification from multiple sources, and stay as close to the heart of the data as possible and still come short of expressing the true nature of the phenomenon in question.

Limitations to the generalizability of the findings are to be assumed as this is a bounded system dealing with the perceptions of five specific women in a unique situation. However, many interviews with women in higher education leadership have been reported in case studies in the past from which parallels or similarities may be drawn. If one looks to stories of sister organizations that were formed during the rise of the women's movement one may find elements or theoretical frameworks that promote the generalizability of this case study. A small sample allows for thick and rich description which helps reader/user

generalizability to match situations and decide if findings are transferable (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996; Merriam, 1998).

Having highlighted the background and statement of the problem, the need for the study, and possible answers to the research questions, the following chapters will include a presentation of the methodology, cases, and cross-case analysis vis à vis the findings. But before one may explore the findings to the research questions one must first have a deeper understanding of the conceptual background to the problem of cultural and organizational change.

CHAPTER II

Conceptual Background to the Problem

Organizational Culture

Until there are enough women to balance representation in leadership positions at the university and thereby model that females can succeed in leadership positions, the organizational culture will continue to perpetuate and promote the norms of the majority in leadership. These norms are driven by embedded mechanisms that, in the case of males being in the leadership majority, lead to embedded masculinity within the organizational culture.

Culture is described as "a social or normative glue based on shared values and beliefs that holds organizations together and serves" the purposes of identity and stability. Culture acts as a "sense-making device that guides and shapes behavior" (Kuh & Whitt, 2000, p. 161). Peterson and Spencer (2000) offered the analogy that culture is like the "meteorological zone" and climate is the "daily weather patterns." Culture is viewed as the "underlying values, beliefs, and meaning" of an organization, where climate is the "resultant attitudes and behavior" (p. 173). As earlier noted, for women at the university, this climate is often referred to as being "chilly."

Embedded Mechanisms

An organization's culture is driven by embedded mechanisms that dictate the climate of an organization. These mechanisms are "how leaders embed and transmit culture" (Schein, 1992,p. 231).

> [T]he mechanisms discussed...are powerful primary means by which founders or leaders are able to embed their own assumptions in the ongoing daily life of their organizations. Through what they pay attention to and reward...the ways they allocate

> resources,...the role modeling they do,...the manner in which they deal with critical incidents,...and the criteria they use for recruitment, selection, promotion, and excommunication, leaders communicate both explicitly and implicitly the assumptions they really hold. (p. 252)

If the leaders are predominantly male and continuing to operate under a male-modeled culture, the climate will be slow in changing to something that is less than chilly for women. As these mechanisms create the climate, they are contributing over time to a culture of embedded masculinity.

Embedded Masculinity

These embedded mechanisms are driven by masculine norms as there are not yet enough women to influence a change in the organizational culture. Astin and Leland (1991) explained that under this male-driven mechanism there have been few attempts to change the mechanism. "While the success of the women's movement is amply demonstrated by women's entry and inclusion in the labor force, the workplace still is organized according to the male model, hierarchical and competitive. Women have had to adapt to that model and have not accomplished the restructure of work to make it easier and less stressful for themselves and, perhaps, for men as well" (Astin & Leland, 1991, p. 150). Rather than witnessing a transformation of the academy, women were forced by culture to assimilate in order to survive and achieve.

In her study of seven women college presidents, Jablonski (1996) discussed the influence of the male model on the women and how this affected their behavior at the university. She stated:

> they developed expectations about leadership and gender over their lifetimes.... Culture, social, environmental, and organizational influences on the individual development of each president appeared to be primarily traditional. They had male role models, male boards of trustees to report to, and many male faculty leaders to deal with. In theory, the presidents espoused generative leadership, but their colleges' governance structures, committees, and board of trustees could not support such a model. Organizations need to be structured differently to accommodate alternative leadership styles. (p. 8)

Embedded masculinity sustains the climate and organizational culture, which in turn reinforces the perception of who and how one has to be at a university in order to succeed. In his attempt to "demystify the presidency," Hahn (1996) proposed that success is often based on perception, what he calls "success-as-reputation...success is a kind of shared conclusion based on a set of appearances: perceived potential, acquired visibility, and accreted prestige, multiplied in a mirroring network that validates perceptions. Eventually the perceptions become self-referential determinants of success" (p. 77).

Consequently, "one of the greatest inhibitors is the requirement that women follow male models of career advancement" (Chliwniak, 1997, p. 57). If these perceptions are of a male-model, it is a natural response to follow that model in order to achieve rank and position while at the university. Yet at the same time one unknowingly perpetuates the culture. "The effect of patriarchal leadership...often results in masculine norms perpetuated throughout the institutional structure and culture.... As a result, [we] receive patterns of information that perpetuate the continuation of the status quo.... Images of leadership are based on stereotypic masculine traits and characteristics" (Chliwniak, 1997, p.13). Therefore,

if the status quo is to be changed, a change in the representation of leadership must occur. However, this does not come about without complex organizational change.

Organizational Change

The true challenge for orchestrating change in organizational culture comes in deciding what methods will produce the most desired outcomes and then implementing those methods. Organizational change is a process that encounters resistance as new power positioning and new forms of modeling are introduced into the organizational culture. As Yukl (1998) pointed out "the essence of leadership" is leading change (p.438). The change process is comprised of three phases: unfreezing, changing, and refreezing. (Beckhard & Pritchard, 1992; Schein, 1992; Yukl, 1998). Beckhard and Pritchard (1992) referred to the process as stages of learning, not just change. "Change is a learning process and learning is a change process. Ultimately underpinning these processes are changes in the way individuals think and act" (p.14). The goal is to melt old or current beliefs and behaviors, teach new methods or ideas, and then facilitate the transition for and the continued use of the new, preferred behaviors.

Beckhard and Pritchard (1992) suggested that a "related process is the determination of the minimum commitment required from each player or group in order to allow the change to happen. The goal is not to achieve total commitment from everyone, but rather to obtain the minimum commitment necessary for success" (p.77). Leaders should ask what each member may contribute to make the change happen, "help it happen, by providing resources", or "let it happen, by not blocking the process" (p. 77). Yukl (1998) stated that change is introduced through changing people or changing their roles. New attitudes or skills will cause behavior to change in people and a "change of work roles to induce people to act

and interact in new ways...The assumption is that when roles require people to act in a different way, they will change their attitudes to be consistent with the new behavior" (p. 141). These structural changes may include redesigning jobs to include different activities and responsibilities as well as modifying authority relationships.

Change in an organization is a precarious event for its members. With change comes resistance to change. It is hard to share a comfortable seat whether one is male or female. Change "...affects individuals' ability to feel effective, valued, and in control...change disrupts existing roles and working relationships, producing confusion and uncertainty...change creates conflict between winners and losers -- those who benefit from the new direction and those who do not...finally, change causes a loss of meaning for people on the receiving end of change" (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 339). According to Yukl (1998), resistance to change is attributed to a number of beliefs, fears, and perceived threats which include: "lack of trust...the belief that change is unnecessary...fear of personal failure...loss of status and power...[and] the threat to values and ideals" (p. 439). Therefore, such structural changes that affected organizational roles and relationships are not easy to implement. Yukl (1998) offered steps to ease the process which include "determining who can oppose or facilitate change," "building a coalition to support the change," "fill key positions with competent change agents," "make dramatic, symbolic changes that affect the work," and "monitoring the progress of change" (p. 449). Those involved with leading organizations must constantly be aware of the forces at play for pushing against and pulling for change. Leaders must also be aware of these forces throughout the naturally occurring organizational life cycle.

Organizational Life Cycle

The biological metaphor of a life cycle is often used to describe the stages of development of organizations. There are parallel stages of infancy, adolescence, young adulthood and maturity. The organizational lifecycle model draws from studies of population ecology as well as group development (Cameron & Whetten, 1984; Harmon & Mayer, 1986).

Because organizations are understandably more complex than groups, some organization theorists are hesitant to apply group stage development or the simple biological metaphor to describe the growth stages of an organization (Cameron & Whetten, 1984; Harmon & Mayer, 1986; Robbins, 1987). Robbins (1987) however, supported the life cycle viewpoint. "Viewing organizations in a life cycle perspective offsets the tendency to look at organizations as static entities. Organizations are not snapshots; they are motion pictures. They evolve and change" (p. 18). Therefore, this perspective is used in this study as a model by which to understand the flow of organizational development and decline.

Cameron and Whetten (1984) synthesized the growth stages of ten life cycle models into one summary model. Their model highlighted four fundamental stages of development and growth for organizations: entrepreneurial, collectivity, formalization and control, and elaboration of structure (p. 45). Schein (1992) stated the stages in more symbolic terms of: founding and development, organizational midlife, and organizational maturity and decline (p. 254).

One particular model, Downs' Motivation for Growth (1967) may best serve as a lens through which to view a higher education organization because his model focused on bureaucracies that are characteristically hierarchical. Downs' model is a basic three-stage framework (Cameron & Whetten, 1984; Downs, 1967). An organization first begins with the

struggle for autonomy. The autonomy stage is comprised of legitimization of function, obtaining autonomy from parent or competing institutions and stabilizing resources. The organization then advances to the stage of rapid growth. Under the stage of rapid growth, innovators establish control and there is an emphasis on expansion. Finally, the organization cycles out to the deceleration stage. At this stage, the increase in size and complexity of the group typically creates problems with coordination. There is deemphasis in the innovation, a routine is established, control is in the hands of "conservers," roles are formalized and flexibility is reduced (Downs, 1967, p. 7-14).

The "graying" of the organization as expressed by Astin and Leland (1999) is common, understandable and predictable as roles change within the life cycle of an organization. While achieving the involvement of others to attain goals, "individuals disappear into collectives" (Kanter, Stein, & Jick, 1992, p. 619) and "early events and people disappear into the background as later events and people come forward" (p. 620). Downs (1967) noted, "Fast growing bureaus experience a rising proportion of climbers and a declining proportion of conservers" whereas "shrinking bureaus experience a rising proportion of conservers and a declining proportion of climbers" (p. 263). Bureaus, or in this case organizations, age like people do. Their members become comfortable and used to routine. They become wiser, more experienced, and therefore more influential as they grow older. They also have more at stake when change arises. At the risk of losing the level of stability that they have gained, they are willing to do whatever it takes to stay at the level of comfort, power or prestige to which they have grown accustomed (Downs, 1967). "As the organization matures and remains successful for a period of time, its structures, processes, rituals and norms come to be taken more and more for granted" (Schein, 1992, p. 255). In

order to maintain the status quo organization members continually face the choice of organizational decline or survival. Often the organizational change they face stems from outside of the organization in systemic response to social change.

Theories of Social Change

There are two theories that are helpful in understanding the process of social change within the scope of this study: Tarde's S-curve and diffusion of innovation. They each build on the idea of the progression and diffusion of change. The theories also rely on the initiative of pioneers within a context of social change.

Tarde's S-curve

Gabriel Tarde researched social change with an interest in how ideas or innovations spread through society. His research derived from a belief that social phenomena were based on "the human tendency to imitate fellow beings" (Degenne & Forsé, 1999). According to Tarde, there are three phases to social change that follow along an S-curve as the change spreads through society. The process begins with the initiating phase where an idea comes to life, it then catches on and makes an upswing, then subsides in a downturn. This theory was later expanded through the work of those studying agricultural trends. An important point that came out of the studies was that the innovation typically was initiated by the more "cosmopolitan farmers with higher socioeconomic status" (Degenne & Forsé, 1999). Those with the means became the opinion leaders.

Diffusion of Innovation

A second theory, built on Tarde's S-curve, provides a model for what is commonly referred to as diffusion of innovation. The studies first began in an effort to continue to explain the path of introduction, growth and common use of agricultural technology. Further

studies investigated the dissemination of new ideas and products. Various innovation diffusion studies gave credence to the S-shaped curve that later evolved into a segmented curve depicting components of the population across the diffusion of innovation. (Degenne & Forsé, 1999; Harris, 1993). The theory presents a percentage curve of various populations of adopters as an innovation spreads out over time from its inception. An idea, cause, or technology is introduced by the innovators, is quickly accepted by early adopters, and spreads to an early majority. The innovation then eclipses as it reaches the late majority and subsides with the laggards. What is interesting to note about this theory is the change in roles of the population as it carries the innovation over time and that the innovation does take much time to spread. "In many cases there have been 30-year and 40-year delays in the widespread dissemination of innovations, even when products and services demonstrate a crystal-clear, decisive advantage from the start" (Harris, 1993, p. 194). Researchers found that "whatever the source, information travels faster than the innovation itself although it too will move along an S-curve" (Degenne & Forsé, 1999, p.161). It takes time for the innovation to spread because it relies on the strength of the human inclination for communication and imitation.

As noted in the numerous diffusion studies conducted by Rogers in the early 1980s, most individuals "depend mainly on the subjective evaluation of an innovation that is conveyed to them from other individuals like themselves who previously have adopted the innovation. This dependence on the communicated experience of near-peers suggests that the heart of the diffusion process is the imitations by potential adopters of their network partners who have adopted previously" (Harris, 1993, p. 194). Diffusion of innovation links heavily with the theory of social networks. This theory explores the components of how interaction

between those inside and outside of organizations advances information sharing for organizational effectiveness. Members within organizations serve various linking, communicative roles that carry information between groups. These groups may be within or outside of institutions, organizations, or movements. For example, some members are considered to be locals or cosmopolitans having strong or weak ties with those inside or outside of their primary group. Locals stay close to home and cosmopolitans tend to branch out. The connections these members have within and outside of their groups is what carries the innovation (Degenne & Forsé, 1999; Harris, 1993). But how does the innovation get started in the first place?

Pioneers.

Innovation starts with the so-called opinion leaders, pioneers, or change agents. As mentioned previously, it was the wealthiest farmers who became the opinion leaders. They had the means and ability to gather and be exposed to new ideas as well as afford the new technology. Degenne and Forsé (1999) explained that "pioneers are willing to take bigger risks; they are closer to the socioeconomic mean and track down new information more actively" (p. 161). They had the financial stability to risk the status quo and the means to access information for new ideas to increase their potential for success. "To understand information properly, you have to be looking and ready for it; only influential people have this active receptivity. Thus, opinion leaders are the prime conduits for useful information. Only when they have the information can they exert influence efficaciously" (Degenne & Forsé, 1999, p. 162). Yet, in order for them to be able to influence others there has to be certain sense of readiness, a context that allows for the social change to develop.

The context for social change.

In his exploration of social movements, Meyer (2000) offered a name for the context or timing of social change. "Scholars use the term 'political opportunity structure' to refer to the world outside social movements. The presumption is that the development of movements reflects, responds to, and sometimes alters the realities of politics and policy" (p. 44). Meaning, there has to be an opening for the innovation to be introduced or that there are elements in society that suggest the timing is right for the innovation. Meyer described it as "a particular constellation of social and political factors"(p. 45). He outlined four "dimensions of opportunity" that feed social change: "the openness of the state to participation; shifts in ruling alignments; the availability of influential allies; and divisions within elites" (p. 45). These all serve as "favorable signals" which the public then interprets and establishes that a condition is ripe for a social change to take place. Here again is where the role of pioneers, those with influential ties, comes into play. "Critical to the successful emergence of protest movements is a positive feedback loop through which well-positioned elites reinforce both an alternate position on issues and the choice of protest as a strategy" (p. 47). The suggestion is that for there to be movement on the outside of the power structure there needs to be movement on the inside and vice versa. They need each other to catapult any interest. He suggested that "Movements do not decline because they run out of gas, recognize their failures, or because adherents get bored and move on to something else. Instead...[they] decline when the state effects a new arrangement with at least some activists or sponsors" (p.45). The social context from which the movement sprung changed thereby influencing the nature of the movement and the call for the members within it.

Cross-Cultural Adaptation

Another useful theory that may help in part to explain progression in social change in relation to women entering the ranks of higher education is Kim's integrative theory of cross-cultural adaptation. Rather than a linear curve, the theory suggests that adaptation is a spiral, a cyclical moving forward and circling back yet upward at a progressive angle. As an immigrant enters a new culture, she or he experiences stress, adaptation, and growth while at the same time there is a constant balance of return to the person's cultural upbringing (Kim, 1995). "Each stressful experience is responded to by strangers with a 'draw back,' which then activates their adaptive energy to help them reorganize themselves and 'leap forward'" (Kim, 1995, p. 178). This model is based on three "open-systems" assumptions: "(1) Humans have an inherent drive to adapt and grow, (2) Adaptation to one's social environment occurs through communication, and (3) Adaptation is a complex and dynamic process" (Kim, 1995, p. 172-3). An individual's progression along the spiral is facilitated by various competencies and constructs possessed by the host, the "stranger" and the environment in which they interact. Some examples of these constructs include the host's interpersonal communication, host receptivity, and preparedness on the part of the newly adapting person. Kim explained that personality traits such as openness and strength are strong indicators for the stranger's ability to adapt to a new culture. Like pioneers, strangers with a sense of openness possess "an internal posture that is receptive to new information...[which] minimizes resistance and maximizes a willingness to attend to new and changed circumstances...[that] enables strangers to perceive and interpret various events and situations in the new environment as they occur" (Kim, 1995, p. 186). Similar to the S-curve and diffusion of innovation, this theory depicts that "Large and sudden adaptive changes are more likely during the initial

phase of exposure to a new culture" (Kim, 1995, p.178). Also like the other theories proposed, it takes time to progress through the cycle of the spiral of adaptation. After each advancement there is some kind of draw-back or decline followed by a regenerative period.

The conceptual background to the problem is built on the theories of organizational culture, organizational change, organizational life cycle, social change and cross-cultural adaptation. This case study further explored these concepts through the perspectives of five women who were change agents in higher education during the modern feminist movement in the United States.

CHAPTER III

Design of the Study

In order to gain the perspective of the gender gap by the women who initiated the Committee for the Advancement of Women, "the committee," this will be a qualitative research study using the case study method. "A case study design is employed to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved" (Merriam, 1998, p. 19). The researcher's goal is to understand "the phenomenon of interest from the participants' perspectives, not the researcher's" (p. 6). Therefore, an emic case study, one exploring the "insider's perspective," best allows one to gain a deeper understanding of the efforts and experiences of those who were working to advance women in higher education leadership. Yin (1994) addressed the challenges in identifying what may qualify as a "case" to be studied. The case may be an individual, a group, or an event. A case is a "bounded system" one in which the researcher looks at a concept, "a single entity, a unit around which there are boundaries" (Merriam, 1998, p. 27). The Committee is a bounded system, a group, where only the members of which can speak for their perspective on their experiences in the pursuit of the advancement of women in higher education.

Careful consideration was given to the debate between a single versus multiple case study approach. According to Merriam (1998) a multiple case study contains two stages, the "with-in case analysis and the cross-case analysis" (p. 194). In the first, each case is its own entity. In the latter, parallels are built across cases to better understand the phenomenon as a whole. "The level of analysis...can lead to categories, themes, or typologies that conceptualize the data from all the cases; or it can result in building substantive theory offering an integrated framework covering multiple cases" (Merriam, 1998, p. 195). As Yin

(1994) pointed out, "evidence from multiple cases is often considered more compelling, and the overall study is therefore regarded as being more robust" (p. 45). For the purposes of this study, each participant is considered a case and the group they formed as a kind of meta-case through which one can better understand the diffusion of the status of women in higher education.

The Methodology

The phenomenological case study centered on the perceptions of the founding members of the committee as to the outcomes of their efforts toward advancing women in higher education. The participants of the study are the five founding women of the Committee for the Advancement of Women. I identified the core group who formed the organization through articles found in higher education literature and through member contacts. There were seven women who met to form the original group. Two were unavailable for interview. Several of the participants named other women who were involved on the periphery of group activities. However, because the focus of the study is on the outcomes of the advancement of women in higher education leadership as perceived by the founding members of the committee, in order to stay within the bounded system, only the five available women who were mentioned as the core group from the first meeting were considered for participation in the study. (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996; Merriam, 1998).

I established and maintained contact with the five participants while waiting for permission from the University of Oklahoma Institutional Review Board (IRB) to proceed with the interviews. Any emails I sent or received were printed and added to my supporting documentation. I took notes during and after telephone calls and added them to my collection

of field notes. After receiving the official release from the IRB, I set a time and place with the participants for personal and telephone interviews. For the three cases where I flew to meet the participant at her home or place of work, the IRB informed consent document was signed at the time of the interview. For the two telephone interviews, I mailed the informed consent documents to the participants so that I would have them returned before the interviews were conducted.

The two telephone interviews followed the in-person interviews by a few weeks. During the time between the personal and telephone interviews, I personally transcribed each of the taped, unstructured interviews. I also typed up the voice recorded and hand-written field notes that I had taken post-interview with the women. I used this time to verify consistencies among the three data sources I had gathered: participant interviews, field notes and supporting documentation. After the telephone interviews, I immediately transcribed each of the taped, unstructured interviews as soon as I got off the telephone. I compared the transcriptions with the notes I took during the telephone conversation and verified consistencies with the other interview data sources and supporting documentation.

Generally, each interview was scheduled to last no more than one to one-half hours depending on the participant's availability. The interviews with Cheryl, Barbara and Evelyn lasted close to an hour. The interview with Tina went past two hours and Marilyn hosted me for six hours. Despite the varied lengths of time of two of the interviews I found that the substance of the information was fairly parallel. Additionally, the longer interviews contained pauses that included, for example, tours of the women's homes, personal breaks and interruptions. After the interviews were completed, I reflected that the interviews held in the participant's homes offered me a more well-rounded interview experience. I noted that

while telephone discussions resulted in a clearer tape-recorded interview quality, there were limitations to interactions with the participants. In the five interviews, each of the women gave a general biographical sketch of their lives and included vignettes of their personal and professional experiences as they related to the status of women over the past 30 years. Although I generated a list of questions pertaining to the context of the case study, the interviews were "not a series of questions and answers" rather "a dialogical reflection" (Tesch, 1994, p. 147) and the questions merely served as a guide in case the interview discussion faltered (see Appendix A).

Participants

The five women ranged in age from 60 to 76 years. They have each served in both academic and administrative roles in higher education for well over twenty years. Their family backgrounds range from poor to upper-middle class. All are native to the United States while several stem from European and Eastern European ancestry. All have been married during most of their careers. Almost all are mothers of two or more children, including daughters who are now adults and working in higher education. Currently two women serve as directors for private organizations. One woman describes herself as her own independent institution, although she remains affiliated with a university. Two of the group have been on faculty with their respective institutions for over 30 years. Although one of the two has recently retired, she remains active with a project of a sister college near her home institution. Several of the founders continue to work as activists for the advancement of women. They are leading and serving in organizations for the equity of women, lecturing to the public, and are still studying, speaking, and publishing on issues that affect women.

Participant Privacy

While many may want their achievements recognized, there may be those who want to maintain their right to privacy. With exposure in a case study, the participants subject themselves to judgment and evaluation. Therefore, in order to put the participants at ease and hopefully establish and retain their trust and cooperation in the study, I proposed to shield the participants in the analysis of the interviews and presentation of the data. In several cases, the women asked me who else was participating in the study, or in one case, for the contact information of one of the other participants. Even though I was aware the women knew each other personally and professionally, I only gave out the information when I had specific permission from the other participant to do so. After I knew that one of the first participants chose not to be identified I made the decision to use pseudonyms for the members, the group and any institutions with which they were affiliated. Upon each subsequent interview, even though the women signed permission for their names to be revealed, I let the participant know that I would be using pseudonyms. This potentially aided the participant with an element of anonymity and benefited the case study with more open and uncensored participant responses.

Role of the Researcher

During the process of the interviews, I became very aware of my role as the researcher. As Peshkin (2000) clarified, "An important reason for reflecting on the development of an interpretation is to show the way a researcher's self, or identity in a situation, intertwines with his or her understanding of the object of the investigation" (p. 5). The participants encountered a female graduate student of European heritage from a younger generation who had no training or background in women's studies or feminist movement

history. Often reference was made to my being of a different generation and possibly not knowing or understanding the context of much of what was being shared with me. I heard statements like, "think about what it would be like if you didn't know anybody who had gone to college and that you had never gotten any help...your plans...think about it" or "I don't know if you understand...know much about that...forgive me if I sound patronizing but I just don't know what you know." After each interview, I returned to the library books or the feminist texts that they gave me to understand better the interview that took place and to be better prepared for the next interview. I reflected on new questions that would emerge from the history lessons I had been given. Although the interaction with the women greatly influenced my personal and professional development, I made a conscious effort, in part through separated journaling, to keep the questions and personal exploration that arose from tainting the purpose of the study.

Trustworthiness, Threats, and Validity

In order to establish trustworthiness for the case study, I considered external and internal validities. Strategies to promote trustworthiness of the data included triangulation, member checks, and peer examination (Merriam, 1998). Possible threats to the validity of the case study were participant availability or attrition, interviewer bias or misinterpretation, participants censoring themselves, limited interviewer access to supporting historical documentation, lack of participant review of the transcripts and the factor of participant ability to recollect over time. I attempted to minimize threats to internal validity and trustworthiness by offering the participants confidentiality by screening their identities, pursuing avenues for supporting documentation and having the transcripts of the interviews reviewed by an experienced qualitative researcher. During the interviews, I asked for

clarification if I knew or suspected a statement contradicted or supported something I read or had heard in another interview. Several of the women mentioned how certain events were hard to recall after so many years had passed and indeed some names, dates and circumstances were occasionally muddled. After the interviews I performed factual checks through literature, original documents and texts (donated to me by the participants) and resources from the universities where they studied or worked.

Data Analysis

Three essential data sources composed the data set: participant interviews, field notes and supporting documentation. Once the in-person interviews were completed, I took copious notes detailing the experience both on a voice-recorder and in notebooks. These observations were kept as field notes and served as a second data source. I kept a separate journal for notes on my personal impressions, questions, and experiences. As soon as I returned home, I transcribed each of the interviews along with the telephone interviews that followed shortly thereafter. The third data source of supporting documentation included books and articles written by the participants, articles about their organization, articles about the individual participants and texts on women in higher education that often referenced the women or their association in particular. In order to protect the participant's privacy, these documents are cited as supporting documentation and listed under masked references in the reference section. Each of these sources provided additional information and anecdotes on the participant's personal and professional involvements.

With these three sources in hand, I then conducted an interpretational analysis. As Gall (1996) defined, this involved "the process of examining qualitative data to identify constructs, themes, and patterns that can be used to describe and explain the phenomenon

being studied" (p. 761). Interpretational analysis is comprised of segmenting the database into meaningful fragments, developing categories, coding segments, grouping category segments and then drawing conclusions. (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996, pp. 562-568) The absence of a pre-determined focus helped reduce interviewer bias and allowed for themes and patterns to emerge from the data collected. I printed out each of the transcripts and read through the comments of the participants, highlighting any statements that alluded to common themes between them. I read through the side-notes I had written post-interview for additional observations or clarification. I referred to the supporting documentation to tighten factual points such as names, dates and locations. I then went back through each participant interview transcript and wrote any noteworthy statement individually on index cards. The stack of index cards were later coded and grouped under conceptual categories (Merriam, 1998). During the process of writing the analysis of the emergent categories, however, I used the original transcripts.

This methodology helped to build a case study that effectively explored the perceptions of five women who worked to advance the status of women in higher education leadership. The data analysis that followed was strengthened by anonymity of the participants, an awareness of the role of the researcher and attention to the trustworthiness and validity of the data. The case study on the whole was anchored by the graciousness and thoughtful participation of the five women who formed the Committee for the Advancement of Women.

CHAPTER IV

Cases

Five original members of the Committee for the Advancement of Women agreed to participate in the case study. They were Tina, Marilyn, Evelyn, Cheryl, and Barbara (see Appendix B for a table of the cases). Each individual told an impressive story of personal experiences and opportunities which led to full careers in and beyond higher education. Most interviews began with a brief biographical sketch and naturally flowed into an explanation of their interests, experiences and career track, as well as personal and professional lessons learned along the way.

Tina

Tina is a native of New York. She was born in 1935 to parents who emigrated from Eastern Europe. Tina is tall, lean, energetic, and handsome. At 66, she was proud of her looking young for her years and remains a physically active woman. She enjoys outdoor sports like hiking and skiing. Tina is smart, well read and good with languages. She continues to describe herself as a change agent. She is an organizer and a strategist. She claimed her efficiency is due to having eliminated four Cs from her life: cooking, children, committees, and commuting. She keeps a thick Rolodex that holds all of her contacts over the years yet remembers most names and addresses without. She lives across the street from the state university with which she keeps strong ties. She has been remarried for seven years to a physicist from the university. " He does the cooking." The interview was held at her kitchen table where she reads her New York Times every morning. She claims to live on New York time and maintains a consistent schedule of going to bed at 11 and getting up at 6 everyday (Field notes; Interview).

On a tour of the house, which seemed like one continuous office from room to room, she showed me pictures of her spiritual mother, Betty Friedan, her parents, and her sister who died some years ago. Her husband was then away on a trip to Japan, his home country. She showed me their travel closet filled with bags and clothes ready to go at a moment's notice (Field notes).

Tina's college education began at Richards University. She earned a bachelor's degree in history. She left the United States to work as a journalist in Germany for four years and learned that being an American female in a foreign country granted her certain privileges she would not have had back home. "What it was like to go to college in the 1950s,...it was a war....That's why I went off to Germany. Germany is just as sexist if not more so than America but I was an American and 'die Amerikanerin' can do things and get away with things...that the German woman could not." She eventually returned to the United States and pursued a Ph.D. with Carlisle University. Circumstances in her life changed and she left "all but dissertation" and entered into university administration. During this time she met and married her husband, Jake, whom she followed to Callahan University. Jake was agreeable to a decision she had made when she was 24 not to have any children. The couple then left for Williams University. Being the one with a better job offer, Jake followed her. Tina was offered a senior position as Associate Provost. She described her style of administration as very supportive and salutary. "I had a very successful administration considering that I was a change agent." She served there for about seven years.

> [My] president was very enthusiastic;...he was very supportive of me and kind of excited because the women's movement was exciting. I brought Gloria Steinem to the campus. I brought Joan Crawford to the campus,...and my president asked me if he

could get a ticket,...he wanted to meet Gloria in a one-on-one in his office....I was delivering all that glamour and also we were writing a lot,...getting into the New York Times...that didn't hurt Williams to be [in the press] in a very positive way....We brought a lot of glitz. (Interview)

However, not every woman had the same positive exposure at the university. Tina had a colleague who was having a slightly different experience. They worked together to overcome the obstacles.

> The second female was hired....in a senior administrative position [and] was head of student mental health,....and one of the things we...discussed a lot was why she was so unwelcome at trustees meetings and dinners and I was the poster child. Because I was bringing a lot of positive press to Williams. And she had suicides, the mental illness, the dorm difficulties, the crisis, and they didn't want to hear about it. She and I understood that. It didn't make her job any less significant. It was very important. And she and I would go out for what we'd call a liquid lunch every month or so...and go very far away to some truck stop where nobody knew us, and we'd just, you know, talk. (Interview)

During that time she also developed and cultivated her interest in the lack of women in math and sciences. From this interest, she crafted a career helping students to overcome "math anxiety" and became a noted author on the subject. "[It] was out of my connection and attention to student's needs that I got an idea...namely the fear of mathematics. It was only because I was closely watching transcripts and listening to students who trusted me that I realized they were undermining their own futures by refusing to take calculus, linear algebra, computer science...and so on" (Interview).

In a quid pro quo agreement, she joined Jake to leave New England for his new position with the Carter Administration in Washington D.C. Tina found that much conversation in her new surroundings centered on national defense. In response to learning the subject for herself to keep up at cocktail parties, she initiated a writing project to create a book on national defense for beginners. The connections from that book led her to the western United States. She has been there ever since. In the same years she amicably divorced her first husband and through work at the university met her second husband. She joked that she married him so she could get dental insurance. Out west, she became her own institution. Working out of her house, Tina continues to teach, write, lecture, and serve on various boards and organizations related to higher education, women's studies, and advancing women in the disciplines of math and science (Interview; Field notes).

Marilyn

Marilyn was born in New York and later transplanted to New Jersey and then New England. The interview was held in Marilyn and Phil's home. They live in a quaint but simply decorated house a few blocks down the road from Hillstead's sister institution where Marilyn continues to work with a feminist organization. Marilyn is witty and gregarious. She is playful and affectionate with her husband of over 50 years. Despite her hard youth she is gracious and laughs easily, even in telling of the obstacles she had to overcome in her life. For a portion of the interview we sat at her kitchen table, eating a creamy egg salad on bagels followed by a snack of chocolate biscotti she had prepared for the occasion. She described herself as smart and a "tough son of a bitch." She explained that she outlasted many of her experiences because "I knew how to survive. I was a survivor." Marilyn is now 70 but looks like she is in her 50s. Although she attributed her youthfulness to good genetics one cannot

help but think it is because of her healthy, strong attitude. She is currently writing her autobiography that may explain much of what has kept her active and young (Field notes).

She described herself coming from "a very poor and crazy family." Marilyn's mother died when she was 9. Marilyn fully left the house to fend for herself by the time she was 12. She met her husband, Phil, when she was 14 and then lived with his family on their farm. They married when Marilyn was 16. She recalled with affection how she had the support and guardianship of a family who owned a local store. She worked with them for five years. They became her *ersatz* family and continued to support her throughout her life (Interview; Field notes).

She started to pursue formal higher education while working as a secretary for a man who relied on her to do his job for him. She realized that if she was going to be working the rest of her life she may as well get an education so she could do her own job. Despite the setbacks of having no money and being a non-traditional married, older, commuting student she was accepted into Davis College and earned her bachelor's in history. Two women mentors at the college recognized Marilyn's intellectual aptitude. With their strategic help, scholarship support was provided so that Marilyn would not have to quit school to earn money for a future term. They encouraged her to earn her doctorate and teach history at the university level. "It was the first time I had had any kind of feedback. I knew I was smart but I didn't know I was intellectual smart....I felt since I was there on scholarship I had to do well because otherwise I was taking up somebody else's place...I was there on sufferance." Then Marilyn found out she was pregnant with her first child. "I immediately become pregnant ...[it was like] the floodgates opened...I never felt so good in my life." She then had to tell her history professor, who was arranging for her career, that she was pregnant. Her

professor thought that would be the end of the line for Marilyn. But she thought differently. "All I knew was that this didn't change my plans." Marilyn later found out her mentor had to stand up to the faculty to make tutorial accommodations for Marilyn to finish on time.

> [She] goes to the faculty meeting to request this favor, and they don't want to do it. Now if you've ever gone to a faculty meeting and you try to get something changed? Forget about it. So they knocked her down. So she stands up and she says, " I have worked at this university for 32 years and I have never asked for any exception on anything ever. And I'm asking you to do this for this woman who's very special. She's one of a handful of students that you have in a lifetime of teaching and...I want her to finish. She's an older student and I want to give her this chance. (Interview)

Marilyn eventually finished her coursework and worried about fainting at graduation, then pregnant with her second child, "I carried like a whale." Although Providence University did not admit women at the time, she chose to apply there because it was close and would be the most convenient option for a mother of two babies. She described a letter writing campaign and unwelcoming interviews. "I knew that I had a million strikes against me and no matter what I said in the interview they looked at me like I was a curiousity of some kind. They didn't even want to have me on campus, they had to interview on the telephone." In two interviews it was defended by the panel that she could not attend Providence with statements such as, "you know we can't take you because we don't have any bathrooms." She responded: "Well, I have excellent self-control." With much support and the right connections she was admitted into Providence and earned her Ph.D. in history under a prominent British historian. Again, it was Marilyn's major professor and mentor from undergraduate school who managed the coup. Her professor went to a dinner party being

held to welcome the new professor to Providence. "[She] nails him at his dinner party and she says 'we have this student,'...and he had taught at Oakland so it wasn't such a big deal [to take a female]....Providence has this tradition when they hire someone that they really, really want to get there...it's their honeymoon. And whatever they want they give...and he said, 'well I would like to teach Marilyn.'" The department voted her in and Providence admitted Marilyn as an "incidental student." Her new major professor mentored her not just on the subject of history but also on the innerworkings of university administration. He even made accommodations for her non-traditional student needs by arranging for her to have private microfilm use at home. "He got the money to have the papers microfilmed...and I...had the micofilm in my kitchen for five and half years...and I used to work on my microfilm in my darkened kitchen...[with the children playing in the corner] and I'd say 'Genius at work.' And the kids knew to leave me alone and I wrote the dissertation...so that's how I got through" (Interview).

As she was about to transition from graduate study to an academic career, her husband, Phil, fell ill. She prepared for an interview with a newly formed innovative college in New England. In the interview, questions posed to Marilyn implied that a family with a woman as head of household was dysfunctional. They inquired if her husband was an alcoholic or if her children were normal. In spite of such questions, Marilyn was offered the job. The surprising twist of her husband's ailment enabled them to sell the farm and allowed her to take a position as the master of a house and professor of history at Hillstead. She has remained there ever since her hiring, teaching history and serving in various administrative capacities. Her ability to "read people" got her nominated to countless campus search committees along the way. "I had a special gift for people...[I] could read people like they

were covered in saran wrap." All along, she was active in the women's movement. She was prominent in helping to incorporate a feminist perspective into the curriculum at Hillstead and other institutions in the area. She collaborated on a book exploring the model of professional development for women and recently published an article with her daughter on the challenges women face in advancing in science professions (Interview; Field notes).

Cheryl

Cheryl returned to her native home of Chatterton twelve years ago to serve as president of a major philanthropic foundation. The interview took place on the eighteenth floor of a skyscraper in the heart of the financial district of Chatterton. Though we had to squeeze the interview between two cross-town meetings, Cheryl was gracious, even-toned, and focused. Cheryl is petite, youthful, fit. One would not easily guess that she has now turned 60. Considering her well-connected positions and wealthy background, she comes across as being natural, simple, and approachable. Her office is functional with a few scattered pictures on her desk of her children when they were young. A handful of African art pieces decorate the packed bookshelves that box the room. Near her desk, she sported a collection of canvas tote bags filled with notebooks and papers that wait to travel with her to whichever meetings across town they belong (Field notes).

Cheryl told how she was born the youngest child of four into an upper class family from the wealthier neighborhood of Chatterton. Her mother worked outside the home as a full-time volunteer. She grew up with the stories and legends of the prominent, active and civic-minded women in her family and the men who surrounded themselves with intelligent, capable women. She attributed part of her success to her upbringing. "Because of my

parents...feeling that I could do a lot, and it never occurred to me that there were those boundaries or barriers out there" (Interview).

She earned a degree in history at Richards. She chose the school because she was attracted to the "intellectual excitement" it offered. "[I] felt that I had learned as much as an undergraduate outside the classroom as inside the classroom...and at that point higher education was really one of the few areas where you thought there might be openings for women because everything else was shut at the time." Mentored by the dean of Richards, she was encouraged to earn a "real doctorate" in order to advance in higher education administration. "I needed to get my academic credentials really clearly solidly defined if I was going to be able to move up an administrative side." Upon that advice, Cheryl went to Oakland University in England and earned her doctorate in African studies. After living and studying in North Africa for a while, she returned to the United States where her first job was as Assistant Dean of the woman's college of Tillman University. While there, she had the opportunity to collaborate on a task-force book highlighting the status of women in the workplace and salary differentials at the time (Interview).

She was promoted to Dean and later transferred to Providence as Dean of Students. "I had decided that what I had wanted to do was learn from a place that was run right...[and] the next five years were just a chance to learn [from the institution]." Her appointment was not without hardship.

> There were a bunch of alumni who were totally opposed to my appointment...and they assigned someone to follow me around ...and wait for me to make a mistake. Once I said "shit" and it was all over the conservative [alumni magazine]....They were really out to get me out of my job. And that meant I had to be extremely careful

about what I did, or I had to leave but I couldn't. I felt very much that if I failed at Providence, much more than any other job, it would have seemed to be a reflection on women rather than that there was something wrong with me. So making this Providence thing work was really important to me. (Interview)

One characteristic that helped her through that period was her ability to seek outside help. "I was very good at asking for advice," she stated and noted that it is something women may do more easily than men. Providence served as an excellent training ground for her next position as President of Hillstead. She was very attracted to its interdisciplinary approach to education. "I didn't like to be in intellectual boxes. Looking at things in different ways was something I had always liked to do and at Providence I felt academically you had to go through so many hurdles....I was just so excited by the kind of work I saw being done at Hillstead by students and by faculty because they were encouraged to draw outside the lines and think outside the boxes." At the time of her interview for the job she was pregnant with her second child. "There are those who would describe how I waddled into that event." She expressed concern over some of the interview questions. "The chairman of the board asked me...there were two issues with that...one is he said to me basically how are you going to manage with two children under two and being a college president." She called up her mentor from Richards afterwards and asked if that was sexist. "She said, 'No, it's a huge, complicated thing to do and most people probably couldn't manage, and so he wanted to make sure you could do that.'" "But then when he started to tell me I didn't need a significant salary because my husband was working" and asking how she would have dinner ready by 6:30 when the board met until 5:30, "that clearly was sexist." Despite the challenges

presented in her interviews, Cheryl served as president of Hillstead for ten years and gave birth to a third child in the process (Interview).

During her career she also sat on the board for Harrison, one of the first women to do so, and is even reported to have nursed during some meetings. After fulfilling her commitment with Hillstead, Cheryl returned to her hometown of Chatterton to lead a nationally recognized foundation for ten years. She followed that position a few years ago with her current job as director of an organization that works for early childhood education reform. She continues to serve on numerous boards that support issues of concern to her. When the time for the interview ran out, Cheryl grabbed one of the totes and joined me for the elevator ride down the 18 floors and headed off to her next meeting (Interview; Field notes).

Evelyn

The interview with Evelyn was held by phone yet that did not seem to diminish the impression of grace, intelligence, and wealth of experience that was communicated through the phoneline. Evelyn was born in Maryland in 1925. She studied music and attended the local conservatory. Although her real interest lay in pre-med, "I was more of a pre-med student who liked music," she could not find the financial support to fund medical school. She instead went to Yates University and earned a Ph.D. in music. "I was the only woman in every class I took." There she met and married her husband who was also studying and teaching at Yates. After graduating, she followed him to Massachusetts. He taught at Milton College while she eventually got a position at Richards as Assistant Dean and part-time music history teacher at Harrison. Married with two daughters and an adopted niece she found it hard to find a position. "I had a hard time getting a job because I was a married

woman with children in the early '50s and that was a real no-no. Women were not hired who had those credentials. It didn't help much that I had graduated with distinction even from Yates, it just didn't count." But the times and circumstances were slowly changing. She later was hired over to Milton to help create a women's college and increase the numbers of women enrolled at Milton (Interview).

During that time, her husband became ill. Evelyn made the decision to move for a position that would better financially support the family. She became Provost and Dean for Lowell Smith College in New York. "I loved that college...I had a mad love affair with Lowell Smith. Everything it professed...its mission and the things that were part of its ethos. It just felt like I had come home. It was such an extension of everything I believed in." After serving there for a number of years, Evelyn came upon an opportunity to be Provost and Dean of Faculty at Baker. In her letter of appointment it said she was to be 'the conscience of the university in matters relating to women and minorities.' In the early 1970s this was an extremely high profile position for a woman. Not long after, she was offered and turned down a position as president at a different co-educational college.

> In fact, the reason I didn't take it was because my mother was dying of congestive heart failure and I had a daughter who was having problems with drugs....I thought to be the first woman president of a co-ed school would make me so visible that it would not be good for the school or my family. For me to be juggling all that visibility and the people I loved who needed me at that time particularly. So like most women I kind of came down on the side of the people in my life. Probably changed my career as you do when you make hard decisions. (Interview)

A pending change of administration forced her again to consider jobs elsewhere. She sought and achieved a position as president of Bantam, a prominent women's college in the Northeast. Despite some question over the school board's future plans, she took the job knowing she could not refuse a second offer for a presidency. She stayed at Bantam for six years. It was a struggle to last as long as she did, competing with outside political agendas that countered her mission as president. Her term ended when she was forced to resign and subsequently black-balled by the Bantam board. She wrote in her journal of the event and its consequences, "They didn't mean for me to starve but they would see to it that I [would] never gain...visibility or credibility." She explained how she continued on after the traumatic incident and renewed a love for her work regardless of the title she held. "I knew it was the end of a career I thought I was having but I also knew that the minute I dropped back to being provost and a dean how much I loved the work" (Interview).

Evelyn then went through a series of administrative positions at various universities in the South, Southwest, and Northwest. "I integrated each school I was in." She often was hired to troubleshoot and act as a buffer to protect a president and the controversial purpose of campus integration. "I know it was said of me in one recommendation that I was in every way an exemplary administrator except...I was too blunt to be 100%.... I was always described as controversial...I was enough of a social activist that I could always get into trouble on things I believe passionately for." Evelyn referred to herself as a change agent and reflected that, "in those days it was very popular in training administrators to talk about the importance of being a change agent but nobody ever said what is true. If it's full of risks, as they always claimed, then to be a change agent – if you really are committed to what lies under it – then sometimes you're going to pay that price" (Interview).

Upon reaching the age of retirement, she bid higher education administration farewell and moved to Chatterton where one of her daughters lives. Not ready to fully retire, she entered graduate school to earn a master's degree in gerontology. She was discouraged by the treatment she received and the lack of prospects that followed. Evelyn did teach for a while and became involved in developing a curriculum and program for the institution where she studied but eventually left after receiving no support from the department. "I was under the mistaken idea that if you're over 60 and a gerontologist you shouldn't have any trouble teaching because after all that was the right age to be. Well that's not how it works. Departments and schools are primarily run by people much younger." She decided to stick to retirement but continued to write and teach on the subject of aging. "I was making my peace with being a retired lady which I can't say I exactly love.... I love problem solving...I couldn't stand not being mentally, intellectually active." Serendipity then led her to a position as director of a private institute for continuing education. She submitted her resume to them for possible teaching opportunities and instead was offered the vacant director's slot. At 76 she exclaims, "I love being back in harness." When asked what enabled her to stick so long with the administration battles, in spite of the continuous obstacles, she answered, "I really truly believe in education. I'm an absolute idealist on that one. I have always believed that liberal education absolutely frees people, that it can transform lives." She told her story with a smooth voice that held no bitter tone. She remains appreciative of her friends and close with her family who supported her through the years (Interview).

Barbara

Barbara described herself as having an unremarkable background with the good fortune of knowing brilliant men who looked out for her. The interview was held over the

phone and hard to arrange because of her demanding schedule. The discussion was initially delayed because of a phone connection problem in her office. Barbara quickly emailed a solution and graciously drove back home so that the interview could take place as planned. Through the conversation she came across as efficient and determined yet witty, personable, and inquisitive. She often asked questions that took the attention away from herself (Field notes).

Barbara hails from New England and has had a lifelong relationship with Harrison University. Her various roles include that of graduate student, research assistant, undergraduate advisor, dean, and lecturer. She "credits her family background and a marriage that was a partnership for much of what she has accomplished." She "witnessed the respect accorded her maternal grandmother and the marriage of equals between not only her own parents but that of several aunts and uncles" (Supporting documentation).

Barbara's career began with an interest in science and sociology. "I was always interested in science and sociology combined." She earned her bachelor's from Richards and then spent about ten years at the medical school of Harrison as a research assistant and occasional student. "I had a remarkable opportunity thanks again to a professor who kept pushing me about developing my career...when a postdoctoral fellow dropped out at the last minute – which was something that never happened at Harrison – he put me forward as a candidate to take his job when I was really quite young and not experienced...and the opportunity I think is worth recording somewhere because it has to do with chance and grabbing onto something" (Interview).

She was then advised to get some formal training in sociology if she wished to work with a new program that Harrison was developing for medical students. Taking the advice,

Barbara earned a master's in sociology with the University of New England. "And I felt those men were dazzled by me where nobody had really ever been and saw in me an incredible potential." She then returned to Harrison with the qualifications in hand to initiate the new training program and eventually earn a Ph.D. in the social science of medicine. She was only one of two women in the program. "Out of that grew my fascination with how people learned." During that time she met and married her husband, also of Harrison, and they had two daughters together. She studied under a prominent psychologist

> who was the "in" professor at that time in all of social studies and I became both his teaching assistant and his head "section man" as we used to call it...and when I said to him that his theories of growth and development had nothing in common with what I was seeing from my Richards undergraduate advisees or certainly in my own life, by then I had two little girls, he said "Go ahead...talk about the differences." So he allowed me to give one or two lectures a year on what I saw as the differences in late adolescence between young men and young women...and that really launched me into thinking more systematically about young women. So that was the beginning and I always carried [women's issues] in parallel with whatever I was doing. (Interview)

In the early 1970s Barbara became involved with a project on the status of women in New England that led to an appointment with the president of Harrison. From there, Barbara progressed into various administrative and teaching positions with the university. She was advised to get out of the women's issues arena if she wanted her career to advance and again she followed the advice given her. It was "in the mid 70s when I was really on every women's committee, a senior colleague said to me 'if you want your career to go ahead, you've got to get out of that stuff.' And I did." She grew into a position with notable prestige

at the Public Policy School of Harrison but has always kept women's issues in mind in her writing (Interview).

In summation, I found five articulate, very well-educated, strong, compassionate, savvy, accomplished, hard-working women who do not know the meaning of retirement. "Afterall," as one woman noted, "why should you retire when you love what you do?" They are passionate about their work and supportive of the women who follow in their footsteps. They were described as "well read, curious, good thinkers, and able writers" (Supporting documentation). These are five of the women who in 1971 came together to form the Committee for the Advancement of Women.

CHAPTER V

Cross-Case Analysis: Historical Description

A cross-case analysis of the historical description of the formation of the Committee for the Advancement of Women follows. The analysis is a conglomeration of the individual case interviews and unless otherwise noted was built from the interview data source.

The Committee for the Advancement of Women

The Committee for the Advancement of Women was formed in 1971 by seven women who were serving in various administrative capacities in higher education. The group came together out of a need for solidarity with other women who served in executive positions throughout New England. The impetus for the women to meet was fundamentally rooted in the change in the social context at the time.

Tina described the context for the change that occurred that allowed for women to increasingly appear at administrative levels on campuses in the United States.

> We were all hired in either co-ed or previously men's universities to effect change and the occasion was going co-ed. The number of men's colleges among the elite schools...they had all gone co-ed. And they had all gone out of their way to hire women. Now, already the feminist movement was having an impact on the thinking of these administrators, because, had it occurred...five years before in 1965 they would have hired Deans of Women to hold the women's hands and to provide them with guidance and the counseling. But by 1970, each of these presidents and their boards and their faculty were aware there was something other, that there was an agenda. That you just didn't have to get the women to adjust to Yates, Providence but you also had to get the universities to adjust. And some more reluctantly than others,

> some enthusiastically went out looking for senior women. And so we were respectively, Associate Provost, Special Assistant for Women's Education, a Dean, Senior Advisor to the President...different titles but we all pretty much had the same agenda. So each of us had appeared on the scene.

It was not long after those few women got settled into their new positions when they sought others who were in similar situations. They started to become aware of how isolated and singular they were and sought to connect with others like themselves.

Evelyn, one of the first women hired to an executive position at a predominantly male university, recalled that "...when I started at Baker I was looking around to see if there were any other women in the [area]....and at that time there weren't many." Once connecting with the few others like herself, Evelyn noted how she thought "...it'd be a good idea if we all got together and just sort of swapped war stories and thought about how we can help one another and about what we can do to get more women in things." After a string of telephone calls amongst the women, a meeting was set. Tina elaborated on how the first meeting came about in the way that it did.

> The occasion for the first meeting at Stockton, at this motel, was the arrival on the scene in...probably '71 of Evelyn, who had been...a very high [position] at Lowell Smith. She came to Baker as the most senior of all of us, the most power rich position. And we were not sure if she shared our ideology or our agenda. So we thought maybe it would be a more powerful statement to have her come to meet us at some independent place. So it was already a politics of location involved.

Marilyn, newly hired at Hillstead, became involved in the group through her affiliation with Tina.

> I think it was in the first year that I was there. Tina called me up or maybe I sent her a letter to say I got the job...it was very nice of her to put me forward. Not very many people did that in those days you know. And she called me and said "Listen, a group of women are getting together to see what we can do about helping women in this area...would you like to join us?" and I said, "Sure...where are you meeting?" [Tina replied], "Well, we have to meet in a motel room 'cause we couldn't meet on campus."

Marilyn explained, "Because in those days if you met on campus,...if a group met together all the men got paranoid and they got so hostile because they were sure you were plotting to overthrow – I don't know overthrow what – but I didn't think it was so strange when she says, 'Well, we have to meet in a motel.'"

The challenge of the first meeting was to find enough women to gather together. In the early 1970s, the door to university administration had been opened to only a handful of women. Marilyn highlighted that although "there were more than 35, probably closer to 50, colleges in Western Massachusetts alone...and we were...she was trying to mobilize women in New England colleges who were administrators, not 'assistants to' but an associate, a dean, or chair or something like that and she was able to get seven people to come to that meeting." Emphasizing how small the pool to draw from was she added, "You know we could've met in a phone booth." Cheryl also recalled that,

> At that time there were just very few women in positions of administration. Evelyn was at Baker and she had been one of my teachers at Richards. Marilyn had become... [a housemaster] at Hillstead. Tina was working for the president of Williams. A friend of mine, Barbara, at Harrison wasn't in an administrative position

but had studied women's careers and Ellie [not interviewed] was advising the president at Yates on women's issues. But actually Evelyn and I, well and Barbara too, were the only ones with line positions, the rest were kind of advising presidents and so we decided to meet....We all kind of picked this motel in Stockton because it was geographically between all of us and spend a day trying to figure out what our lives were like and what we wanted to do and at the end of it all we really thought we needed an organization.

Tina continued her description of the first meeting:

...we chose a motel equidistant from [various New England locations] and all charged up there in separate cars....I mean some had never seen the others before so there was an icebreaking opportunity...and we're spontaneous, talky women and two topics I remember that very definitely broke the ice were how uncomfortable we all felt going to a hotel in the afternoon – motels in the afternoon had one meaning – so we talked about that and that bonded us and made us realize we had a great deal in common in and out of our jobs. And the second thing which came when we went around the room and described our jobs and our background was [that] each of us remarkably had enormous titular power and responsibility [but we] did not have any control, not even access, to the budget....That meant potentially that we were window-dressing. We weren't sure, but it was not healthy for us not to have control of the budgets. What we did have responsibility for in each instance was moving the university to a more co-educational environment.

From this initial discussion, the women decided that they wanted to continue meeting. They also quickly set objectives for the group. One of the first objectives the group decided

on was to establish a kind of placement service to start filtering resumes and requests for faculty and administrative positions. A second objective was to get funding to support the placement service. This was achieved and the placement service was housed out of Baker. A third objective, established later, was to help administratively train women. Many of the women had academic backgrounds with no exposure to budgets, grant writing or other administrative skills. The group transformed from a social support group to an agency to advance women in higher education, themselves as well as others.

Marilyn pointed to how the objectives for the group were set.

> And so we go to this meeting and the first thing we had to think about was what was it we wanted to do. Should we help the students...or staff? Where could we put pressure where it would do the most good in advancing women in higher education? That really developed into the question which took some talking about....We said "How do you change things?" You have to be in a position of power to change anything....We decided that we would make an effort to see that women get ahead in administration because that is how those institutions change.

Because a number of the women were already in administration they came to the joint decision very quickly. They felt it was the one area where they could have the most impact. Barbara concurred, "What we found at that time was that it was easier to really make a difference on women administrators. The men simply didn't think about women as administrators." The first objective, to help advance women into administration, was agreed upon.

The topics that subsequently flowed from that decision were how to meet the first objective. The women determined to keep meeting as well as to establish and finance a

network supporting the hiring of more women. Marilyn reflected on how they continued the discussion. "So in this room, we talked. 'What should we do? We have to get money and provide a grant and we have to get funding' and [we decided to] meet again, ...enlarge the group and look around [for other women in similar spots]." Cheryl concluded, "and so Tina picked up the phone and called Maxine who was at the Foundation for Furthering Higher Education and that's basically how we got [sic] born."

Meetings, Memberships, and Growth

After the birth of the organization from that first meeting, the original members recalled how the group had no established leader for any of the meetings. They mentioned how feminist groups were considered by nature to be collective and non-hierarchical. Several members noted how quickly the group grew yet how they preferred the intimacy of the initial small group of supporters. But they understood that to be effective, they had to be strategic. Tina remembered how it evolved:

> We...wanted to continue to meet because we had found that first meeting very satisfying and productive. We learned a lot from each other. We learned a lot about each other's universities. And we didn't want to meet again in a motel so over the next years...we would meet at one of our campuses...in New England where the host would provide a lunch....The meetings had a very collective, feminist orientation. We didn't have speakers. That's what the men would have done. Instead we went around the room each time, there was a pattern, and had each of us speak to the following three questions: One, "what was the best thing going on at our institutions?" Two, "what was the worst in our particular set of responsibilities?" And three,..."what did we want to get out of this meeting?" So the agenda came from the group.

Tina made the distinction that this was a feminist group not a female organization modeled after a male organization. There was no president or chairman. She specified the difference in that they did not have an outlined structure commonly used having, for example, a treasurer's report and a reading of the secretary's minutes. But they did have an occasional reporting of the numbers of women that were placed through their service. Evelyn recollected "the group began to slowly grow and it was an interesting time. It was a time when there was a real feeling among women that there should not be what was thought of as a male hierarchy. So there was no chairman of our group."

Marilyn described information sharing as being a primary activity. "We...shared what the problems are and how you overcome them and so it was a mentoring situation for the women." Cheryl, the most junior of the women, personally benefited from learning the experiences of the rest of the group, "I was new, I was young...I mean I think of all the things I didn't know...that, just to meet with these women, most of whom were older than I, and more experienced was just wonderful and I could've spent every year just having the five of us or the six of us meet two or three times a year." Although the women enjoyed the social benefits of the group, there was an understanding that they could or should be doing more.

Cheryl noted that Tina, in comparison to herself, "had a greater strategic sense of what was happening....Tina saw that we had to move beyond that...that we had to reach out to all women that there was really this need." Tina acknowledged that, "[the committee] was best small. Obviously to go around a room and talk like that. But we felt obliged to open up membership simply because we didn't want to become...exclusionary...an elite country club....and I think by the time '77 – '78 came we were probably 30, 35. But we really

encouraged younger people or other people from different kinds of universities to start their own groups."

Not long into the growth of the group, it was decided that they also needed to involve themselves with the administrative training of other women. It was understood that in order to enhance the women's chances for promotion they needed to attain certain skills to which females generally were not exposed.

> We realized there were a lot of training programs in the country...[but] the curriculum was designed for males. Namely, lots of training in organizational theory and behavior, and people handling skills, negotiation, writing but not in the stuff that women needed. We were all superior...we could've taught those courses, right? What we needed, and we got this out of a lot of conversation, was a training in grants writing, in budgeting, especially in the special kind of accounting that goes on in non-profit institutions. So we decided we would invent our own training program for administrators.

That decision led to conferences and summer training institutes led by women who had experience in those targeted skill areas. Cheryl summated, "It enabled women to come together and build a network and build friendships and enabled them to learn something about the skills that were important and to get people to call when they got stuck." Thereby, the small group of women who first met to support each other were then able to support and advance many more women throughout New England.

Progression and Reflection

Eventually, the women who first had the clandestine meeting in a motel that afternoon moved on to other projects of importance in their lives. The group had grown into

a self-sustaining organization with an infrastructure. Most of the women are still in touch with one another in personal and professional ways.

Tina remarked, "So I'd say each of us went on and did very well. It may have been that was our trajectory to start with but I think the support and the information we got from each other was important. But everyone began to move on." Each of the women referred to a kind of "moving on" from the group. Tina went to Washington and then moved out west. Marilyn reflected, "Everybody in that group was doing 20 different things in addition to that." She too decided to withdraw, "And after three years I stopped going. They went off in different directions....I became active in the project [for women in Hillvalley]....I became active in several things. After three years I begged off, folded back. Took sabbatical." Cheryl pursued the new presidency at Hillstead. "By the time I went to Hillstead I really moved away from it and didn't spend a lot of time and really wasn't involved. The Hillstead job was a huge job. By that time I had kids and had to let go of something and I think...you know, there was a wonderful group of people who were running it and taking it over and I felt it was in great shape." Evelyn was juggling the transitions in her career and also ended up moving out west. Barbara had been encouraged by a senior colleague to get out of her activities with the women's movement and focus on her academic career. "But," Tina emphasized, "each of us I think became nodes of activity wherever we ended up." The personal stories of each of the women seemed to reflect that they indeed remained active and tried to contribute to the advancement of women wherever and in whatever way possible.

In the years that followed the growth of the Committee for the Advancement of Women, other organizations were formed in the Midwest and West that emulated the training and advancement programs of the New England group. The organizations will have offered

almost 30 years of service to the advancement of women leaders. Over 3000 women have participated in the combination of programs. The participants represent a cross-section of 40 host institutions that financially supported 96 percent of women attending. The programs became user-fee-based because of limited funding support over time. However, that in turn led to greater institution support and involvement from organizations wishing to sponsor training for advancing women (Supporting documentation). As an example of some of the training program's past success, 30% of the participants of the 1980 administrative skills program were promoted and of "the seven women who served on the first advisory committee for the [East Coast group], none held a rank higher than dean. Within a few years, three became presidents and two assumed more responsible administrative positions" (Supporting documentation). A former director of one of the organizations discussed the study of success rates and impact of the organization's efforts. She gave the impression that attempts to quantify the program's progress were difficult. "[It's] very hard to judge in any absolute sense....At the time I was involved with it we really didn't have enough basis for comparison. We did run studies on who got promoted, who went where and that sort of thing. Problem is you didn't have a control group" (Supporting documentation). She shared a story of her being on a cruise ship and, after telling someone about her work, a woman from a few tables away who overheard the conversation exclaimed, "You started [the program]?!...It saved my life." The director concurred with Barbara's assessment that while there were pockets of "revolutionaries for social change...this (the committee) was specifically an East Coast phenomenon" and added,

> There was...historically a relatively high concentration of academic women in [the New England] area and there still is. It's also true for men. It's highly focused on

> higher education....So that there were by the nature of things more jobs, if they weren't always good ones, they were still here. Most of the women's colleges were here. So that might've been the nucleus. I think that was probably a reasonable historical development. There were other active spots. The Midwest was generally slow. At Wisconsin there were some well-known feminists and hardly anything in the South that I'm aware of. But there was a lot of activity in California. (Supporting documentation)

For a variety of reasons, Cheryl, Evelyn and Tina moved westward and the remainder of the original committee members stayed in New England.

Tina reflected on the involvements of the women both together and individually, "So everything we did had multiple impacts. It was the consciousness raising. It was the politics. And the group itself." Her recollections of the women themselves were that, "we were all very, very smart you must realize, smart and survivors." Reflecting on how it all came together, Barbara explained that it was "...partially coming out of Tina's real insight. What a smart, driven woman she was. She was the one who got us together. She was the one who went for a small grant from the Foundation to enable us to meet. She was just smart. And the rest of us all came along. " A statement applied to describe one of the women might be used for all, "she was just too smart to be held back." Evelyn described the group as "a bunch of very strong personalities." She reiterated, "You have to remember that for any of us to be in those spots we had to be uncommonly tough or resilient or some of both. Because we really were the pioneers."

Looking back on the experience of the group and the outcomes of their efforts Barbara summarized, "...I think, overall, I would have to give a somewhat upbeat response

to this. I would come out feeling the work that our group initiated was not in vain. And others have supplanted us and moved and done even more important things and that we were very lucky as a small group that we did feel extremely excited, challenged, felt that we had the opportunity to do something. And felt that in maybe some small, small, small way to make a difference."

Tina stated the she often shares the story of the group when she talks to audiences of women because it offers "some great insights, you know about our being of one mind, and so much alike, of friendships." She concluded, "We managed a very large set of projects without strife...and we really liked each other. We enormously respected each other....So it sounds like we were on a winning team."

CHAPTER VI

Cross-Case Analysis with Relation to Theory

The case study centered on the life and career experiences of five women who were in the forefront of the second wave of the women's movement as it intersected with higher education. In almost all cases, the women were "firsts"...first student, first faculty, or first administrator in Northeastern colleges or universities. By example and effort, these women helped to break the barriers for other women to advance in all levels of higher education. In reflection, the women provided examples of being survivors, change agents, pioneers and educators. They shared key lessons about politics, power, and administrative insights for institutional change. They agreed that change is contextual and complex, thereby requiring multiple impacts. Several of the women demonstrated the importance of mentoring in their careers and were critical of the "queen bee effect." They benefited from the contacts, information sharing and support that the committee provided. They stressed the slowness of change in the model of professional development emphasizing that the years for professional development coincide with the "fertile years" for women. The combination of these factors supports much of what the literature suggests to be barriers and solutions to the gender gap in leadership.

The cross-case analysis with relation to theory covers: the context for social change, the pioneer position, increasing the numbers, the model of professional development and equality of condition. These points are followed by a cross-case analysis of the women's efforts to promote change that focused on financial backing, fiscal training, consciousness raising and mentoring. The analysis is shadowed by a reflection on the change process that marks the elements of inside/outside communication, multiple strategies and the spiral of

history. Finally, the cross-case analysis concludes with reflection on the efforts by the committee members to promote change.

The Context for Social Change

The most common theme among the discussions of the women was the social context of the late 1960s and early 1970s that warranted them forming a group together. Their comments revealed that they were part of a movement. Their positions and involvement in higher education at the time was part of something bigger on the outside of the institutions with which they were affiliated.

In the cross-case analysis of the group formation, Tina commented that, initially, administrators in higher education were impacted by the feminist movement and therefore established a new agenda to bring co-education to their campuses. The women's subsequent "arrival on the scene" stems from an apparent movement that was in the air. The declaration of a movement at hand is important to note because according to social change theory certain preconditions have to be in place in order for a movement to take flight (Meyer, 2000). The environment must be ripe to allow for something like a movement to come to fruition. Cheryl made several references to the indications of a movement getting off the ground. "Then...we kept meeting,...and it was clear then that a movement was really starting. I mean I don't think it had been entirely clear, it was just becoming; something was happening but it hadn't kind of gelled. Gloria's book I think had just come out." A cluster of books were published that a great number of women were reading all at the same time and more than once. In the early 1970s books like Betty Friedan's Feminine Mystique, Kate Millett's Sexual Politics, and Our Bodies, Ourselves were widely read and talked about (Field notes; Supporting documents).

While beginning her career at Tillman, Cheryl began to write her own book on women in the workplace and noted, "at that time there were lots of issues around working women that were just beginning to emerge." Cheryl commented on the very hiring of women at that time in the face of the movement, more specifically the hiring of her to be president of Hillstead. "I have to really admire the courage of that board to — what was it 1977— so I was 36, to appoint someone who was 36 years old to run that place. The other piece of it was because of the women's movement and the timing of it all. There were all these [places] like Providence looking for women and there wasn't a larger pool so it created opportunities that are different now" (Interview).

Evelyn specified, "this was at a time when there was a lot of pressure for women's colleges to become co-educational." Tina compared the situation at the time to a card game.

> It's like playing bridge...you have a contract...some card is trump. It's a very valuable card to have. And it's as if we had been playing a bridge game of which we always had the worst hand and suddenly trumps were changed in the middle of the game and suddenly you were ending up with all these little clubs which you thought were losing cards and suddenly clubs were trump. Meaning, having been a female all that time was a *dis*advantage and suddenly it was an *ad*vantage. (Interview)

Barbara established that, "Once the mores changed in the '70s, the women were ready. It wasn't as if there was this cultural lag – it was as if there'd always been this pent-up ambition, and desire to accomplish something important, and the minute society said it was OK...they were off" (Supporting documentation). The women were unique in their roles at these now co-educational institutions and were considered pioneers in the second wave of the women's movement.

Pioneer Position

In parallel to diffusion of innovation these women were the innovators. They possessed a privileged educational background from elite northeastern colleges and universities. The wealth of education afforded them placement in the front of the curve of innovation and therefore access to positions that allowed them opinion leader status (Degenne & Forsé, 1999).

A few of the women alluded to the distinction of titles at the time. Amongst themselves even, they made a distinction between those who were "assistant to" versus those who were "assistant of ...". Cheryl recalled the initial members and distinguished those who had "line positions" from the rest who "were kind of advising presidents." Marilyn, recollecting back to who was involved at the first meeting, specified, "One was assistant to the president of Harrison but she was 'assistant to' and of course 'assistant to's' will always remain 'assistant to'. There's no career track you know. I mean women don't even know what the career track is at this point" (Interview). Tina remembered that an article appeared in a prominent East Coast newspaper titled "We are the A's" "because among the many of the other discoveries we made in this conversation we had among ourselves is that every one of our titles began with A. Associate, Acting, Adjunct. It was just amazing. It wasn't clear if that was intended. But it said something symbolic" (Interview). With the exception of Evelyn, who was Provost and Dean of Faculty at Baker, the women questioned whether they were playing the role of "supporting actor."

Several of the women reflected on their feelings of isolation that prompted them to look for others and find some common ground. Cheryl mentioned she felt that "...it was enormously isolating to be the only woman in the senior administration of any of these jobs

and you would look around and feel like you were in this house of mirrors sometime." Marilyn emphasized the importance of having the kind of group they formed, "because a lot of women, then and now, work really in isolation...there may be only one or two in their department" (Interview). In order to decrease the sense of isolation, the committee members decided to work toward increasing the numbers of women in ranked positions.

Increasing the Numbers

The founders recognized that in order to balance the status of females in higher education they needed to increase their numbers. An increase of women in executive positions would not only make their jobs easier but also help ease the transition for more women entering academe in the future. Kanter's (1977) structural theory proposed three variables that may explain the strength of positioning within an organization to effect change: opportunity within an organization for mobility and growth, power to mobilize resources through both formal means and informal contacts, and relative number or proportions -- the "critical mass" (Hawkins, 1994; Kanter, 1977). While all three variables are equally important, the "critical mass" component is what women in academia were and are currently lacking most.

Beckhard and Pritchard (1992) explained that critical mass is not just sheer numbers of persons, rather "it is defined as the smallest number of people and/or groups who must be committed to a change for it to occur. Determination of what constitutes a critical mass requires an analysis of the formal organization, surrounding key constituencies, and their relevance to and position toward the change. From such an analysis a new system emerges that is smaller than the core system" (p.14). The lack of this critical mass consequently reduces the overall opportunity for women to have access to power to be instigators of

change and further advancement for other women (Kolodny, 2000). The committee understood this and therefore established their first objective: to increase the number of women. They were challenged however by the common hiring practice. Tina recalled:

> We couldn't move farther until we had more people...we decided within weeks of that first meeting that we would try to collect resumes in a very systematic and fair manner and provide them to those various presidents [who were seeking candidates]. So that was our first real commitment and each of us had of course been getting informal queries from various places, "Do you know any women in sociology?" and we all felt very uncomfortable recommending anybody because we just know that person, it's just not fair, it's not fair to the person we don't know. Now I don't know if the men feel this way but we had a very strong sense of fairness and justice and we knew that we ourselves would've been overlooked except by the accident of knowing somebody. So we did not want to play that game. We wanted to do it more systematically. And at that time the hiring of faculty was on a network, call it "old-boys" if you want, a network of friendship and knowing people and often, as at my university, it certainly was the case the provosts office did not set guidelines for how many you had to interview, how many you had to bring to campus. Guidelines that authorized appointments if or de-authorized appointments if the guidelines weren't met. There really was no central control. It was very much a de-centralized system like fiefdoms... (Interview)

The group asked themselves, "How will we go about sponsoring women's candidacy at other institutions?" Marilyn explained why the referral service became the answer, "to at least have a network of information to have a track of what jobs were open. Remember, this

is a time when jobs were not advertised. That comes later where you're forced by law to advertise a job. That didn't become a legal necessity until sometime later. So the only way you could get hired was through a network and that was all male" (Interview).

Evelyn recounted how on more than one occasion men were brought in to a university by someone they knew. A member of the board at Lowell Smith "brought in a personal friend and associate to be president." Even later in the 1980s that was still the case when she moved out west. A new president of the state university where she was just hired brought in "his best friend and long time associate to head up the campus" that she was supposed to be leading.

There was a smaller or different pipeline for women who wanted to have a career in higher education. That is why the committee, according to Barbara,

> began thinking systematically about increasing the numbers of women. It was still terrible. I mean, what we called it many years afterwards and it's probably not so different now is the "flushable bottom." I don't know if you've heard that dreadful term but it means that everybody gung-ho moved in and hired many young women as assistant professors but they didn't give them tenure so that you saw this huge bulge in the figures of women in universities [but] the minute you broke them down you saw that they were non-tenured. (Interview)

Because there was no open career track for women many were never able to ground themselves in one place. Barbara pointed to women who had to jigsaw a career together. "I was on a number of committees for giving grants...you would read about these extraordinary women who were academic gypsies. It would say 'two years, University of Buffalo...two years, University of Miami...three years, University of Chicago'. They went wherever the

jobs were and led lousy lives because they had no retirement plan. They were just an unprotected group of migrants and that was a group that we felt very strongly about trying to protect" (Interview).

If a woman had the good fortune to be hired at a supportive institution she planted herself. Marilyn explained, "Here were all these brilliant women who knew they couldn't go anywhere – when they went to an institution they stayed for life. The men always circulated, you know, everyone who was a scholarly star went to more than one place to enhance their careers. Women were never invited" (Interview).

As an historian, Marilyn explored the history of women entering professions and catalogued how the women were white, middle class, college educated, English speaking, and Protestant. "So in every way possible they were in the eligible pool – except they were women." Although women were later allowed to increasingly join the faculty and administration, the very nature of their being female presented different barriers for advancement. A married woman who worked and had, or planned to have, children had additional responsibilities different from her married male colleagues who had spouses who traditionally took care of the children and household matters (Apter, 1994; Bolton, 2000). The lifestyle expectation that a woman is the primary care giver for her children hindered many women in the model of professional development.

The Fertile Years and the Model of Professional Development

One explanation given to why the gender gap persists revolved around the model of professional development conflicting with "the fertile years" of women who have or desire to have children. Many of the women expressed the challenge that women have in pursuing professional careers at the same time they are trying to grow and nurture a family life. "There

was a time when you had a kid that meant automatically you were out" exclaimed Marilyn. Tina emphasized that, "The thirties is the period of career movement. And that is why it is so hard for women because that is exactly when they're having children. I always say from 25-40 you make your key career moves and what is happening from 25-40 in women's lives? They're having children" (Interview). Several books such as Apter's Working Women Don't Have Wives and Bolton's The Third Shift explore the challenge many women face of maintaining, or choosing between, career and family. Often women feel that to be successful in one requires a sacrifice of the other. Literature on the subject mentioned the struggle of the "double bind" where women are penalized professionally for not playing the expected appropriate masculine or feminine roles (Supporting documentation). Cheryl observed, "I still think we have this problem which is that what's being assertive in men is aggressive for women....That there's less tolerance of different styles when it's women....That more idiosyncratic men can keep moving and it's harder for idiosyncratic women"(Interview).

Marilyn, who wrote a book on the historical professional development of women, explained how the model developed over time:

> This model of professional development, developed in the 19th century when the professions emerged in this country...and in Europe. And it was an exclusively male activity. Because middle-class women, if they were educated, stayed at home. The other women were not educated and they were made to work...if you're working class, you work. But they didn't get into professions. So the professions became the exclusive preserve of men of...white middle-class Protestant men in this country. If you're Catholic it's no good even. So a very closed system, and that's the model for professional activity based on that man, that particular type of man...with a home life

> and a wife that took care of everything else...and that's the model that women are supposed to adopt but it didn't work for their lifecycle because women aren't men. (Interview)

Very often, women sacrificed marriage and motherhood or had to make some kind of "special arrangement" in order to succeed in education and go on to have some kind of professional career. For these reasons, Marilyn emphasized the difference in women's needs and the flexibility on the part of institutions to, for example, put off the tenure decision. "Just delay it...so give her enough chance to get enough publications out. Because right at the time when she's coming up for tenure is when she's having babies and it slows them down." A comparison was given of what accommodations are made for "men with hernias...or heart attacks...[who] retained all their benefits" (Supporting documentation). Marilyn underscored that men "have their middle-age heart attack...their career manages to go around that. But to go around women's needs? No, that hasn't happened"(Interview).

Barbara also commented on the expectations for women to successfully juggle work and family:

> And so you can see certain shifts in that....When I first began...thinking about these issues, the goal we had was to give people choice. Not for people, women, to have hot shot careers right out of college. And for a while, it was really awful. If women didn't make the choice to have a career, they were in certain academic communities or business communities looked down on and there was nothing worse than being a wife and a mother. And that was heartbreaking to me. Because my hope had been that men and women would have choice. And we're beginning to see a handful of men identifying themselves as house-husbands. But now what we're beginning to see is a

number of women are opting not to work because the pressures of raising a family are so extraordinary that they've measured the gains from their work, now this is outside academia, and they're deciding to step back. How they get back into the system is something again one has to understand better in another ten years. In academia, there is some leeway but as I watch some of my own junior colleagues, young women, only those with [an] extraordinary amount of drive or [an] unusual capacity to manage lots of things or a husband who is sharing 50-50 or, as you find very often, someone who has an independent income and can afford a lot of help. I mean, that is one of the big dirty secrets of some success, which is that there are people who've been able to use other sources of funds to support the kinds of infrastructure you need to be married, have children, and write that book. And that's a big issue not fully exploited. (Interview)

Marilyn reiterated the point of the changing model by re-stating what she has told many of the audiences she has spoken to over the years. "I always say in my lectures when I did [talks] around the country...when I was young, you might not work but you were expected to marry. Now just the reverse is true, you might or might not be married all or part of your life, but you will work. And women know that. Younger women know that."

Equality of Condition: The "Twice-as-Good" Syndrome

Although the status of women and their opportunity to advance through tenure and into administrative positions has greatly increased over the past 30 years, the interviews suggested that there are still barriers preventing women from achieving the higher ranks in a balanced way. While a university may have let women enter, it may not have been altogether hospitable. Women encountered intimidating situations, perhaps not being allowed to use the

library or having doors shut in their faces when seeking advisement from certain professors. Here, one might recall Cheryl's comments about being trailed at Providence and feeling the pressure to represent all women and their ability to succeed at the university. Marilyn told of how she once caught a professor evaluating her teaching from outside her classroom window because he wanted to find out why students were flocking to her classes. Marilyn referred to this barrier as "the equality of condition." As an example, Marilyn told how she felt when she was first admitted into Providence.

> You know how you feel when you first go to graduate school and you feel everybody's smarter than I am. You know what I mean?...the normal trepidations about going to graduate school and then there's this... I mean this is a world [class] university [and a distinguished department of history]....So they took eleven men from around the world....Some of these people had [incredible qualifications]...I had nothing. The students are...graduates [from elite universities and are highly praised]. But only two of them are even as smart as I am. I can say that, I'm almost 70; only two. (Interview)

While continuing her studies at Providence, Marilyn would not dare to turn an assignment in late or show up late for class.

> I had one class that was held at 8 o'clock in the morning and I had to commute there. They [the single, male students] were living on the campus. I had to commute and get two little kids to bring to the babysitter and get dressed and the whole nine yards and get there by 8 o'clock. So I'm running up to the thing...skirt and heels and I'm running and [the professor] sees me on the ground floor and he says to me "Oh, Mrs. Smith, you don't have to run, you know you can come in a couple of minutes late." I

said, "Oh no, that's ok."....So at the end of the term when the big paper's due I'm staying up all night trying to get it done and I had to call my girlfriend to drive me to school. I was afraid to get in a car because I had been up for days trying to get it in on time. Turns out everyone in seminar, every fucking man had asked for an extension and got it. I didn't ask for an extension. It wouldn't even have occurred to me....How could I? I was there on sufferance....You can't be late, you can't do anything. You have to be twice as good. Well, that's not equality of condition.

In her study of women and members of other traditionally underrepresented groups entering corporations, Kanter (1977; 1980) addressed the notion of merit as competitive superior performance. The high performing new outsider is given a "special place." She is often held up as a model for the standard when in fact she has to outperform the standard. Marilyn explained how this false standard demonstrates equality of opportunity but not equality of condition.

And what that does is give the elite people who have the power the self-satisfaction of saying, "Well, we go by merit." Look we let Marilyn in and she can dance twice as fast as everybody else....Look, she's married, she has children, she's [all sorts of accolades] and we let her in. They don't say she only had to be twice as good as everybody else they let in....What they don't say is that the merely competent haven't got a chance....That's not equal opportunity. It's not equal until the merely competent can get in. I'm not saying get [something for nothing]...if you have a barrier that everybody has to pass, but you don't have to jump 50 feet over it like superman or superwoman....You have to have equality of opportunity and equality of condition. That's the secret. Mostly you have equality of opportunity because they do have

objective merit standards, which are overt, that are knowable that you can meet or not but they don't have equality of condition. (Interview)

The implication is that those who lack the requisite characteristics will have to leap extra hurdles if they want to run in the same race. Barbara suggested that there are some who will win any race every time while others may not even enter the arena. "I always exclude in any conversation the geniuses. Because geniuses will do well anywhere. If you look at a lot of careers a number of these women are genius or close to it and nobody, no matter how misogynistic is going to turn his eye, his back, on a genius who can come to his department. It's the rest of us. And that's where you begin to see the differences." Marilyn elaborated on how an elite group comes to the point of including others. "Some people succeed who are not in the elite class, in the tightest caste system, because no elite historically produces enough really good people to keep their particular stratem going. They just genetically can't do it. You just don't reproduce brilliant people in those numbers enough to keep their own class going so you have to absorb from another class below them. But that makes a situation where in order to enter the door, which is very narrow, you have to be twice as good as everybody else who's in there. And that means there's only going to be a few people who can make it from outside" (Interview).

The other women concurred that a "twice-as-good" standard still exists. Cheryl stated, in her experience in the business community and in "one of the most powerful positions in Chatterton for ten years, that you probably still have to be just a little bit better than. You're probably looked over and challenged. There's a level of doubt whether it's hidden or not but still exists." Barbara added that, "The context has changed. And I think

women will not be systematically discriminated against. I still think they have to be twice as smart" (Interview).

The cross-case analysis up to this point delivered answers that are consistent with what much of the literature suggested to be causes for the persistence of the gender gap in higher education. While Powell (1999) listed many competing cultural factors that contribute to the gender gap, the women tended to focus primarily on the impeding factors of the number of women in positions of power, the equality of condition, and the model of professional development which conflicts with many women's desire to both raise a family and have a successful career. These comments were supported by Chliwniak (1997), Kanter (1977), and Kolodny (2000) who, among others, write about women in higher education and the challenges of the slowly changing cultural context. After discussing these factors, the women illustrated how they worked as a committee to facilitate change in higher education and offered their opinions on how change works.

Efforts to Promote Change

As mentioned in previous chapters, several objectives to promote change were established by the Committee for the Advancement of Women. While continuing to meet for social support, they wanted to help push the placement of women into universities around New England, they pursued funding for the placement service and they initiated training programs to provide women with administrative skills. The women seemed to possess foresight and an uncanny understanding for the strategy to seek outside financial backing.

Financial Backing

In the interviews, it was clear that the women had an understanding and appreciation for outside financial support. The notion was clear that you use someone else's money to

further your cause. Most of the women still work with grants today on both the issuing and receiving ends.

For example, early in her career Barbara had been working with Cheryl on a project to explore the status of women in New England. Barbara remarked how "those were the days of the 'Golden Grants.' If you had two brain cells that were working there was money." So she and Cheryl prepared a proposal for their project and sought financial backing. "Cheryl and I had been talking about what we might do for women and he (the head of the funding corporation) said to her 'if you really want to make a difference for women, you've got to be willing to take money from the men' and we said we were very agreeable and we got an enormous amount of money from the Cartwright Corporation to begin a study plus an application of the study to five or six New England colleges..." Cheryl, who has worked for many years assigning grants to various change-oriented groups, looked back on that project and stated that the head of the Cartwright Corporation "was deeply committed to women's issues and provided money to set up the service" but she prefaced by saying "I would've never given us that much money...without insisting on a more extensive proposal" (Interview). One outcome from their study showed that of the New England schools, Milton "was by far the model. The president...had already given his women faculty in the early 1970s a big budget to do extraordinary things for women" (Interview). The financial support demonstrated the leadership commitment and means needed for the desired changes on campus.

The proposal that funded the placement service for the Committee for the Advancement of Women was an inaugural event for the group. They put together a proposal to submit to the Foundation for Furthering Education.

> We delivered this proposal for something like $19,000. I mean the only thing we could think we needed was some secretarial help. Computers didn't exist. And that somebody somewhere in an office would get all these C.V.'s we were getting and all these queries we were getting and do a matching. And I remember the person to whom we wrote the proposal, Maxine [from the Foundation for Furthering Higher Education], writing back saying "This isn't enough to do anything" and doubled it.

Tina revealed that "for many of us it might've been the first proposal we ever wrote" (Interview). The proposal was the first in a handful of grants given by the Foundation. It is interesting to note, that through the newly established relationship between Tina and Maxine a groundbreaking meeting was held. Upon Tina's suggestion, a gathering took place joining foundation leaders and various women who were leading women activists in higher education. That meeting in turn led to a string of grants from the foundation that over the years amounted to $9.25 million. The grants supported multiple efforts by a variety of organizations throughout the United States relating to the needs of women in higher education (Interview; Supporting documentation).

Through this initial proposal writing experience, the group realized not many women they were helping get hired or promoted had training with grant writing and budgets. Therefore, another objective was established to help train women in higher education on these administrative skills.

Fiscal Training

Cheryl's first job at Tillman served as example of how fiscal training was desperately needed. Cheryl remembered back to when she was first responsible for a budget in her new position. "I thought the first year I was at Tillman I saved all my money from my budget

because I wasn't sure what I was going to do and I thought I could spend it next year. I didn't know the great big administrative vacuum cleaner would come along and put that into the central pot and I'd start off with the same amount next year" (Interview). Cheryl clarified that on the whole, women were not exposed to fiscal responsibility. "But the other piece was that there were a set of skills and information that women normally didn't get access to and that has a lot to do with budgets and numbers and also how institutions work because we weren't a part of that kind of system."

In response to this lack of fiscal awareness, the committee designed a training program to give the women the necessary exposure to grant writing, budgets, and accounting procedures. Marilyn elaborated on why the women were underprepared in fiscal matters.

> These were academics essentially. They weren't administrators. And boy you know academics are brainwashed not to do administration. See your degree trains you to become an administrator (referring to researcher) but a lot of the deans and presidents and those people come up through the academic route and that's a very different route because you're modeled after your mentor. And your mentor, if your mentor is mentoring you for a Ph.D., is a scholar and a publisher, not an administrator. Very few women understand how the hell a college worked or for that matter how it runs" (Interview).

Cheryl continued on how the training was beneficial,

> I mean there are women at lots of institutions that needed help. If you now had asked the right budgetary questions then you can also position yourself for the next promotion. But if they sit around and say so-and-so could do this job but she can't do

the budget, you're not going to get the promotion. So in terms of the glass ceiling stuff, those skills were an important part of it" (Interview).

These fiscal skills are increasingly important today as presidents and other campus leaders are sought more and more for their ability to raise funds and make sound fiscal decisions (Milley, 1991;Walton, 1996). In this vain, the training programs that were initiated in the early 1970s are still functioning. Along with their administrative training curriculum, the programs continue to support consciousness raising efforts which include mentoring (Supporting documentation).

Consciousness Raising

In part because of the nature of the feminist movement which created the social context for the committee, education and information sharing was a key component to their activities. In those days, the term commonly used was "consciousness raising." Educating others on the status of women came in many forms. Some activities were as simple as conversations among women or events that increased awareness on campus (Supporting documentation).

For example, Barbara and Cheryl's collaborative study made it a point "to make sure there were women's groups meeting at these universities. Women faculty and students who would begin to think in a concerted way about how do you increase the number of women administrators and women faculty" (Interview). Cheryl told of how when she attended functions as an administrator, she found it difficult to initiate and have comfortable conversations with the other women present who were faculty wives. They were not used to a woman in the role of executive administrator. "I think I was just distorting and confusing their sense of how the institution worked and what roles were within it" (Interview).

When the Committee for the Advancement of Women met rotationally at each member's campus, it became expected that the president of the university would attend the meeting. Tina mentioned how

> in time we began to insist that our presidents welcome this group and the reason we did that was our presidents tended to think they'd gotten the only woman in the world who was qualified to do these jobs and we wanted to demonstrate to them that was not the case. There were 5 and then 8 and then 20 just like us. So that was an important consciousness raising activity, to bring the president in if only to see the women, dressed in their suits, and welcome them and maybe stay 30 minutes. (Interview)

The tradition began with Marilyn at Hillstead:

> We met at my house, in my commodious living room in this beautiful masters house. And I made [cookies] to serve with coffee...and I invited the president...and we had lunch too....We were like 25-30 women, administrators, which sounds like a lot, but from all over New England which has a lot of colleges. Some were members of the committee and some weren't, some were interested or they had some special contribution. I don't remember exactly who all was there but they were the core women in New England and so to get the mettle going I invited the president and vice president to come to our meeting. I really had been working on them about feminism and there's a feminist group on campus...and they're beginning to get educated on this and I wanted them to see that there are, that women are organizing.... I said to them, "I'm having a meeting....I want them to see that I have the support of the president and the vice president. For them to see you come there as a mark of support.

You have to do nothing else, just stand there." I told the president that. Because there was a terrible problem with that, if you met women, if a group of women met to talk about their needs and so forth men felt very, very threatened....So I figure, well I'm going to take the wind out of those sails and I'll invite the president and the vice president and they did, they came. What I did by doing that? By that time I had won their confidence as somebody they could count on in this difficult endeavor. Anyway, they came. I knew that they would...and they said all the polite things....And one of them said that it was the first time in his life that he was in a room where he was the only man, where there was only one other man, in a professional meeting. And he could see how difficult that could be....He told me that after. For that alone it was worth it. (Interview)

Today, the women continue to take opportunities for consciousness raising. They bring attention to areas where the status of women seem hindered or when they consider behavior inappropriate. Cheryl noted how even today she has had to speak up against some of her board meetings that were planned to be held in male members only establishments. She commented, "There's just a lack of thinking sometimes...and the old-fashioned phrase of 'consciousness raising' it still is an issue" (Interview).

Leaders are encouraged to communicate a new culture rather than perpetuate an old one (Pawney, 1997). The accomplishments of women in higher education leadership serve as vicarious experiences that may be modeled to the university community. Martin (2000) stressed communicating the whole picture to the community, not just the negative or the positive. Women need to be "given a realistic reading of the chilly temperature for women in the halls of academe...a realistic picture of academic life so that they can make informed

decisions about the future" (Martin, 2000, p. 171). Women on the rise need to see and hear what alternatives exist within the whole organizational culture. "They need to know that a woman can be a professor and the mother of young children, a professor in a heterosexual or a lesbian relationship, a professor who remains single throughout her life...[and] made aware of the whole wide range of lifestyles available to academic women" (Martin, 2000, p. 171). Consciousness raising contributes to the changing of the embedded mechanisms that contribute to the organizational climate (Schein, 1992). The sharing of information, dissemination of new ideas, and active role-modeling are key attributes for the diffusion of innovation (Degenne & Forsé, 1999; Harris, 1993).

Mentoring

An important part of consciousness raising is mentoring. Mentoring is a strong tool for career advancement (Ragins, 1999; Scanlon, 1997). Each of the women mentioned having and acting as mentors along the way. Support came in the various forms of supportive parents, professors, employers, and colleagues. Marilyn would have never made it so well through her undergraduate education or even to graduate school without the guidance and financial support of her professors who looked out for her success at Davis and Providence. Evelyn praised the role-model of the president at Lowell Smith and acknowledged the difficulty in not having a mentor in her current writing pursuits. Tina stressed the importance of her relationship with her father and the spiritual connection with leaders of the second wave of the women's movement. Barbara benefited from the encouragement of her professors at Harrison "who kept pushing me about developing my career." She illustrated how, "There were all these men who kept saying to me 'more, more, more...you're not pushing yourself enough' and...there were also slights but all you need is one or two

significant people who say to you 'that's a very interesting observation, you could do this'"(Interview).

Several of the women admonished those who operated under the "queen bee effect" where some women were not helpful in bringing others up through the ranks. Kanter (1977; 1980) warned against the situation that occurs when a star performer is held up as a model to others. Those who relish their singular spotlight are unwilling to share it with newcomers. Cheryl noted that there were those "who were competitive and trying to keep it a small pool and those who were trying to say 'this pool has to be much larger and we need to create opportunities for lots of women.' But...you'll find that there...are some women who don't do a lot for other women...and I always have a problem with it." Marilyn also warned against queen bees, "...you have to hope that the person who gets in there is not a queen bee. There's a queen bee phenomenon where a single woman gets in and [the employer says] 'they're unique and they're special and look how unprejudiced we all are that Joe Blow is here' and then another person comes in...and this person [the queen bee] doesn't want [them] to because they're no longer special." Whereas, for example, Tina demonstrated an alternative in her story of the "liquid lunches" she and her new colleague shared. They worked with each other to overcome obstacles at Williams.

Similarly, Cheryl's mentors at Richards and Tillman "would go out of their way to provide support and keep moving forward in helping this kind of next generation." She named males colleagues at Providence "who were just amazing mentors in many ways about how to run an institution." She praised a president from a sister school at Hillstead, who during Cheryl's presidency acted as her mentor, "who I had known since I was an undergraduate,...and she was just fabulous in terms of really helping in creating space and

understanding – one, just the personal issue of having teeny kids and trying to be a president of a college without any endowment....She was really supportive and very helpful." She described the lifelong mentoring as "crucial." (Interview).

These women served as mentors and role models for other women and for each other. Cheryl called on the support of others in the group. "Tina was always there being slightly more provocative and challenging in a very good way. You know, whenever I was feeling sort of slightly stuck or that we weren't pushing boundaries as much, I would call Tina and she'd get me back in pushing boundaries mode" (Interview).

The mentoring came from many different role-models. Cheryl described growing up with the exposure to various women who were affiliated with her father's good friend, a prominent man in political circles in Chatterton and Washington D.C. "Another one of my male mentors was...my god-father and he also was enormously supportive of women. He liked women. He liked women who were smart and engaged in issues and things. And so I got a sense from him...around him were these amazing women...I can just think of a whole bunch of women who were part of his circle so I saw a lot of these terrific women." When asked what it was that allowed for some men, including their husbands, to have no problem mentoring and supporting women, the women suggested that it had to do with "who their mothers were and how they were brought up." Men who themselves were raised by working mothers or for some other reason were exposed to the competency of women early on seemed to be more open to working with women. Such men seemed less threatened by the women. Similarly, it was noted that at Providence the "alums who were the most supportive of co-education were those with daughters" (Interview).

These examples express the importance education and exposure to models played in the development of women both personally and professionally. The combined efforts of financial backing, fiscal training, consciousness raising and mentoring helped the women and the group promote change. From these efforts the women learned much about the dynamics of change.

Reflection on Change

During the interviews conversation often led to a discussion about the dynamics of change. With their wealth of experience the women possessed great insight into how change occurs and how one works toward change in an institution or organization. Three central themes emerged from their comments: inside/outside communication, multiple strategies, and the spiral of history.

Inside/Outside Communication

In some of the interviews the notion of inside/outside communication was presented. The idea is similar to what communication theorists call locals and cosmopolitans (Degenne & Forsé, 1999; Harris, 1993). Meyer (2000) mentioned the critical role of "well-positioned elites" who are on the inside of power structures reinforced by those pushing on the outside. Certain group members establish and maintain connections between those inside and outside of institutions, organizations, or among co-workers in and outside of offices. The two naturally work together in order to achieve shared goals.

Cheryl described her first lessons toward comprehending the potential behind communication linkages.

> When I got to Providence I thought the most important thing I can do for women is to do my job well. And that goes back to if I failed then women couldn't do the job. At

> the end of the first year, the kind of leading women's organization people called up and said, "What have you done for us this year?" and I said..."Where have you been?" Without them out there saying "We want a women's center" or whatever,....which then I could bring inside and say "They want a women's center. They're pretty outspoken about it. It's actually a pretty good idea. Let's figure out how to move it." I couldn't raise those issues inside without the voices outside. (Interview).

Cheryl recognized that different people have different communication styles but it takes those different styles to carry a message. Cheryl illustrated that, "I'm probably more willing to acquiesce and find a very polite way to raise the issues and Tina was more strong and more strident sometimes. Which is great. And what I realize is that a movement needs both." She added, "And I'm much better as the inside person but unless there are people outside, it's very hard to be an effective inside person around these issues" (Interview).

Tina reflected on what her style of administration was on campus. She elaborated on how she would go outside of her office to interact with others on campus.

> When I needed to see someone, if someone needed to see me, I went to that office on campus. And it was extremely good for political reasons. You show up, you're seen.... You "read the walls," you go in you see what the bulletin board is saying about opportunities in graduate school, you stick your nose in the laboratory, you see the distribution of gender among the students and I overhear a conversation...and then you walk into the faculty person's office and you have access to that person's pile and you make a very good impression that you are administrator as server....And

> that makes an enormous difference,...and you express that by your physical movement. (Interview)

And in the case of meeting outside of your institution with others, Tina commented, "...when you met people outside of your institution who talked about behaving like that, you were reinforced. Whereas, at my institution I was the stranger." Cheryl added that the training programs that the committee initiated helped broaden the outside links "...and that got us out of us just being an [elite New England] thing too which was important. I mean there were women at lots of institutions that needed help" (Interview).

Evelyn, in tracking her career, stated that once she was "put out of the league" she went on to several institutions to come in as an outsider to initiate unfavorable policies.

> The only kinds of places that...would look at me were schools that were in some kind of serious jeopardy or schools that were in trouble and they needed an experienced, seasoned administrator who could be helpful and essentially, protect the president to extend his presidency a little longer. And I did that three times, each time I held a provostship that was created to establish a buffer between, in one case, the president and the old-guard administration he had inherited who were opposed to racial integration. (Interview).

Sturnick (1991) observed that it is often the case that women presidents, for example, were hired as campus trouble-shooters. It was not uncommon for search committees to pick an outside "clean-up person" for "high-risk presidencies" (p. 101).

The concern of who is inside/outside came into play on the question of membership for various women's groups with which the women were involved. They, too, made the

decision to exclude or include someone. The committee decided to keep its membership open despite the desire to keep the group small. The women's movement on the whole had to face the inclusion of lesbians at the risk of being excluded themselves from those uncomfortable with homosexuality. African-American women often had to concentrate their energies on either the African-American movement or the feminist movement, finding that they could not serve both (Supporting documentation). Marilyn offered the example of her newly founded feminist faculty group and their decision not to include males.

> They knew we were meeting at lunch time, the male faculty stopped me and said, "Why are you meeting? Why didn't you invite us? We're for women. We're feminists." Some of them were, actually. Some of my male friends in the valley and other places were more feminist than some of the women. Hard to believe. But I said, "No...You wanna meet? Then meet with the men and discuss it. You don't have to meet with us. We can't." That's a decision you have to make. He says, "You women are going to meet and we're going to be left out of it and you're going to make policy for us?" Very hard. But we did it. (Interview)

The decision was a hard one to make because it was a small college where everyone knew each other as colleagues and as friends. But the politics of membership was something these women understood. Marilyn reiterated that:

> you have to understand what the infrastructures are. You have to understand that...in all these cases where women were kept out like at Harrison or Providence...I don't believe that people sat around and said, 'Oh, we hate women and we don't want them in.' The interesting thing is, maybe they said it and maybe they didn't. Maybe they thought it and maybe they didn't. But it's irrelevant. That's the part you have to

> understand. It's a project for them. It's a project of upward mobility for them, for the people sitting there. That means they need a monopoly on the membership going in and out. It doesn't really matter how they feel about you. (Interview)

Marilyn explained that positions of power are maintained by keeping membership out and keeping the entrance narrow. Therefore, communication links with inside/outside membership are vital.

With this in mind the women pushed forward and strengthened their administrative ties inside and outside of their organizations. "I mean, you have to realize when you're an administrator, that everybody's got their own agenda and if you can play into somebody else's agenda, you can do very well....So, if you can find a policy that's good for you and that's good for the university and good for the outside world, they like it." These were, what Tina explained, the reasons for foundations like Cartwright and the Foundation for Furthering Higher Education to support the women's movement. But these were also the reasons behind how the women spread out in their communications and support with others. "Because," as Tina reiterated, "you're not going to have the marches on Washington unless you have an infrastructure" (Interview; Supporting documentation).

Cheryl emphasized how, "You need the inside people and you need the outside people. And any movement that succeeds needs both. And ideally they're talking to each other and planning and conspiring and saying, 'Ok, it's time for you to demonstrate and it's time for me to do this and you demonstrate and I'll go inside and say this is great.' But you really have to have the two" (Interview). An additional element of these inside/outside communication linkages is the benefit of multiple strategies.

Multiple Strategies

In the cross-case analysis of the Committee for the Advancement of Women, Tina expressed that "everything we did had multiple impacts." Several of the women learned through their experiences over time that it does indeed take multiple strategies to promote change.

Cheryl claimed that her experience with the committee taught her about the strategies required to sustain a movement for change. First, by the example set by Tina, that they had to reach out in order to develop the group and its goals.

> Now I look back and have seen a zillion other organizations or movements go through the same thing. What I really liked was just meeting these five women....And there are times now even at [the philanthropic foundation where I worked] when I would go to some meetings and realize that...[as an example, some new group] of eight architects who founded [an organization]...and then their meetings got bigger and bigger...and I said, "Hey look. You need to hire a staff. You need to...become institutionalized and if the eight of you want to meet you can't do it at your annual meetings. You'll need to find another time." You can't keep a small-type group of eight and also start a movement. (Interview)

Cheryl also explained the funding strategy she used to back organizations and the causes they represent. She demonstrated that movements with multiple impact targets have several footholds and tend to gain a lot more ground.

> The studies that we have done at inner-city neighborhoods show that the strong inner-city neighborhoods are the ones that have 8 to 10 very strong organizations. They have a good Y. They have a good church. They have a good school....Therefore, the

> grant making strategy...is to strengthen all of them....It's better to make a number of small grants. In the land mine movement we funded four different groups instead of one. So we got four different strategies, four different kind of voices, four different constituencies....Here again, I think [you've] got to take the problem and the issue you're trying to move and figure out what's going to be best. I do not believe in silver bullets or that there's a single solution. If you're going to change a school, you've got to have parents, you've got to have teachers or whatever....So I guess you need multiple kinds of strategies and multiple organizations and groups trying not to work at cross-purposes but understanding that these different strategies [can work]. (Interview)

Evelyn made a similar statement. She recognized that solutions to change are complex and systemic. "Every school I worked for was in some kind of crisis when I went and...I never solved [the problems alone] because it takes a village to raise a child and it takes a community to save a college. But I always had a part in it and that was wonderful."

Cheryl cautioned that "...the important thing for everybody to understand is that they have something to contribute to the bigger solution we're trying to get to. And the problem is when they start competing against each other saying 'my solution's better than yours' instead of saying, you know, 'there are multiple strategies.' Now sometimes there's a trade-off and you can't have it both ways" (Interview).

Marilyn recalled how when they were establishing the feminist faculty group at Hillstead, they had to answer a similar question faced by the committee: Where to put the pressure to push for change? "We have to have a feminist group on campus and this [question] comes up again. Do we help the students? Do we help the faculty? Do we help the

administration? What is the goal because if you try to do it all you can't do anything. You can only dance at one wedding at a time." They decided to focus on helping the women in the faculty. As Cheryl summarized, "So you have to make choices. In a lot of cases the different voices and the different groups all have something to contribute" (Interview).

While a group or organization may focus on its singular efforts, it is the connection to other groups and the concert of efforts that allows for multiple impacts. The world economic development theory commonly known as "the big push" suggests that in order to change an economy of a less developed country there should be a push in all areas for change (Kondonassis, 2000). The premise is that economic development arrives through multiple impacts. The conflict with the big push theory is that countries with limited resources struggle implementing even a single strategy. Economists question whether or not it is better to put all resources into furthering one cause that a country most needs. The examples given by the women suggest that the varied impacts through multiple strategies have greater potential to push change over time.

Marilyn outlined multiple strategies used to change the context. Change then comes from the new reiterated norms within an institution (Schein, 1992; Yukl, 1998).

> People behave contextually, so if you change the context you change the behavior....So you have to make a context in which they can function. That's how it's done. You have to have a certain legal framework to back you up. You have to have a court system that'll back you up. You have to have an educational system that provides ideas that conform to what you're trying to change. You have to develop scholars...for other people to read to give them new ideas and change their view of how the world works. (Interview)

Barbara addressed the challenge of bringing new faculty into academic departments. She recommended that the pressure to change needs to come from multiple sources of leadership.

> When you talked about faculty then you were stepping on departmental toes and to this day [there] is very little outside input on making faculty choices and... to increase the number of women faculty there you have to reach the president of the university, the corporation, the board, the advisors, all of those people who change the environment. Once every dean is told by the president "either you get more women and minorities on your faculty or your budget changes with what comes out of my office" then you begin to get change. And as always, you get a couple of really gifted men who see the future and march. So it's a combination of institutional and personal issues. (Interview)

Again, in this example one may recognize the strength of financial backing and communication links to those in positions of power. The support of key leaders who express their commitment through financial backing is a powerful tool for change agents. Those leaders were willing to "change the environment" while the political opportunity structures were sending out favorable signals (Meyer, 2000). History taught these women that circumstances evolve and revolve. Thus the women could not ignore the competing power of social context which tends to spiral over time.

The Spiral of History

A third theme of change that emerged from the data was the notion that history repeats itself. There was a common understanding shared by the women that while circumstances can and do change there is always a chance for regression. The women

stressed that we must know our history for fear of repeating it. Evelyn suggested that progression and regression are common to the cycle of movements.

> I mean, each of us has to look at who went before us because we really all continue. It's not ever going to be different, I don't truly believe. I truly believe that if you study women's history...you discover you have a round of women's advancement and then you have a dropping back with a little bit of progress, and then you have a round of exercising, of everybody exercising their voices and trying to get a movement going and then the next generation is bored or thinks it's overplayed or dramatic and then you sort of slip back and then it sort of has to be rediscovered. So each generation's going to have to rediscover it for themselves. (Interview)

When it was suggested that the historical progression is like a spiral (Kim, 1995), Evelyn responded, "If you think about a spiral it's different from a circle because each time it goes around it's in a slightly different place and we have to hope that the spiral is actually on end so that it's reaching upward...and not just a spiral that meets itself coming and going in a circle" (Interview).

Tina cautioned several times that "you must know your history." She remembered how the feminist movement she and others were involved in was not the first attempt to push for women's equality in the United States.

> Those of us who know our history know that the first wave of feminism was a sub-group movement [and] was forgotten. Partly because people chose to forget it. Partly those who wrote the history books chose not to include it. But it was forgotten so as a result we had to do it all over again. And that is what I fear, that in the forgetting,

with the generation now coming up will be unprepared for any loss of privilege or reintroduction of discrimination should it come to pass and it could. (Interview)

She explained how conditions in the country during the Depression changed and Congress along with the president changed rules and policy "all because of a terrible crisis that was bigger than everybody." She further cautioned, "That could in a pinch happen again. I tend to think not. But other things could happen. The right wing might conceive of a strategy that the younger generation is unprepared for." Tina reasoned a final analysis, "But we can't dictate how the next generation is going to define its feminism or its politics, all we can do is stand as audience and worry about what may come. Because we've seen it before." But as Barbara stated, "We're never going to go back to zero on women"(Interview).

Reflection on Efforts to Promote Change

The founding committee members worked both as a group and individually for change in the social context of the modern feminist movement. They worked as change agents to increase the number and status of women in higher education. With the support of an already changing infrastructure, they focused on several strategies for change. They keyed in on the push for placement to help increase the represented number of women, they pursued funding, participated in consciousness raising activities, and initiated fiscal training and administrative skills development seminars. Although their efforts to promote change had multiple impacts, the gender gap persists.

The women reflected on their involvement in the change process and the current status of women. Marilyn argued that, "Essentially, when you look at is a historian now, not a sociologist, you see that it evolved at a particular cultural time and place and it is culturally biased and culturally constructed." Her comments indicated that the social context has

changed over time. "Are people going to continue to be prejudiced? Sure. But that's no longer the reiterated norm." Marilyn pointedly concluded, "You want to change people's hearts, well then you have to go in the ministry. Maybe you can do it. But if you want to understand how institutions change, that's how they change. They change the context."

Tina elaborated on the current social context for women. She expressed concern over a lack of involvement from the younger generation.

> I don't think N.O.W (National Organization for Women) any longer has the staff or the political caucus...I don't have the staff....We're missing the money. That's because people are not paying membership dues, they're not joining. The younger generation isn't volunteering and we are at risk. Of course we worry and I have my own theories as to why the alienation. I think it's partly the backlash, the media. I think a lot of it has to do with fear of lesbianism. And we could not and were not willing and still would not be willing to separate ourselves from lesbians...and I think we all knew when we embraced the lesbian cause that was going to hurt. (Interview)

Tina understood that although she followed the footsteps of her mother, who marched for birth control rights for her own generation, not all women would do the same. Not only had the social context changed but the expectations and responsiveness of each generation with it.

Following up on her earlier comments on the equality of condition, Cheryl contemplated, "There is a glass ceiling. There's no question about it. And why do some people get through it and other people don't?" Barbara offered the opinion that, "Clearly more women have survived and more women are in universities and more women are doing well but men are also having a hard time because tenured slots are not growing. I still believe

that by and large, when the chips are down, the man gets the job – unless the woman is a genius." She continued,

> It depends on the day you call me. Sometimes I could say, you know, we put in all of this work and what have we got. But on another day, I look at Harrison, which was really awful. [Now] the president's legal council is a woman. We've got women on the corporation [and the board]. I'm not pleased with the number of women who are full professors but there are certainly a lot more than there were 20 years ago. Now, as I said, when the chips are down, the guy gets the job. But you have an environment in which at least women have a fighting chance. (Interview)

There are more models of female professionals for future generations to emulate. Barbara noted, "It changes from very early childhood on, one's perception of what a professional is, so that kids no longer say, 'Oh, a woman doctor.' That's just what women do as well as men" (Interview).

Marilyn believed that still more women need to be in leadership positions. "In the case of women, it was extremely important that there be a woman [at the top] who opened opportunities or at least looking at different kinds of candidates." She made it clear, "That is how you bring change to an institution, by placing women and make room for them by having women in positions of power make decisions about policy, about who to hire and all that sort of thing" (Interview).

The women are still active and concerned with the status of women in higher education. They continue to educate others and take the opportunity for consciousness raising. They are aware of the social context, the processes of change, the importance of communication linkages and multiple strategies that enhance efforts to promote change. They

are aware of their roles as change agents in that process. They served as models for how change is possible at what Tina called, "the intersection of the women's movement and campus."

CHAPTER VII

Conclusion

This study was designed to explore answers on how to bring about organizational change through the example of efforts to balance gender representation in higher education leadership. The case study asked the questions: Why does the gender gap in higher education leadership persist? And how does one bring about organizational change? The cross-case analysis sought answers to these research questions through the perspective of five women who sponsored the advancement of women in leadership together and individually over the past 30 years.

A review of the literature on organizational change suggested that one must understand organizational culture and how it is driven by embedded mechanisms of cultural norms (Schein, 1992). Change is brought about when roles and behaviors change and in turn elicit new cultural norms within the organization (Yukl, 1998). Theories of social change established that initiators act as change agents in the process. They seek out innovations and communicate new ideas to others. They are supported by a social context that suggests the environment is ready for the change (Degenne & Forsé, 1999; Harris, 1993; Meyer, 2000).

In the case of the status of women in higher education in the early 1970s the social context was primed, change agents initiated efforts to advance women, and new cultural norms were introduced to institutions across the United States. The women referred to a kind of spirit in the air as their institutions moved to co-education and they were put into positions of leadership. They met as a group and formed the Committee for the Advancement of Women. "Certain conditions improve the possibilities for greater degrees of egalitarian participation in organizing. These include small size, common goals (including the goal of

equal participation), relatively equal knowledge and experience, individual members who are flexible and noncompetitive and a benign organizational environment that supports participatory practices" (Ferree & Martin, 1995, p. 141). Based on the comments by the members, the committee seemed to have possessed all of these characteristics. Initially they met to support one another but decided to work together to increase the numbers of women in positions at universities around New England. Much of their efforts to promote change involved fiscal training, consciousness raising, and mentoring.

The gender gap persists despite legislation for equal opportunity, changes in curriculum, and programs like the ones initiated by the committee to identify, train and promote women to executive levels. A director who led an administrative training program that was created by the committee commented, "We learned once more that institutions and the attitudes of the people who shape them respond to social change with glacial speed. We also learned that legislating justice did not guarantee that justice will be done; it merely opened avenues for action which did not exist previously" (Supporting documentation). The barriers of time and culture blocked the changes necessary to close the gap.

The literature suggested that one answer to the gender gap is the increased numbers of women in higher education over time. As more women enter the pipeline, more women will rise to executive positions and thereby influence the cultural change. Kolodny (2000) discussed this idea when she wrote about her many experiences over the years as dean. She highlighted the National Center for Educational Statistics report which concluded that "the higher the rank, the fewer the women" (p. 137). She strongly supported continued training for women "to produce a critical mass of educated women who take leadership" (p. 144). She stated that, "Only when women attain policy-making administrative roles in higher education

will there be substantive changes sensitive to women's concerns" (p. 130). Once women acquire leadership positions in greater number they will better be able to continue to act as agents of change.

Although the number of women in higher education on the whole has shown gains "...an increased flow of people through the lower reaches of the institutions does not nourish it in the upper regions" (Spurling, 1997, p. 38). "A profound cultural change will need to take place if the pattern is not to be repeated. It is different kinds of people...that change cultures. More kinds of people are entering higher education but the culture will only change if they stay and move to positions of professional power and influence" (Spurling, 1997, p. 37). Women have to move strategically to get to positions of power that in turn allows them to pull others up as well. The challenge remains for the women currently on the rise to widen the path. Pawney (1997) elaborated that "upward mobility requires an appropriate springboard and a major obstacle is getting to the appropriate position from which it is reasonable to apply for a senior post" (p. 54).

Accordingly, the current numbers of representation are just not yet in great enough proportion to men within administrative university populations to have the necessary influence to continue to shift the paradigm (Bain & Cummings, 2000; Chliwniak, 1997; Hawkins, 1994). This paradigm shift is essential for the organizational change needed to balance representation to close the leadership gap.

The balanced representation of women in higher education administration will continue to be a challenge for the higher education organization in pursuit of cultural change. However, the steady rise of the percentages of women over the past 30 years shows that the efforts have not been fruitless and it is a challenge that can be met with optimism. "After all,

women in large numbers have only come to the academy in recent decades. They are increasingly prevalent in first-degree programs, in graduate schools, and in the lower ranks of academia. Thus, surely many women will move up" (Bain & Cummings, 2000, p. 512).

The women in this study, however, suggested that the gender gap persists for reasons beyond just the numbers of women "in the system" or in positions of leadership. They mentioned a lack of equality of condition for women in academe and a model of professional development that is antiquated. Kaplan and Helly (1984) supported the view of the women. "Despite such real and measurable advances, the different way in which women and men continue to be socialized and the difference in their access to power and wealth still create differences in their perceptions of the world" (p. 68). These perceptions then continue to perpetuate the embedded mechanisms and embedded masculinity that are driving the organizational culture. "A paradigm shift is required therefore, away from the description of gender roles and achievement toward the processes by which females systematically maintain and modify their perceptions of their abilities, opportunities, and choices over the life span" (Washburn, 1994, p. 145). Many women experience a double bind. They may feel a pressure to choose between career and family. They may question what level of success they can achieve with either if they want to have both. In catch-22 fashion, the perpetuation of traditional lifestyle choices in turn hinders the advancement needed to feed the growth toward the "critical mass;" this in turn hinders more alternative models of professional development.

In the meantime, women are encouraged to continue their efforts but with a heightened awareness of the organizational culture in which they are navigating. Leaders in higher education need to communicate women's career accomplishments to the remainder of

the university community, not just to the new generations of women, in order to contribute to new "stories, heroes, symbols, and rituals" (Masland, 2000, p. 147) that build and strengthen the organizational culture. "Armed with realistic expectations, women are less likely to personalize the pressures they encounter and simultaneously more likely to implement self-directed, career-enhancing strategies which are tailored to the situation" (Pistole & Cogdal, 1993, p. 5). Therefore, efforts toward consciousness raising are still held important.

The women of the committee expressed both concern and optimism for the future. They expressed the value in understanding history and the cycle of change. Their concern for the lack of consciousness raising in the current generation of women is not uncommon. Chamberlain (1988) also expressed concern. "Women students...appear to take equality for granted and do not appear to be aware of the many forms of subtle discrimination that are still ongoing in the classroom, in departmental practices, and in the campus at large" (p. 367). Astin and Leland (1991) interviewed several women leaders and change agents and found that, "Respondents indicated some uneasiness about the new generation of professional women not now associated with the women's movement and their seeming lack of a feminist identity in the face of needed momentum for the movement" (p. 149). An interviewee in their study expressed concern over the graying of the women's movement and commented on a communication and legacy gap between the generations where the "young women are the beneficiaries but they take a lot for granted" (p.149). Another respondent in the study who happened to also be an historian commented that those feelings are typical with all reform movements because later generations feel entitled to certain opportunities not enjoyed in earlier years. These comments are similar to those the women offered on the spiral of history.

The Spiral of Change

The theories of organizational and social change flow in parallel with a certain lifecycle: birth, growth and decline. Therefore, it may be more beneficial to integrate the theories when exploring the process of organizational change. When combined with Kim's (1995) spiral of adaptation, the integration of theories reinforces the notion of a cyclical advancement of innovation. Rather than an innovation coming to a halt after decline, one notes a regeneration of it in a new social context. Thus, an idea or cause spirals through the following: innovation, progression, regression and regeneration. The persistence of the gender gap may be explained as the period between regression and regeneration while the innovation spirals back around. During this period one expects slow adoption by the laggards and a hiatus before the next innovation cycle that develops in a new social context. The further closing of the gender gap in higher education leadership then rests in the efforts of what some refer to as the third wave of the women's movement.

The integration of theories in this spiral of change provides a conceptual framework through which to view the problem of the lack of women in higher education leadership. One finds that while the innovation, in this case gender equality, has flowed through innovation and progression it remains hard to discern just how far it has been diffused within the second wave of the spiral. The change agents, fundamental in introducing the innovation, have already moved on to what lies on the horizon while the late adopters and laggards are focused on conservation of the innovation. There are multiple constituencies and communication linkages both inside and outside of the spiral of change that push the innovation onward. The literature and discussions with the women indicate the possibility that the innovators and early adopters moved on to new battles while the late majority and the laggards were still

adjusting and bringing up the rear. For this reason the participants stressed the continued role of education and consciousness raising. Ferree and Martin (1995) acknowledged such activities as well.

> Movements are not institutions, but to survive beyond the initial burst of spontaneity they must take on many of the characteristics of institutions. This means not just forming organizations but recruiting new participants and training them to work effectively in movement groups. Older members must socialize newer members into the history and culture of the movement to provide any kind of continuity...constant recruitment of new participants is necessary to replace those who burn out; these new members have to be socialized into the culture and history of the existing movement, or their energy will be dissipated or they will change it into something...(p. 403-404)

Because the social context changed over time those currently in the back curve of the spiral lack the momentum and push from the outside that women benefited from in the dawn of the second wave of the feminist movement. Therefore they are equally challenged, if not more so, into adopting the innovation as they also face its regression in the spiral.

> Encapsulation is what happens when all or part of a movement loses its missionary impulse, when activity is directed inward rather than outward, and movement boundaries lose their fluidity to the point that they become barriers to new participants. Joining a new movement is like joining a street party: everyone's welcome; if you don't like what's happening, then you do your own thing. Joining a mature movement, particularly one that's encapsulating, is more like rushing a sorority: you have to qualify, and the implicit, unspoken criteria are that you look, act, and think like those already there. (Ferree & Martin, 1995, p. 405)

The late joining members are entering at a different time and therefore a different social context from that of the initiators. Most likely, at the same time new change agents exploring new innovations are "appearing on the scene." They spiral around and push for a new social context. It is as if there never is an actual stopping point, rather the movement changes in parallel to the changing social context.

Meyer (2000) implied that movements do not decline in ways one would expect. They decline in essence because they have succeeded in their goals and have somehow changed the context. Ferree and Martin (1995) agreed.

> Defining the meaning of success for a movement organization is important. Some groups have gone out of existence or modified their structure and goals so much that they have become unrecognizable as movement organizations. Even those that "self-destruct" may be effective, however, if they leave behind a substantive policy impact, cadres of experienced activists, and belief systems and models of collective action that can be utilized by succeeding generations of movement participants. (p. 128)

Initiates who are interested in the innovation follow the efforts of the preceding organizations. They pick-up what those who went before left behind and continue through the spiral of change.

Implications for Leadership and Organizational Change

The cross-case analysis of the efforts for change in higher education corroborates theories of organizational change. The case study not only reinforces theories commonly used but also offers an in-depth look at efforts and perceptions of those experienced in the process of change as it relates to higher education. The case study attempted to mesh theory with practice in order to offer a better understanding for those interested in the process of

change and those interested in working towards advancing women in higher education. While much of the literature explores theory and practice for one or the other, there is little emphasis on combining both.

Further research in the area of leadership and organizational change in higher education is needed. The social context will continue to change and with it organizational culture will evolve and revolve. Leadership will constantly be challenged to anticipate and respond to the needs of students, faculty and staff of their institutions. These needs are in a constant state of flux as they interplay with the social context. In particular, research in the area of women in leadership would be beneficial as more women advance into executive positions.

A passive awareness for the implications of leadership, organizational change and women in leadership is insufficient to balance the gender gap. As the interviews with the participants suggested, administrators should continue to:

- offer and support fiscal and administrative training for women in the ranks
- seek financial backing (incorporate the agenda of others to further your own)
- initiate mentoring relationships; use female/male networking opportunities with those in positions of power
- take or make opportunities for consciousness raising, keeping in mind the factors that hinder professional development and the lack of equality of condition
- support implementation of multiple strategies for multiple impacts; avoid territorialism and recognize interplay of strategies
- establish and maintain communication linkages within and outside organizations and institutions; recognize personal role as inside/outside communicator to further goals

These efforts may help administrators not only minimize the gender gap at their institutions but may also be tailored to help them advance related personal and institutional goals. Administrators should be attentive to the career tracks of women. Women should continue to question their career choices and their own model of professional development. Men and women should be cognizant of supporting the advancement of others by pushing against glass walls of male dominated disciplines not just glass ceilings of rank. Finally, Marilyn's mentor would offer future administrators this advice: "Develop a thick skin. Only fight winning battles. Concede graciously if you do not win, this gives you quid pro quo from the opposition later" (Interview).

A review of the literature showed that in order for equal representation in executive positions to occur, further attention should go to placing women in positions of power. The importance lies in that they may be change agents and model a new context to women and men within the ranks of education. The pursuit of balanced representation of women in higher education leadership battles against the barriers of time and culture. Greater numbers of women in executive positions model to the community and future generations the possibilities of leadership and career achievement for all.

Additional questions for further study include: What do women currently in the ranks of higher education perceive the status of women to be, now and in the future? Do current department chairs and deans who are women perceive different answers to the questions of the persistence of the gender gap and ways to bring about change than those given by the women of this study? What methods do current organizations use that succeed in advancing women who balance career and family? Which institutions have a high percentage of full-

time tenured female faculty and what, if any, are their common characteristics? Is communication technology helping women with children advance in ways not before possible?

Finally, an interesting study would be the role that chance plays in the career paths of women. Almost all of the women of this case study used some expression of luck, fortune, or named serendipity as a lurking factor in their paths. They expressed the advantage of having good parents, the fortunate turn of seemingly unfortunate events, and the luck of being at the right place at the right time. "Some of it was simply serendipitous," exclaimed one woman. Another concluded in reflection of the opportunities that came her way, "Always luck. I would put that at the end."

References

AGB: Assocation of Governing Boards. Composition of governing boards. Washington, DC: AGB, 2001. Available: http://www.agb.org/zrc6.cfm#8

Apter, T. (1994). Working women don't have wives: Professional success in the 1990s. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Astin, H.S. & Leland, C. (1991). Women of influence, women of vision: A cross-generational study of leaders and social change. San Francisco: CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bain, O. & Cummings, W. (2000). Academe's glass ceiling: Societal, professional-organizational, and institutional barriers to the advancement of academic women. Comparative Education Review, 44 (4) 493-514.

Beckhard, R. & Pritchard, W. (1992). Changing the essence: The art of creating and leading fundamental change in organizations. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Bernstein, A. (1984). Foundation support for administrative advancement: A mixed record. In A. Tinsley, C. Secor, & S. Kaplan (Eds.), Women in higher education administration. New directions for higher education, No. 45 (pp. 77-84). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bierema, L. L. (Ed.). (1998). Women's career development across the lifespan: Insights and strategies for women, organizations, and adult educators. New directions for adult and continuing education, No. 80. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1997). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bolton, M. K. (2000). The third shift: Managing hard choices in our careers, homes, and lives as women. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cameron, K.S. & Whetten, D.A. (1984). Models of organizational life cycle: Applications to higher education. In J.L. Bess (Ed.), College and university organization: Insights from the behavioral sciences (pp. 31-61). New York: New York University Press.

Chamberlain, M. K. (Ed.) (1988). Women in academe: Progress and prospects. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Chliwniak, L. (1997). Higher education leadership: Analyzing the gender gap. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 25, 4. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Degenne, A. & Forsé, M. (1999). Introducing social networks. (A. Borges, Trans.). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications. (Original work published 1994).

Downs, A. (1967). Inside bureaucracy. Boston: Little, Brown, & Company.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) (1994). Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Eggins, H. (Ed.). (1997). Women as leaders and managers in higher education. Great Britain: SRHE and Open University Press.

Feree, M. M. & Martin, P. Y. (Eds.). (1995). Feminist organizations: Harvest of the new women's movement. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Gall, M. D. , Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). Educational research: An introduction (6th ed.). New York: Longman Publishers.

Hahn, R. (1996). Demystifying the presidency. In J. B. McLaughlin (Ed.), Leadership transitions: The new college president. New directions for higher education, No. 93 (pp. 71 - 84). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Harris, T. E. (1993). Applied organizational communication: Perspectives, principles, and pragmatics. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hawkins, K. (1994). Anaylzing the pure case: Women's narratives of academic life. Women Studies in Communication, 17 (1) 1-25.

Jablonski, M. (1996). The leadership challenge for women college presidents. Initiatives, 57 (4), 1-10.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic.

Kanter, R. M. (1980). A tale of "O": On being different in an organization. New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Kanter, R. M., Stein, B. A., & Jick, T.D. (1992). The challenge of organizational change: How companies experience and leaders guide it. New York: The Free Press.

Kaplan, S. & Helly, D. O. (1984). An agenda for senior women administrators. In A. Tinsley, C. Secor, & S. Kaplan (Eds.), Women in higher education administration. New directions for higher education, No. 45 (pp. 67-75). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kim, Y. Y. (1995). Cross-cultural adaptation: An integrative theory. In R. L. Wiseman (Ed.), Intercultural communication theory (pp. 170 – 193). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kolodny, A. (2000). Women and higher education in the twenty-first century: Some feminist and global perspectives. NWSA Journal, 12 (2) 130-147.

Kondonassis, A. J. (2000). Class notes: World Economic Development.

Kuh, G. D. & Whitt, E. J. (2000). Culture in American colleges and universities. In M.C. Brown (Ed.), Organizational governance in higher education (5th ed.) (pp. 160-169). ASHE Reader Series. Boston, MA: Pearson Customs Publishing.

Lively, K. (2000). Women in charge. Chronicle of Higher Education, 44 (41). Available: http://chronicle.com/free/v46/i41a03301.htm

Martin, J. R. (2000). Coming of age in academe: Rekindling women's hopes and reforming the academy. New York, NY: Routledge.

Masland, A. T. (2000). Organizational culture in the study of higher education. In M.C. Brown (Ed.), Organizational governance in higher education (5th ed.) (pp. 145-152). ASHE Reader Series. Boston, MA: Pearson Customs Publishing.

Merriam, S. (1998). Qualitative research and case study applications in education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Meyer, D. S. (2000). Social movements: Creating communities of change. In R. L. Teske & M. A. Tétreault (Eds.), Conscious acts and the politics of social change (pp. 35-55). University of South Carolina Press.

Milley, J. E. (1991). Women are used to asking: Women presidents as fund raisers. In J. A. Sturnick, J. E. Milley, & C. A. Tisinger (Eds.), Women at the helm: Pathfinding presidents at state colleges and universities (pp. 30-35). Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Pawney, J. (1997). On becoming and being a manager in education. In H. Eggins (Ed.), Women as leaders and managers in higher education (pp. 49-62). Great Britain: SRHE and Open University Press.

Peshkin, A. (2000). The nature of interpretation in qualitative research. Educational Researcher, 29 (9) 5-9.

Peterson, M. W. & Spencer, M.G. (2000). Understanding academic culture and climate. In M.C. Brown (Ed.), Organizational governance in higher education (5th ed.) (pp. 170-181). ASHE Reader Series. Boston, MA: Pearson Customs Publishing.

Pistole, M. C. & Cogdal, P. A. (1993). Empowering women: Taking charge of our university careers. Initiatives, 55(4) 1-8.

Powell, G. N. (Ed.). (1999). Handbook of gender and work. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ragins, B. R. (1999). Gender and mentoring relationships: A review of research agenda for the next decade. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), Handbook of gender and work (pp. 347-370). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Robbins, S. P. (1987). Organization theory: Structure, design, and applications. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Scanlon, K. C. (1997). Mentoring women administrators: Breaking through the glass ceiling. Initiatives, 58 (2) 39-59.

Schein, E. (1992). Organizational culture and leadership (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Spurling, A: (1997). Women and change in higher education. In H. Eggins (Ed.), Women as leaders and managers in higher education (pp. 37-48). Great Britain: SRHE and Open University Press.

Tesch, R. (1994). The contribution of a qualitative method: Phenomenological research. In M. Langenbach, C. Vaughn, & L. Aagaard, An introduction to educational research (pp. 143-154). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Touchton, J. G. (1995). Women presidents in U.S. colleges and universities: A 1995 higher education update. Office of Women in Higher Education. American Council on Education: Washington, DC.

Walton, K. D. (Ed.). (1996). Against the tide: Career paths of women leaders in American and British higher education. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Walton, K. D. & McDade, S. A. (2001). At the top of the faculty: Women as CAOs. In J. Nidiffer & C.T. Bashaw (Eds.), Women administrators in higher education: historical and contemporary perspectives (pp. 85-99). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Washburn, C. A. (1994). Gender-role development: A pathway to understanding female achievement. In J. Gallivan, S.D. Crozier, & V.M. Lalande (Eds.), Women, girls and achievement (pp. 144-158). Ontario, Canada: Captus University Publishers.

Yin, R. K. (1994). Case study research: Design and methods (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Yukl, G. (1998). Leadership in organizations (4th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Zeldin, A.L. & Pajares, F. (2000). Against the odds: Self-efficacy beliefs of women in mathematics, scientific, and technological careers. American Educational Research Journal, 37 (1) 215-246.

Masked References for Supporting Documentation

Barbara. (2001). Article on personal achievement at Harrison.

Cheryl. (1975). Text on women in the workforce.

Cheryl. (2001). Web sites on foundation activities.

Evelyn. (1974). Text on women in higher education.

Marilyn. (1984). Text based on doctoral dissertation.

Marilyn. (1987). Text on professional development of women.

Marilyn. (2000). Article on women advancing in science profession.

Outside Participants. (2001). Personal interviews at New York feminist gathering.

The Committee. (1973). Article on first New England training program.

The Committee. (1978). Article on establishment, funding, and efforts of the group.

The Committee. (1978). Article on establishment of group.

The Committee. (1972-1973). Original documents from first year efforts of referral service.

Tina. (1997). Text on feminist movement.

Tina. (2000). Text on women's movement founders in higher education.

Tina. (2001). Personal web site.

Appendix A

Interview Guiding Questions

1. What influenced your decision to join the Committee for the Advancement of Women?
2. What were your impressions of the first meeting...impressions one year later?
3. What was your role?
4. What were your expectations of outcomes for the organization's efforts?
5. Have the outcomes been consistent with the expectations you had at the time?
6. What are your perceptions of the impact the Committee has had on the advancement of women in higher education leadership?
7. What is your understanding of how organizational or institutional change happens?
8. What suggestions can you offer for current and future programs that have similar goals? What, if anything, would you have done differently?

APPENDIX B

Cases

Case	Birthplace	Education	Status	Career Track
Barbara	Massachusetts Ca. 1930s	B. S., Richards University M. S., University of New England Ph.D., Harrison University	Married (widowed) Two daughters	Harrison: Research Assistant Undergraduate Advisor Dean Lecturer - Sociology & Public Policy
Cheryl	Illinois 1941	B. A., Richards University Ph.D., Oakland University, U.K.	Married Two daughters, one son	Tillman - Associate Dean & Dean Providence - Dean of Students Hillstead - President Private Foundation - Director Private Foundation – Director (current)
Evanston	Maryland 1925	B.A. Gordon College Ph.D., Yates University	Married Two daughters, one niece	Richards - Assistant Dean/instructor Milton - Assistant Dean of Students Lowell Smith - Provost & Dean Baker - Provost & Dean of Faculty Bantam - President Various Southwest Institutions - Provost Gerontology Program - Instructor Private Institute – Director (current)
Marilyn	New York 1931	B. A., Davis College Ph.D., Providence University	Married One daughter, one son	Hillstead: (retired) House Master & Professor of History Academic administration
Tonja	New York 1935	B. A., Richards University M.A., Carlisle University M.Phil., Carlisle University Ph.D., Honorary (various)	Married (2) No children	Journalist – Germany Various colleges - Lecturer, History Callahan - Academic Administrator Williams - Assisant Provost Various Southwest Institutions - Lecturer Independent agent – Author & Lecturer