This paper examines the historical perspective of women in higher education, the problems facing women moving into leadership roles, the impact of Title IX on women, and finally the implications of these factors on women's ability to advance in higher education. The paper begins by examining the effect of affirmative action on women's progress, focusing particularly on their advancement to top administrative positions in higher education, and looking for the root of these problems in differences in leadership styles between females and males; disparities in access to professional development, in opportunities for publication and advanced degrees, and in salary. In reviewing the effects of Title IX, the 1972 federal civil rights law that prohibits sex discrimination in education programs, on women's athletic programs, the paper finds positive and negative effects: women have benefited from more athletic participation opportunities and more equitable facilities, but a major area of concern involves equality of salaries. A final section of the paper reviews the role that mentors play in women's career development. The paper also offers work shadowing and a sense of humor as factors that can help women advance in their careers. (Contains 30 references.) (CH)
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INTRODUCTION

The higher education system continues to be unfair to women even after 50 years of freedom. It has been established throughout history in the entire world that women have not only a limited role in society, but also restricted opportunities. This discrimination against women extends to all aspects of life (Nelson in Women in Development, 1998). Many researchers feel that higher education needs to be reoriented to increase women’s access to traditionally male-dominated courses (Varghese in Higher Education, 1997). This, in turn, will equip them better to move into leadership roles.

Initially, the historical perspective of women and their advancement will be examined. Next, problems prohibiting women from moving into leadership roles will be addressed. Effects of Title IX and its impact on women in non-traditional roles in higher education will be reviewed. In conclusion, implications for advancement of women in higher education will be offered.

THE PATH OF PROGRESS

Research on affirmative action in the public sector has shown that women have made some progress in government employment (Critzer and Rae, 1998). Still, they continue to work primarily in clerical positions (Huckle, & Karnig, Welch, & Eribes in Critzer and Rai, 1998) and are unlikely to move into top administrative positions (Saint-Germair, in Critzer and Rai, 1998). This is certainly the case as the data is examined on women in higher education. Only 16% of college and university women are presidents, only 13% of chief business officers are women, and
only 25% of chief academic officers are women. Yet, women comprise more than 52% of the current student body (Chliwniak, 1997).

These disparities exist in other areas of higher education as well. Women are also excluded from administrative positions within athletics. Women head only 21% of college women's athletic programs and fill only 33% of all administrative jobs in women's programs (Women Still, 1995). Very little progress has occurred in the past 25 years. In 1972, more than nine out of ten women's sports' programs had female head administrators. By 1998, four of five (80.6%) were headed by men, which is a decrease from 81.5% in 1996 (Carpenter in Cook, 1998c). The number of jobs is increasing; however, women need to get a larger share of them. In the past two years there were 667 new head coaching jobs for women's sports but most went to men (Carpenter in Cook, 1998c).

In order to explain this discrepancy, some researchers point to educational differences. Education is one of the most important issues to be discussed in defining the roles of women in development. Women who have increased education are more aware of opportunities available to them. They are more self-confident, open-minded, and more competitive (Curtin in Critzer and Rai, 1998). However, women are under-represented significantly in higher level courses. Giri (cited in Higher education, 1997) found that while women represent 50% of the population, they comprise only 34% of graduate and post-graduate studies and 26.6% of diploma and certification courses. This disparity can be one of the many hard facts as to why women in higher education have such difficulty moving into non-traditional roles.

Schwartz (1997) explains that success stories of women in higher education have not been told or examined on a consistent and regular basis. Information that is available is often limited or inaccurate. Lee (1998) examined research on leadership in an 800-page book that claimed in
1981 to include “all the published evidence” on leadership. Chapter 30, “Women and Leadership,” summarized research studies done in the 1970’s. Lee (1998) provided some excerpts:

“Women are seen as poor prospects for managerial positions for a number of reasons... The factors include: (1) women lack career orientation; (2) women lack leadership potential; (3) women are undependable, and (4) women are emotionally less stable.” (1971, p. 1).

“The female role stereotype that emerged found the woman to be less aggressive, more dependent and more emotional. The stereotypical female leader...was excitable in minor crises, passive, not competitive, illogical, home-oriented, unskilled in business, sneaky, and unfamiliar with the ways of the world” (1972, p. 1).

“Women’s self-confidence is increased with the incorporation of more of the stereotyped masculine traits into their own self-concept” (Lee, 1998, p. 1).

Only by analyzing women in development can researchers hope to dispel these frequently perceived misconceptions. The authors of this paper will examine the problem facing women in leadership roles in higher education, the establishment of Title IX and the implications for women in higher education today. For as Gloria Randle Scott, president of Bennett College North Carolina was quoted, “It is women who will make the changes that will be made in higher education and the world” (Green, 1998b, p. 1).

THE PROBLEM IN PERSPECTIVE

As one attempts to get the problem defined as to why women have such a difficult time entering leadership roles in higher education, one must examine women’s role in education. Irby and Brown (1997) found that women who wanted to teach, historically, faced the same struggle as women who wanted to vote and those today who desire a leadership position in education.
The struggle, they feel, is based on the fact that male models for leadership dominate. Desjardins, Acker, Gutek, and others (cited in Chilwniak, 1997) also identified the problematic issue as male norms being used as the standard for behavior in leadership positions. Much research on women in non-traditional higher education roles focuses on the vast difference in leadership styles of women and men. As Hovis (cited in Cook, 1998a) stated clearly, “Gender expectations clearly influence leadership styles” (p. 8).

**Differences in Leadership Style**

Gender is a factor that only recently has been taken into account in studies of leadership. Earlier researchers sought to understand leadership by focusing their investigations on the characteristics of the leader, and since these leaders were almost exclusively of one gender, the notion of gender as an important variable in leadership was not raised (Middlehurst, 1997). Many believe that by closing the leadership gap, institutions would become more centered on process and persons (described as feminine concerns) rather than focused on tasks and outcomes (attributed to masculine styles of leadership) (Chlwniak, 1997).

Many psychologists explain that women are more nurturing and better at sharing than men are. Men bond together in ways which make them feel more powerful, and one way of achieving that is by excluding other people (Irby and Brown, 1997). Helgisen (cited in Chilwniak, 1997) related these to leadership as she concluded that women leaders place more emphasis on relationships, sharing and process, while males focus on completing tasks, achieving goals, hoarding information and winning. Ultimately, she states that while men are more concerned with systems and rules, women are more concerned with relations and atmosphere. Male leadership styles often follow traditional patterns:

1) Men define situations and decisions as win-lose.
2) Men work at a relentless pace without breaks.

3) Men perceive work as life's highest priority and strongly identify themselves with their work.

4) Men prefer live action and have little time for reflection.

5) Men generally have difficulty sharing information (Sturnick in Green, 1998b)

   Women’s leadership styles are often in stark contrast:

1) Women bring their emotions to work and are caring and helping in general.

2) Women share information and set aside time for sharing and connecting.

3) Women take time for reflection, asking why is this working and how can we change?

4) Women work via inclusion, consensus building and a collaborative structure.

5) Women have long-term focus with a social vision (Sturnick in Green, 1998b, p. 1).

Hovis (cited in Cook, 1998a) found in her study of eight college and university CEO’s that the most successful women presidents capitalized on the strengths most people expect in a woman, instead of trying to act like a man. Men are often more confident of their own abilities and less likely to invest time in gathering opinions from others. Women are generally better at gaining consensus before they act. Strong women leaders gather input from as many people as possible while staying responsible for the final decision. Women presidents who keep their jobs longest and draw highest praise at their institutions take a collaborative approach to decisions large and small. There’s a close fit between their self-image as women, their actual behavior, and the expectations of those around them (Hovis in Cook, 1998a).

Brunner (1997) suggests that women need to develop the ability to remain “feminine” in the ways they communicate and at the same time be heard in a masculized culture. Sturnick (cited in Green 1998b) states it best when she says, “Women know how to develop collaborative
leadership models, build bases of support, develop networks and create long-lasting change” (p. 1).

Sturnick (cited in Green, 1998b) readily admits potential challenges women in higher education face. Women must overcome stereotyped accusations. They as a group are held to higher performance standards and must learn the rules of the game with less help and less access to and support from insiders. Sturnick found that women presidents last an average of 2.2 years less than their male counterparts and are less likely to go on to another presidency (Sturnick in Green, 1998b). She provides research to support the fact that differences in leadership styles account for a part of the reason there are fewer women in non-traditional roles in higher education.

These differences provide a good summary of the diversity between men and women in their leadership styles. Much of the data focuses on these differences as researchers attempt to explain the discrepancy in numbers that exists. Other researchers elude to issues they feel cause problems for women attempting to move into leadership roles in higher education.

OTHER ISSUES

Access to Professional Development

One of the other major issues that arises when explaining existing disparity is the fact that women have a more difficult time moving up the career ladder because of less access to professional development (Sturnick in Green, 1998b). Other reasons proposed include lack of equity in measurement of faculty productivity (Creamer, 1998) and the difficulty women have in earning a doctorate (Chrzanowski in Cook, 1998b).
Opportunity for Publication and Advanced Degrees

The gap between men and women faculty publications has narrowed in many fields in the last 20 years (Creamer, 1998). But women are still disproportionately over-represented among the non-publishers. About 43% of women compared to 23% of men surveyed reported never having published a journal article (Creamer, 1998). Women faculty are also under-represented among the prolific, defined as having published 51 or more articles (Creamer, 1998). These facts effect the number of women who have opportunities to advance in higher education as publications are often used to judge effectiveness and increase rank. Also used for tenure and promotion decisions is the attainment of a doctorate. More women seek doctorates on a part time basis than ever. Women take longer than men do to finish dissertations and more women drop out along the way, often because they’re part-timers for whom schedules conflict, isolation, and feeling devalued create overwhelming problems (Chrzanowski in Cook, 1998b). These conditions have significant implications not only for the role women play in impacting the knowledge in a field, but for their success in the traditional academic reward structure (Creamer, 1998).

Salary Differences

Another discouraging factor for women who have the desire to move into non-traditional positions deals with salaries. Although salaries for campus administrators rose more last year than in the previous 30 years, female salaries still lag behind men’s (Ott, 1998). The College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) surveyed 1515 institutions covering 170 administrative positions in September, 1997, from president to admissions counselors. Women in Higher Education journal selected 54 job titles most likely to be filled by women, plus a few more for comparison. Of the 54 job titles in four different types of schools, only 15 jobs showed women
earning higher median salaries than men, fewer than last year’s 19 jobs and 1995’s 30 jobs (Ott, 1998, p.5).

**Gender Differences in 1997-1998 Administrative Salaries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Doctoral Female</th>
<th>Doctoral Male</th>
<th>Comprehensive Female</th>
<th>Comprehensive Male</th>
<th>Baccalaureate Female</th>
<th>Baccalaureate Male</th>
<th>Two-Year Female</th>
<th>Two-Year Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO single unit</td>
<td>158,760</td>
<td>189,595</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>134,249</td>
<td>124,800</td>
<td>125,066</td>
<td>100,500</td>
<td>104,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst to pres</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>87,775</td>
<td>52,082</td>
<td>70,945</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>41,276</td>
<td>64,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec VP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>99,857</td>
<td>73,779</td>
<td>91,900</td>
<td>80,898</td>
<td>81,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief acad off</td>
<td>151,200</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>95,004</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>85,550</td>
<td>84,900</td>
<td>75,248</td>
<td>74,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst chief acad off</td>
<td>103,500</td>
<td>102,721</td>
<td>72,561</td>
<td>78,224</td>
<td>53,776</td>
<td>63,353</td>
<td>64,261</td>
<td>61,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir library serv</td>
<td>100,912</td>
<td>98,565</td>
<td>60,200</td>
<td>66,932</td>
<td>46,279</td>
<td>50,586</td>
<td>46,871</td>
<td>52,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir instit res</td>
<td>70,760</td>
<td>73,138</td>
<td>49,075</td>
<td>57,411</td>
<td>44,995</td>
<td>54,590</td>
<td>46,870</td>
<td>52,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir learn res ctr</td>
<td>57,077</td>
<td>66,360</td>
<td>40,773</td>
<td>51,582</td>
<td>34,120</td>
<td>38,775</td>
<td>49,703</td>
<td>52,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir sponsored res</td>
<td>71,044</td>
<td>78,250</td>
<td>47,380</td>
<td>62,149</td>
<td>39,794</td>
<td>52,650</td>
<td>53,600</td>
<td>59,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean arts &amp; sci</td>
<td>121,423</td>
<td>123,750</td>
<td>85,148</td>
<td>86,521</td>
<td>72,950</td>
<td>64,927</td>
<td>61,240</td>
<td>59,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, business</td>
<td>136,086</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>81,271</td>
<td>94,302</td>
<td>53,976</td>
<td>61,200</td>
<td>58,845</td>
<td>60,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, communica</td>
<td>129,850</td>
<td>112,175</td>
<td>64,062</td>
<td>82,472</td>
<td>46,833</td>
<td>68,506</td>
<td>50,259</td>
<td>50,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, cont ed</td>
<td>95,847</td>
<td>98,906</td>
<td>69,142</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>53,848</td>
<td>65,150</td>
<td>58,758</td>
<td>64,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, education</td>
<td>111,940</td>
<td>112,374</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>83,400</td>
<td>50,620</td>
<td>57,622</td>
<td>68,476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, health rel</td>
<td>105,656</td>
<td>112,217</td>
<td>86,814</td>
<td>89,471</td>
<td>51,966</td>
<td>58,035</td>
<td>71,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, humanities</td>
<td>103,312</td>
<td>113,333</td>
<td>57,982</td>
<td>68,753</td>
<td>54,075</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>61,022</td>
<td>60,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, sciences</td>
<td>127,296</td>
<td>77,493</td>
<td>81,403</td>
<td>50,426</td>
<td>60,342</td>
<td>60,842</td>
<td>62,131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, soc sci</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>123,116</td>
<td>64,764</td>
<td>73,920</td>
<td>46,501</td>
<td>58,322</td>
<td>50,316</td>
<td>61,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir, contin ed</td>
<td>66,271</td>
<td>77,200</td>
<td>47,300</td>
<td>60,643</td>
<td>40,216</td>
<td>51,855</td>
<td>49,550</td>
<td>54,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief bus off</td>
<td>127,926</td>
<td>132,600</td>
<td>88,400</td>
<td>96,497</td>
<td>74,000</td>
<td>84,251</td>
<td>63,600</td>
<td>75,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief admin off</td>
<td>109,692</td>
<td>124,200</td>
<td>76,427</td>
<td>86,661</td>
<td>71,500</td>
<td>72,500</td>
<td>70,306</td>
<td>71,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief fin off</td>
<td>129,688</td>
<td>107,100</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>78,363</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>55,748</td>
<td>66,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen counsel</td>
<td>100,825</td>
<td>111,300</td>
<td>76,812</td>
<td>78,375</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td>76,320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief pers/HR</td>
<td>84,500</td>
<td>84,500</td>
<td>55,063</td>
<td>61,614</td>
<td>44,976</td>
<td>53,327</td>
<td>50,939</td>
<td>58,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Female 1</td>
<td>Male 1</td>
<td>Female 2</td>
<td>Male 2</td>
<td>Female 3</td>
<td>Male 3</td>
<td>Female 4</td>
<td>Male 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc dir pers/HR</td>
<td>55,755</td>
<td>67,829</td>
<td>40,600</td>
<td>49,226</td>
<td>39,750</td>
<td>51,123</td>
<td>42,961</td>
<td>46,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr benefits</td>
<td>47,385</td>
<td>59,251</td>
<td>34,882</td>
<td>38,898</td>
<td>30,536</td>
<td>43,433</td>
<td>34,882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir AA/EEO</td>
<td>66,826</td>
<td>74,615</td>
<td>52,332</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>54,453</td>
<td>66,421</td>
<td>53,864</td>
<td>55,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comptroller</td>
<td>83,250</td>
<td>85,332</td>
<td>54,302</td>
<td>60,729</td>
<td>45,997</td>
<td>55,782</td>
<td>45,828</td>
<td>56,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgr payroll</td>
<td>46,200</td>
<td>54,503</td>
<td>34,109</td>
<td>38,625</td>
<td>29,123</td>
<td>39,440</td>
<td>34,700</td>
<td>47,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir purchasing</td>
<td>63,655</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>41,550</td>
<td>49,113</td>
<td>34,929</td>
<td>43,012</td>
<td>34,433</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc dir purch</td>
<td>45,979</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>35,024</td>
<td>40,839</td>
<td>27,966</td>
<td>32,868</td>
<td>24,600</td>
<td>40,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir bookstore</td>
<td>50,606</td>
<td>61,470</td>
<td>34,076</td>
<td>44,906</td>
<td>28,455</td>
<td>36,552</td>
<td>32,032</td>
<td>40,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief devel off</td>
<td>103,866</td>
<td>124,139</td>
<td>72,646</td>
<td>89,314</td>
<td>71,184</td>
<td>79,404</td>
<td>54,651</td>
<td>59,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir annual giving</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>39,634</td>
<td>40,091</td>
<td>37,421</td>
<td>41,748</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief PR officer</td>
<td>78,675</td>
<td>99,920</td>
<td>51,500</td>
<td>58,375</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>42,824</td>
<td>48,883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Degree Levels

- **Doctoral**
- **Comprehensive**
- **Baccalaureate**
- **Two-Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Doctoral Female</th>
<th>Doctoral Male</th>
<th>Comprehensive Female</th>
<th>Comprehensive Male</th>
<th>Baccalaureate Female</th>
<th>Baccalaureate Male</th>
<th>Two-Year Female</th>
<th>Two-Year Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dir comm serv</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>61,068</td>
<td>42,887</td>
<td>50,355</td>
<td>33,432</td>
<td>47,700</td>
<td>45,421</td>
<td>52,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir publications</td>
<td>53,312</td>
<td>56,323</td>
<td>40,360</td>
<td>42,285</td>
<td>35,422</td>
<td>39,872</td>
<td>38,245</td>
<td>47,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir info office</td>
<td>58,046</td>
<td>66,425</td>
<td>43,260</td>
<td>45,364</td>
<td>37,350</td>
<td>36,111</td>
<td>38,762</td>
<td>38,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chf student affs</td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td>113,352</td>
<td>79,017</td>
<td>82,661</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>65,325</td>
<td>65,268</td>
<td>67,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of students</td>
<td>75,775</td>
<td>77,417</td>
<td>53,250</td>
<td>59,800</td>
<td>46,724</td>
<td>49,303</td>
<td>62,511</td>
<td>64,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief admiss off</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>75,029</td>
<td>55,216</td>
<td>58,404</td>
<td>50,087</td>
<td>53,306</td>
<td>44,697</td>
<td>51,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc dir admiss</td>
<td>48,034</td>
<td>50,049</td>
<td>38,770</td>
<td>41,050</td>
<td>33,750</td>
<td>36,523</td>
<td>36,101</td>
<td>42,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admiss counsel</td>
<td>32,429</td>
<td>32,356</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>31,394</td>
<td>24,213</td>
<td>24,204</td>
<td>30,770</td>
<td>32,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>65,647</td>
<td>71,800</td>
<td>47,346</td>
<td>55,755</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>45,483</td>
<td>38,341</td>
<td>53,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc registrar</td>
<td>46,175</td>
<td>51,312</td>
<td>34,608</td>
<td>41,421</td>
<td>30,708</td>
<td>32,809</td>
<td>32,341</td>
<td>44,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir student fin aid</td>
<td>64,795</td>
<td>69,700</td>
<td>48,099</td>
<td>53,336</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>47,700</td>
<td>44,472</td>
<td>46,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir student hous</td>
<td>57,045</td>
<td>67,583</td>
<td>42,608</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>32,113</td>
<td>35,078</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir student union</td>
<td>49,814</td>
<td>59,005</td>
<td>43,670</td>
<td>47,621</td>
<td>39,730</td>
<td>36,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir student activ</td>
<td>46,500</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>33,825</td>
<td>38,500</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,800</td>
<td>39,545</td>
<td>41,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir career dev/pl</td>
<td>54,613</td>
<td>57,657</td>
<td>40,219</td>
<td>48,060</td>
<td>35,683</td>
<td>40,365</td>
<td>37,736</td>
<td>46,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir athletics</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>111,750</td>
<td>57,721</td>
<td>64,127</td>
<td>45,655</td>
<td>52,159</td>
<td>42,562</td>
<td>50,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir campus rec</td>
<td>50,527</td>
<td>55,897</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>39,300</td>
<td>34,053</td>
<td>32,775</td>
<td>33,995</td>
<td>37,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Underlined figures indicate women earn more than men in this job title.

From the annual administrative survey by the College and University Personnel Asso.

These major differences in leadership styles, publication differences, advancement of degrees, and salary differences have been discouraging factors for women attempting to move in to non-traditional roles in higher education. History reveals that women have made significant progress since the 1970's mostly because of the awareness of an existing problem and the passage of a major enactment called Title IX. Scott (cited in Green, 1998a) pointed out that Title IX has led to huge improvements in women’s equality in campus athletics during the past quarter century, but women need to experience equality on the “academic and personal development side too” (p. 2). Nevertheless, athletics has provided a foundation of Title IX research and data for other educational avenues to follow. Following is a brief overview of the implications of Title IX in athletics including its effects and the impact of these on women in non-traditional roles in higher education.

**TITLE IX REVIEW**

Title IX is a 1972 federal civil rights law prohibiting sex discrimination in education programs including athletics that receive or benefit from federal funding. Since nearly all educational institutions benefit from federal funding, all should comply. (Bonnette, 1996). Title IX has had positive and negative effects on women’s sports (Carpenter, in Cook, 1998c). It consists of three major categories of athletic issues:

1. Sports offerings at an institution should provide participation opportunities for women and men that are substantially proportionate to their respective rates of enrollment as full-time undergraduate students. For example, a university with 52% full time undergraduate
enrollment who are women and 48% full time undergraduate enrollment who are men should have 52% athletic participants that are women and 48% athletic participants that are men.

2. Total scholarship dollars are to be divided in proportion to the participation of men and women in the intercollegiate athletics program. If 60% of participants are men and 40% are women, then 60% of the scholarship dollars are to be awarded to men and 40% to women.

3. Other program areas are also impacted. Eleven specific areas including but not limited to: equipment, supplies, scheduling of games and practice time, travel and per diem allowances, locker room and practice facilities, medical and training facilities, housing and dining facilities, and recruitment (Bonnette, 1996).

EFFECTS OF TITLE IX

As a result of Title IX, women and girls have benefited from more athletic participation opportunities and more equitable facilities. More women have received athletic scholarships and thus an opportunity for higher education that some may not have been able to afford otherwise (Empowering, 1995).

Playing opportunities for women continue to rise. The average number of women's teams per NCAA school reached an all-time high of 7.71 in 1998 compared to 5.61 just 20 years earlier. Between 1972 and 1978 the number of women's athletic teams doubled and thus participation has increased dramatically (Carpenter in Cook, 1998c). In 1972, before Title IX, women comprised only 15.6% of college athletes. In 1993, that percentage had grown to 34.8%; however, from 1981 to 1993 the increase was only from 30.5 to 34.8% showing little progress in recent years (Women Still, 1995).
Persisting Concerns

A major area of concern involves equality in salaries. Women are discouraged from entering careers in athletics because of low salaries. Seventy-five percent of women college athletes in an NCAA survey said they are interested in a career that offered a higher average salary than did coaching or administration of intercollegiate athletics (Barriers, 1995). Head coaches of men’s teams at NCAA Division I schools earn 43% more than women’s coaches (Cook, 1998f). In Division I basketball, men’s head coaches were paid an average of $71,511 but the women’s coaches made only $39,177. Even in female dominated sports like gymnastics, the men’s coaches were paid more on average. And because most schools offer more sports for men than women, the average combined spending for men’s salaries was $625,396 for Division I schools, but only $227,871 for women’s teams (Barriers, 1995). In Texas alone, men’s coaches get $1.9 million compared to $431,000 for women (Cook, 1998f).

Women are also shortchanged in athletic funding. In 1991, the NCAA conducted a study analyzing expenditures for women and men’s athletics. The study revealed major inequities in the funding of men and women’s athletics. The NCAA themselves called the findings “disturbing.” Although the number of women and men on campus were roughly equal, the NCAA found that men received 70% of scholarship money. The inequities deny women not only the equal opportunity to benefit from sports but sometimes the opportunity to attend college at all because they were not offered an athletic scholarship (Women Still, 1995). A 1996-97 discrimination complaint filed by the National Organization for Women against the University of Southern California cited a funding discrepancy of $679,944 in the operating expenses of men’s and women’s basketball. $809,570 was allotted to the men’s team and $129,626 went to the women’s (O’Brien and Marvic, 1995).
A widespread myth says the only way to comply with Title IX is to cut men’s sports, which feeds backlash against women and contributes to an adversarial climate on campus (Carpenter, in Cook, 1998c). According to Carpenter (cited in Cook, 1998c, p. 6), “Eliminating men’s sports is unnecessary and unsound. We need to encourage the use of creative rather than destructive methods for providing equity in sports.”

However, opposition to gender equity in sports does exist. It comes primarily from men coaches who fear that putting more resources into women’s programs will mean taking money away from men’s sports, especially football. Research shows, however, that few football teams make a profit; most run at a large deficit (Empowering, 1995). Opposition also comes from coaches of men’s minor sports such as wrestling, golf and gymnastics. Coaches argue Title IX is hurting their sports by taking opportunities away from men. This is another myth. As more women have entered athletics, they have not displaced men; instead, the total number of athletes has increased (Empowering, 1995).

Despite the persistent inequities, the federal government has been very reluctant to enforce the law. The Office of Civil Rights, within the Department of Education, charged with enforcing Title IX is underfunded and despite the reluctance of schools to comply with gender equity, has never pulled federal funding from schools or colleges that discriminate against women and girls. Enforcement has instead been left up to individuals. Women and girls have had to file lawsuits on their own to challenge discriminatory practices in schools and colleges. While almost all of these lawsuits have been resolved in favor of women athletes and coaches, this is an expensive and time consuming avenue to gender equity (Empowering, 1995).

The good news is women students participate in intercollegiate athletics more than ever before. The bad news is they do it with too few role models. While the number of women
student athletes and varsity teams continues to grow, a shrinking percentage have a female head coach (Carpenter, in Cook, 1998c). In 1972, the year Title IX was signed into law, women coached over 90% of women's teams. Today more than half of women's teams have men coaches but fewer than 2% of men's teams have women coaches (Women Still, 1995).

Women's Teams Coached by Women

Many researchers have produced evidence surrounding the difficulties facing women moving into non-traditional roles. Brunner (1997) found that for the most part, however, the research focuses on topics such as the lack of access to positions, lack of support and family demands. It is clear that in order to truly advance women in higher education, one must examine the implications of all the available research. Recent literature offers relatively little insight into gender-related strategies for success that are specific to women in higher education (Brunner, 1997). Some strategies that will be suggested however include the use of mentors, work shadowing, networking, and humor.
Use of Mentors

Research shows that mentors can play a crucial role in career development (Brooks & Brooks, 1997). Successful women learn from each other. Corporate leaders rank mentoring second only to education as a key to success (Davis in Cook, 1998d). Darby (in Jenkins, 1998) interviewed 15 women about their mentoring experiences. She identified three major components of an effective mentoring relationship:

1) The initial mentoring relationship must occur early in career development when people are more receptive to developing skills and competencies needed for the next organizational step.

2) The mentor must be an influential person in the organization.

3) The mentor must be personally committed to participate in the relationship.

Davis (in Cook, 1998d) gives suggestions on making the most of a mentor that include defining how often you’ll meet, being enthusiastic, following through with suggestions, rewarding your mentor and passing it on by mentoring somebody else.

The benefits of mentoring are obvious. Instructional benefits include on-the-job training. Psychological benefits include increased self-confidence, self-esteem, and emotional support. Finally, mentoring offers professional benefits by networking and opening doors. Effective mentors provide opportunities for their protégé’s to demonstrate competence, performance and special talents to other administrators. They also challenge protégé’s and offer critical feedback and support (Darby, in Jenkins, 1998).

Research shows that only 10% of the population take advantage of associations to advance their careers. What a waste of networking potential! Fewer than one in ten real job opportunities are posted (Davis, in Cook, 1998d). The advantages of networking include serving other women
in positions at their own or higher levels with whom women can share their experiences and knowledge (King, 1997). Work shadowing can be considered a specialized type of networking.

**Work Shadowing**

Work shadowing involves following a person all day in a normal working environment. Work shadowing focuses on the individual learner rather than the material to be learned. Participants already have knowledge and the learning process is being developed. It is an inexpensive strategy that is not intrusive on time and is non-threatening. Work shadowing can be particularly important for women as they find themselves a part of a small minority (Gee, 1997). Learning in a real life setting offers the opportunity to gain practical knowledge such as the value of humor.

**Sense of Humor**

Many successful women point out that a sense of humor can make the difference between a difficult, uncomfortable situation and one that can be worked out (Brooks & Brooks, 1997). Cook (1998e) suggests using humor as a leadership skill. Research suggests it’s well worth learning. Lack of humor is associated with high levels of burn out and low self-esteem. With the self-confidence to use humor, an effective leader can bring about positive growth, bonding opportunities and communication enhancement (Cook, 1998e). Humor can be learned through skill and practice and should be considered an important management tool.

**CONCLUSION**

Recent research lists women’s deficiencies, offering solutions to help women compensate by emulating men (Van Baron, 1998). In reality, women have many positive attributes that actually help them move into positions of leadership roles in higher education. Several scholars contend that a leader with an emerging inclusive style of leadership could provide an institution with a positive step in the right direction (Chliwniak, 1997). As pointed out earlier, women possess this
important quality. Despite difficulty in publishing, earning a doctorate, and gaining equality in salaries, women have made positive strides. Title IX has positively impacted women in athletic endeavors to some degree, but disparity still exists. Women who truly desire to advance in non-traditional roles should actively seek a mentor, make use of network potential and job shadowing. They should keep in mind that adding humor to the workplace can be advantageous.

For if Scott (cited in Green, 1998b) is right, “It is women who will make the changes that will be made in higher education and the world” (p. 1). With growing numbers of strong women leaders who are not afraid to celebrate that they are women, future leaders will have more role models to use as mentors (Hovis in Cook, 1998a). Van Baron (1998) calls women the makers, shapers, and recipients who should be proud of the fact that they don’t fit the traditional male mold. Not fitting the mold is a sign of creativity and not living up to a long established ideal should be seen as progressive, growth producing and strengthening. Women didn’t invent the great monuments of civilization, but they may have made everything else, especially those requiring attention to detail, subtle as well as obvious teamwork and an understanding of the intricacies of life (Van Baron, 1998, p. 2).

Armed with this wisdom, women should be encouraged to seek leadership roles in higher education and further develop the unique skills they possess.
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