CHAPTER 11

The Transition of Women to Leadership in Post-secondary Institutions in Canada: An Examination of the Literature and the Lived DIM Experiences of Two Female Leaders

Lorraine M. Carter and Diane P. Janes

An Introduction to Women in Leadership in Post-secondary Education

Historically, professional women have tended to work in the 'helping professions' with elementary and secondary School teaching, nursing, and social work among their top choices, and it is within these areas that they have held leadership positions. While the value of women's leadership in these fields cannot be underestimated, it would be an untruth to

L. M. Carter (✉)
Centre for Continuing Education, McMaster University,
Hamilton, ON, Canada

D. P. Janes
Learning Engagement Office (LEO), Faculty of Extension,
University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

say that their experiences have been anything but hard-won. As an example, the nursing literature is full of instances of incivility not only among nurses in practice but also aggression toward female colleagues in senior roles (Laschinger, Wong, Cummings, & Grau, 2014). Social work and teaching are noted for similar patterns.

Despite certain less than glamorous experiences in the helping professions, women are now finding their way into senior leadership roles in domains where they did not go previously and where there is more proportional gender representation: business, the technology sector, medicine, and academe are four such areas. It is the last environment— post-secondary education—that serves as the setting for this chapter. Given the public's understanding that universities and Colleges are places where tolerance, inclusion, and equity are declared cornerstones, one might extrapolate that women are well received and respected as academic and administrative leaders. Regrettably, women have a long way to go in these milieus. Women, as they transition from practice to leadership in their mid-to-late careers in academe, often encounter difficult and demoralizing circumstances. These outcomes are especially the case when the female leader is committed to authentic leadership and acts as a change maker. Her role as leader can be characterized by considerable dissonance as well as subtle and not so subtle acts of incivility and aggression.

THINKING ABOUT CONTEMPORARY LEADERSHIP

For many years, the leadership literature pertained principally to the world of business. Today, this is changing. With increasing complexities and unprecedented pressures in large organizations such as post-secondary institutions and healthcare organizations, there are new ways of thinking about and practicing leadership. The move is from 'command and control' hierarchies to 'next generation' models that use employee empowerment to leverage dramatic improvement in organizational performance. According to McKimm and O'Sullivan (2012), today's leaders need 'to practice in very different ways, responding to increased complexity, demographic change, technological advances, global economic trends and increased… involvement [by stakeholders] and accountability' (p. 485). A defining characteristic of contemporary leadership is that it should be shared, 'The notion that a few extraordinary people at the top can provide all the leadership needed today is ridiculous and it's a recipe for failure' (Kotter, 2013, para. 9). With leadership evolving to include

shared models built on ideas of empowerment and collaboration, leaders are those who can motivate others, generate enthusiasm, and harness the collective to achieve intended results (Cameron & Green, 2012; Graban, 2012; Rose & Bergman, 2016).

What do these ideas about leadership mean for women in Colleges and universities? As a starting point, while women have long been recognized for their collaborative skills, most senior leadership positions in post-secondary settings in Canada and other jurisdictions continue to be held by men (Jones, 2013; Bilen-Green, Froelich, & Jacobson, 2008). Moreover, universities are places where there are distinct hierarchies in all aspects of the organizational structure. Tradition and its trappings sit at the heart of academic life with its Senates, Secretariats, and Deaneries. Finally, like many religious organizations, universities are grounded in a history of knowledge control and dissemination, with male persons acting as the primary gatekeepers of the academy (Bilen-Green et al., 2008; Morley, 2014).

In all, even in 2018, the transition of a female person to a senior leadership role in higher education can be rocky.

Differences Between Male and Female Leaders in Universities

One might think that the differences between men and women as leaders in post-secondary education could not be that substantive. After all, to work at a senior level in a university means that the person, regardless of gender, aspires to the vision, mission, and values of the university. He or she has either come up through the ranks or been selected after a careful recruiting process for a specific role: the person 'fits' with the organization and has something others see as important to the role.

As further insight into senior leadership roles at universities, Bruner (2017) suggests that temperament and readiness are critical to transitioning to a leadership position. Regarding temperament, he suggests that the person needs to have solid self-confidence, resilience, and humility in equal measure, and an inclination to action. As for readiness, Bruner recommends leadership experience acquired over time, awareness of the ways of the world, and skill in getting things done.

So, what distinguishes the female temperament and level of readiness for leadership from the male person's temperament and level of readiness?

The differences, to some extent, tie to socialization and other realities of nature. While today's children and adolescents are often socialized differently than their parents were, persons presently in or considering leadership roles were likely socialized based on their gender (Little & McGivern, 2014). As an outcome, it is often suggested that female leaders may be more nurturing than male leaders (Sherwin, 2014; Zenger & Folkman, 2012). In some contexts, this tendency may be regarded to be a weakness, or perceived as inability to be firm and direct. Current research even suggests that girls as young as six perceive boys to be smarter based on their responses to the question 'who is smarter – boys or girls?' (Bian, Leslie, & Cimpian, 2017a, 2017b).

Female leaders may also carry heavier loads at home than their male counterparts do. When a female leader takes time to care for an ill child or elderly parent, this decision may be seen as detracting from the role of leader (Bilen-Green et al., 2008). By contrast, when a female chooses to be a leader who is 'self-aware and genuine; mission driven and results focused; [who leads with the] heart and focus[es] on the long term' (Kruse, 2013, p. 1), she faces another conundrum. Rather than being perceived as strong and capable, she may be labeled aggressive (Oakley, 2000, pp. 324–325).

A DIM EXPERIENCE: DISSONANCE, INCIVILITY, AND MICROAGGRESSION

All too often, female leaders experience the unfortunate realities of dissonance, incivility, and microaggression—namely, DIM. In some instances, DIM derives from the woman herself such as when she questions her abilities in relation to those of her male colleagues and/or other female colleagues. Alternately, she may wonder if she has had adequate preparation for leadership given career interruptions including maternity and family care leaves (Bilen-Green et al., 2008). More often, DIM comes from persons in the women's professional circle and variables over which she has little control including entrenched beliefs about leadership (Caplan, 1992).

Dissonance for the female leader in the university can present in several guises: incongruence with personal expectations; conflicting expectations involving faculty and staff; contrary expectations held by supervisors; and environmental factors including the history of the unit

and ingrained behavior patterns by faculty and staff. By comparison, experiences of incivility and microaggression are grounded in attitudes that convey hostility or jealousy toward the female leader and manifest in inappropriate behaviors. Such behaviors can range from gossip to subtle opposition to overt sabotage of the position of the female leader.

Female leaders who move from academic practice to academic leadership are subject to several constructs that appear in the literature: Among others, these constructs include the invisibility of men relative to the visibility of women in leadership contexts; language; and preconceived ideas about what constitutes academic management. While expectations are changing, the academy remains a place where leadership is often male and support staff is often female. Women continue to be underrepresented at higher levels of leadership and to receive lower salaries (Fisher & Fisher, 2007). Although new management models in academe seem to promote '…new more women friendly environments' (Fisher & Fisher, 2007, p. 508), 'micro-level analysis of the effects of the audit and evaluative seem to suggest that hegemonic masculinities and gendered power are being reinforced by the emphasis on competition, targets, and performance' (Fisher & Fisher, 2007, p. 508; Morley, 2003). These ideas are reflected in the understanding that 'men lead and women manage,' an understanding in which leadership is associated with power and management with oversight of tasks (Langland, 2012, p. 1). Langland (2012) remarks on how this belief is deeply rooted in long-standing cultural narratives that are difficult to change:

> I hate to end on a sarcastic note, but it does reflect the difficulty of changing cultural narratives, especially when they are grounded in deeply held convictions about human nature and essence and informed by a Renaissance leadership text titled *The Prince*. (Langland, p. 9)

An Up-Close Look at the Experiences of Two Female Leaders in Post-secondary Settings

In this section, the experiences of two women in leadership positions in post-secondary education are recounted. In addition to descriptions of the cultures and historical practices the women found, considerations of their experiences through the DIM lens are provided.

Meet Mary

At the time of her leadership experience, Mary had acquired her Ph.D. in education with a focus on online education for nurses. She had extensive expertise in health and nursing education; health education research; and administration at two universities. She further had a broad network of colleagues in the healthcare sector. Mary came to the university discussed in this chapter to lead a center dedicated to faculty support and online course development. She was also provided a faculty position in the School of Nursing.

Two years into Mary's time at the university, she was approached by the Dean to assume the role of Director in the School of Nursing. While Mary did not have a Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BScN), the Dean expressed confidence in her skills, and Mary agreed to take the position. Notably, Mary had taught nonclinical undergraduate and graduate level courses in nursing and carried out various administrative responsibilities in a School of Nursing at her former university.

Environmental context. The environment of the School of Nursing in which Mary assumed the role of Director was complex. Although there were no graduate programs to support, its undergraduate nursing programs were distinguished by different philosophies and teaching pedagogies.

During the time Mary was at the University, the School offered a large face-to-face collaborative BScN program with the local community College; a large online learning program for diploma-prepared nurses wishing to acquire BScN status; and a BScN program grounded in the principles of narrative inquiry and delivered in another city. The School was under-resourced from both a staff and a faculty perspective. Given the northern location of the University, it has always been difficult to recruit appropriately credentialed faculty.

In the first program described above, there was considerable negative history between the College and university faculty which tended to manifest in acrimonious meetings, gossip, general distrust, and overall ineffectiveness.

In the second program, the environment was positive but precarious: The faculty and staff responsible for the program were exceptional persons deeply committed to the success of students. The program, however, had continued to grow every semester, and there were inadequate resources to support such growth. Still, the University continued to pressure the School to accept new students. At the same time, due

to other fiscal problems experienced by the University, it was not willing to hire new full-time faculty. Thus, faculty on short-term contracts or employed on a sessional basis taught the program. The supports for the online and clinical requirements of this program were similarly limited. Quality online education is a complex undertaking and requires dedicated experts who understand how to adapt curriculum for meaningful delivery and who recognize the criticality of instructor training and supports. Finding and organizing appropriate clinical placements for more than 800 nurse-students across the province requires a team rather than the two persons presently charged with this work. Additionally, some faculty in the collaborative program questioned how it was possible to have a quality online nursing program.

In the third program, there were, prior to Mary's leadership, difficulties associated with its development and accreditation status. Innovative in its approach to nursing education, the program was misunderstood by non-participating faculty and was, thus, a target for criticism. Like the online program, it was inappropriately resourced and involved extensive partnerships. Because it was delivered in a city located four hours away by driving from the University, there were additional variables affecting close connections with the program and the development of relationships with the faculty on the main campus.

DIM experiences. Mary's experiences as Director reflect the DIM phenomenon on many levels. As outlined above, the dissonance factor existed in the School before Mary's arrival. However, the fact that Mary was not a nurse seemed to intensify the agitation of those in the collaborative program. The prevailing sentiment was that it was simply not possible for Mary as a non-nurse to lead a School of Nursing despite her long-standing work in the nursing field and her successful leadership of a complex national accreditation process in the School. The national accrediting body had no concerns about Mary's non-nurse status and was impressed with her leadership skills and scholarly accomplishments.

In contrast with the faculty in the collaborative program, the faculty in the other two programs were supportive of Mary. Mary understood the realities of online programming and what is involved in bringing new programs to life. The support of these faculty members meant a great deal to Mary. Perhaps Mary's identification with the challenges of the online program and the new innovative program fueled the negativity of some of the nurses in the collaborative program.

The evidence of Mary's DIM realities is varied in nature. On the one hand, Mary regularly experienced the scrutiny by a member of the nursing leadership team who demanded to participate in meetings to which she was uninvited. Mary's sense was that this person did not believe that a female colleague who was a non-nurse could make appropriate decisions for the department. Not surprisingly, for Mary, repeated instances of this kind of experience culminated in internal dissonance and questioning of whether she should have taken the position in the first place.

Mary's recommendations at meetings with the faculty in the collaborative program were tensely received. Not lost to Mary was the reality that the nurses in the collaborative program tended to be older and more set in their thinking about nursing education and leadership than their colleagues in the other programs. They comprised, however, the dominant voice in the School and set a negative tone. Mary experienced the incivility of negative statements about her capabilities in formal and informal settings as well as the microaggression of omission. On various occasions, she found herself not invited to discussions in which she should have been included.

Mary approached the Dean at different times about the realities of School life and faculty behaviors. While there was general support, no action was taken to address the macro- and micro-elements of negative play in the School and in relation to Mary.

Outcomes. After a year in this role, Mary chose to resign. Her personal health and professional reputation were more important than a leadership role at this university.

Mary's perspective on her experiences as leader. Since the above experience, Mary has engaged in considerable reflection and tried to situate it in context and in relation to the literature. She was aware of the challenges that existed in the School before she took on the role; she was aware too of the hefty scholarly literature dealing with incivility among nursing as a profession. This literature includes accounts of nurses' poor treatment of each other and student-nurses and their difficult relationships with physicians and hospital administration (Roche, Diers, Duffield, & Catling-Paull, 2010; Vessey, DeMarco, Gaffney, & Budin, 2009).

At the same time, Mary had believed that a School of Nursing that needed leadership would be pleased to get it even if she was a non-nurse. She had wrongly assumed that a School of Nursing would be different from what she knew about nursing practice through her work as a researcher.

For Mary, the ironies are that nursing educators declare themselves to be part of a caring profession that values inter-professionalism and pride themselves in fostering leadership knowledge and skills in their students. In Mary's case, acceptance of her inter-professional and leadership skills did not seem possible.

Mary has further reflected on the idea that women aspiring to academic leadership should seek the mentorship of other female leaders. While this inherently makes sense, it begs the larger question of leadership of programs offered by the academy where the faculty are principally female: nursing, social work, the rehabilitation sciences, education, and perhaps some disciplines in the humanities and social sciences. In Mary's estimation, there is still a long road ahead if female leadership in these fields is to become something that women can carry out with support, respect, and integrity.

Based on her hypothesizing about what might have been the experiences of a new male director, Mary holds two minds. The literature emphasizes that both men and women are more accustomed to accepting male leaders than female leaders due to their socialization experiences (Little & McGivern, 2014). There is other literature that suggests that, in the caring professions including nursing, social work, and education, females possess the best blend of traits to provide caring and effective leadership (Dickson & Tholl, 2014). In all, Mary was unable to fully discern a clear picture of how gender played out in her experience; she was, however, certain that it played a primary role.

The role of the Dean in supporting a new leader has also been an area of reflection for Mary. Her observations are that a Dean needs to mentor a new leader for at least a year as she or he learns the operational patterns and general dynamics of the unit. Moreover, when there are complex dynamics, the leader needs to have an open line of communication with the Dean and experience guidance during the navigation of difficult issues. If there is a troubled history in the leader's unit, the Dean's support is especially important. In Mary's case, her non-identity as a nurse might have been addressed by the Dean with the faculty prior to her assuming the role and, thus, lessened her DIM experience.

Meet Susan

At the time of the leadership experience discussed here, Susan who already held a Master's degree in Education and a Ph.D. in Higher Education was completing a Master of Business Administration with a

focus on community economic development. She had worked in several educational institutions, mostly universities, in diverse capacities: Her various roles included work as a laboratory instructor and instructional designer early in her career, as a consultant, and as a project manager. Susan had also held two tenured faculty positions and been promoted early during her first appointment.

Over her 20 plus year career, Susan had chaired academic committees, represented faculty in Senate, led strategic initiatives, and undertaken the creation of new courses and programs in team settings and working as an individual. She had also been Chair of a new Education Department for two years and served a two-year term as Chair of a School of Professional Studies.

At the point in her career described here, Susan was offered the position of Associate Dean (AD) in a School of Business in a mid-sized community College. The community College was located in part of the country that Susan knew and aspired to return to in her mid-career. Susan's contract did not include an option to join the faculty if the position did not 'work out.' She was advised that the College was not prepared to offer such a provision to her contract; while she asked for this limitation to be reconsidered, the terms of the contract were firm. Because she was keenly interested in exploring leadership at the level of Dean, she accepted a one-year contract with this College. She anticipated that she would be successful and that the contract would be converted to a full-time continuing position.

Environmental context. When Susan arrived at the College, it had been experimenting with reorganization in anticipation of becoming a university-level degree-granting institution. Susan was the first Associate Dean to be hired during the reorganization efforts. Her expertise in transitioning new departments and change management, her innovative use of technology to develop contemporary curricula, and her experience in university governance were seen as strengths. These areas of expertise were important since the history of the School of Business had been fraught with change in the years before Susan's arrival.

As context, three years earlier, the long-term Dean had been 'let go' with the arrival of a new President and administration; this person had been the Dean for more than seven years and had provided oversight for the transition of the then Business Department to a new downtown campus. After the departure of this Dean, the faculty found themselves led by a temporary Dean from the main campus for almost a year. During this time, the College engaged in a search for a new Dean.

The new Dean was a volunteer member of the College's community fundraising team and an employee of a local financial institution. While this person had an undergraduate degree in business and was well connected in the community, he had no experience as a senior leader in a post-secondary education institution. As part of his early work, the Dean sought the designation of School for the former Business Department and undertook the search and hire of the Associate Dean for the School.

As the successful candidate of the search, Susan arrived at the College in the middle of this change. Having consulted with Associate Dean colleagues at other institutions, Susan conjectured that she needed a three-year window to establish a steady foundation for the School to go forward: year one to get the 'lay of the land'; year two to build processes; and year three to finesse changes started in years one and two. Her Dean, however, wanted all of this work accomplished in year one.

DIM experiences. The expectations that the Dean had for Susan were numerous and demanding. As an example, before Susan came aboard, the Dean had decided that the College's 'chair model' of administration, in the form of three faculty chairs responsible for the operations of seven programs, was to be eliminated. While the existing chairs had tried to dissuade the Dean from this structure before and after Susan's arrival, within three months of arriving, the work of the three chairs fell her way. Her role, as characterized by the Dean on several occasions, was to be that of an 'Uber [or Ultimate] Chair.' Susan was also responsible for the well-being and monitoring of students, the hiring and mentoring of full- and part-time faculty, professional development, evaluation and teaching assignments, curriculum development, and taking the lead on School negotiations with external partners.

The Dean's involvement with the community, his political aspirations, and his personal need to support senior management before his staff and faculty complicated the situation. Within six months, he had withdrawn most of his formal support for Susan and refused to have meetings longer than one hour a week with her. Although often absent from the School, he continued to maintain control over decision making, limited the purview of the Associate Dean, and impeded a smooth transition from Dean-led to Associate Dean-led decision making. The Dean was very preoccupied with Susan supplying him reports to pass forward to senior management and minimally concerned about the faculty and the mundane operations of the School.

In addition to the Dean, there was an external force that created conflict for Susan in her work as Associate Dean. Before her arrival, the Dean had contracted a private consultant to assist him with transitioning from his previous work to the position of Dean of a School of Business. This consultant had no relationship with the College; however, he seemed to have considerable influence over the Dean, as exemplified in the following remarks.

After his arrival, the Dean experienced several confrontations with faculty and believed that they were not 'engaged' with his vision for the School. About midway through Susan's initial one-year contract, the consultant was asked to conduct a survey of the faculty and of the Dean's office staff, with the aim of assessing the Dean's and Susan's ability to engage faculty. Susan agreed to the survey, believing that it would be used to improve and focus her work and assist the School in the process of becoming more like a university. Additionally, she had been working with the Dean toward a more conciliatory position with respect to the faculty, and felt that the faculty, in general, were engaged. Before the faculty left for their summer holidays, the survey was administered. The results were to be analyzed by the consultant, and a report to be supplied to the Dean and Susan at the end of the summer.

When the report was ready, the Dean was on vacation, and he instructed Susan to meet with the consultant privately. She agreed to meet the consultant off campus at a local golf course. The location seemed to be an odd choice, but she chose to be accommodating. At the meeting, the consultant proceeded to deconstruct the survey data, informing Susan that the survey revealed her 'inability to continue as AD,' 'her inability to engage,' 'the catastrophic choice of the hiring committee in choosing her as AD,' and 'her need to consider a career change.' Susan was stunned by this information as well as the fact that it was being delivered by someone unaffiliated with the College with no authority to convey such information. The consultant refused to provide his comments in writing, despite Susan's request personally and then later by email. She left the meeting with a copy of the report. Neither Human Resources nor the Dean made any attempt to support Susan when she spoke to them after the meeting with the consultant.

Outcomes. A week later, Susan chose not to renew her contract. However, just before leaving her appointment, she was invited to a meeting with the President and several new Associate Deans from the

main campus. Susan's Dean did not attend the meeting; the Deans of all the other Associate Deans were present. Susan's work in advancing the Associate Dean structure and doing so from the 'distance' of the downtown campus was positively recognized. Several members of other Schools had observed what had unfolded in the School of Business and thus kept some or all of their chairs during the hire of an Associate Dean. Additionally, by the time Susan left the College, senior administration had revisited the idea of an Associate Dean returning to or joining a faculty after an appointment. Further review of the consultant's report identified that his analysis of the data was incorrect and should not have been the basis of any decision by the Dean.

Susan's perspective on her experiences as leader. What was most frustrating for Susan was the isolation she experienced and the lack of support by a Dean who took guidance from a third party. Susan had expected that her Dean would know the College's systems and understand the relationships important to her work. By contrast, Susan worked with a novice Dean more interested in politics than academic administration and with a faculty group reeling from change. Given these circumstances, Susan was not set up for success. This lack of support contrasted sharply with an amazing team of male and female staff, faculty, students, and main campus colleagues. While such support is extremely valuable, without mentorship from one's supervisor—in this case, the Dean—a person can only go so far. It is unknown if this situation would have developed differently had Susan been male. What is clear is that her replacement, a male Associate Dean, has held the position since Susan left.

Several concerns continue to stand out for Susan regarding the survey experience described earlier: use of a survey on engagement never used in an academic leadership setting as evidence of her leadership skills; the Dean's reliance on an external party to convey the apparent findings; and his decision to use these findings as a performance measure. Contrary to the verbal debrief on the survey Susan received from the consultant at the golf course, the raw data revealed that, in one year, Susan had been rated as 'engaging' by over 50% of the faculty and that she was in the process of engaging with another 25% at the time of the survey. Given a period of less than one year in a new and complex position involving a faculty in turmoil, these are hardly poor outcomes.

Upon reflection, Susan believes that, if the School of Business had not tried to be political by 'going it alone' in establishing itself as the College's first School, the additional support of the other Associate Deans on main campus would have mitigated many of Susan's frustrations, given that adequate support was not likely from her Dean. Colleagues could have worked together on processes, thus creating some consistency across the academic landscape of the main and downtown campuses. The instances of incivility and microaggression (e.g., the Dean's refusal to meet weekly for more than a half hour on School business; the lack of transfer of authority for operations; and the external consultant engaging with Susan outside of the College administration) experienced by Susan during her time with the College would have also been diminished if she had had colleagues to consult with and form relationships. These relationships/mentors would have given her access to the history and culture of the College that was new to her, giving her the opportunity to make adjustments—to know where the boundaries might have been. This would have benefited any new Associate Dean, male or female. Her ability to collaborate with faculty simply needed time to flourish. Unfortunately, the Dean's perception of leadership was markedly different. In an ironic turn, many of the strengths Susan was hired for (her curriculum expertise, her ability to manage change in institutions wanting to be a university, her higher education knowledge) became many of the reasons for her departure.

From Surviving to Thriving

While the experiences of Mary and Susan are only two instances of women in leadership in Canadian post-secondary institutions, they provide insight into a cross-section of issues reported by other female leaders and reflected in the literature. Each of the issues noted here and recommendations for responding to them are discussed in the following paragraphs: failure by other leaders to set people up for success; institutional failure; the inexperience of new leaders and those supporting them; unrealistic expectations; and the issue of gender. Although gender is discussed last, by no means should this suggest that it is less significant than the other elements. In fact, based on the experiences of Mary and Susan, gender was a primary factor in their experiences as leaders.

The task of setting a new leader up for success is no small undertaking. Foremost, the leader's supervisor wants to believe that he or she has

selected wisely and that, after what seems to be a reasonable time period, the initial supports can be withdrawn. What constitutes a reasonable time period can be difficult to discern. Is it six months? A year? The supervisor may choose to meet with the staff in the unit that the leader is joining to provide insight into changes that may be forthcoming when the new person arrives. This way, the new leader is spared the task of communicating all changes for the first time: The staff has had the proverbial 'heads up.'

In the cases of Mary and Susan, such pre-work was not carried out to a helpful extent. As Mary indicated, she inherited a raucous faculty with a difficult past. The same occurred for Susan: Her faculty and staff would have benefited from clarity about the road ahead for them from the Dean. As Morley (2013) suggests, 'It is pertinent to ask why women should desire or aspire to enter HE leadership at all. This often involves taking on a completely new job – sometimes without any socialisation, training or support' (p. 118). The question 'why' touches on various other issues including support, experience, vision, and change.

In addition to the support of individuals, leaders require supports at the institutional level (Katsinas, 1996; Rose & Bergman, 2016; Striffolino & Saunders, 1989). Assuming a position where there may be a change of institution, a relocation, and a new career focus is a significant life event. If, upon arrival, the person discovers gaps in what is available to do the job well, she is markedly disadvantaged.

In Mary's case, she was dealing with under-resourcing in relation to faculty, and the supports required to deliver two innovative and complex programs. Budgets did not permit new hires either in the School or the University. Susan, by contrast, was confronted with the perplexing task of starting to bring faculty and staff forward from a College identity to a university identity in a unit physically separated from the rest of the institution. Regrettably, the road map for doing so was being created as she forged ahead. Having a Dean with no academic leadership experience was another substantive obstacle. While one might argue that different support strategies may need to be in place for female leaders, Mary and Susan have wondered if the supports they needed were not put in place because they are women. Hypothesizing, given that the two Deans were male, it may be possible that, if Mary and Susan had been male persons, their Deans might have responded in more proactive and supportive ways; in fact, Susan was replaced by a male Associate Dean who remains in the role three years later.

While newness can mean freshness and alternate ways of thinking about and doing things, too much newness is problematic. Indeed, there is much in the leadership literature about persons who move through organizational structures to positions of greater responsibility until they are in positions for which they have received no formal training (Dickson & Tholl, 2014). Certainly, many new leaders can be successful without leadership development training, but preparation will enhance that success. Additionally, achieving success without institutional support is a daunting proposition. Reflecting specifically on female leader, Morley (2014) calls for 'more investment … to be made in mentorship and leadership development programmes for women … [while] gender needs to be included in existing leadership development programmes' (p. 124). When such guidance is not provided, such as in Susan's case, the risk of not being successful increases. The best scenario occurs when the female leader has a strong mentor (or group of mentors) who will inform her of institutional strengths and shortcomings and provide guidance as she experiences difficult and delicate situations. This way, the leader is less likely to experience career landmines and not only survive but thrive.

An obvious but often underestimated element of new leadership is the time it takes to enable change and roll out the new leader's vision. In Mary's situation, to go forward, some undoing of historical practices and attitudes was necessary. While the literature tells us that skills can be acquired in fairly straightforward ways and according to predetermined timelines, change of dispositions is another matter (Carter, 2008). Simply put, the building of healthy culture is an incremental process with few shortcuts. In Susan's setting, the expectation that a new person could incite will and energy to transform institutional identity from that of College to that of university in one year was simply unrealistic.

In both Mary's and Susan's situations, gender played an important role, albeit in different ways. Susan found herself in a School of Business, a professional School historically dominated by males. While her Dean may have thought that he was supporting Susan, it was from a male person's perspective: conscious and unconscious bias was prevalent in a number of ways including failure to understand and use Susan's expertise. Instead, her collaborative, problem-solving model of engagement ran counter to the Dean's views. His ideas about leadership and engagement were clearly different from Susan's and resulted in a 'lack of fit' (Jaffe, 2014, para. 8), the reason for Susan's leaving. In Mary's case, she, too, was mentored by a male person but in the context of working with a team

of women. Perhaps this situation was a contributor to the dissonance Mary experienced. In all, Mary's day-to-day experiences were complicated by the gender composition of the group.

The gender factor is one that requires careful consideration. There are issues of men (and women) who cannot or will not accept women in positions of senior leadership. Perhaps this will change given the call for equity and inclusion across this country and beyond (Rochon, Davidoff, & Levinson, 2016). Still, historical patterns are difficult to amend, and change rarely happens as quickly as it should. Alternately, are women hard on women who assume leadership roles because they are jealous or because they are unable to take direction from a colleague of the same gender? Or, have women been affected by long-standing mores and values about leadership grounded in male thinking? Another perspective is that 'acknowledging that women experience working with other women as difficult or that they may preference male leadership becomes an uneasy confession' (Vongalis-Macrow, 2016, p. 96). Either way, the twenty-first-century movement that encourages women to mentor women is not as straightforward as it first might seem, just as the realities of present-day higher education remain distinctly complex. For higher education to remain relevant, 'new forms of leadership and new leaders (will be) called upon to navigate through these turbulent times' (Hannum, Muhly, Schockley-Zalaback, & White, 2015, p. 65). Block and Tietjen-Smith (2016) 'believe that the lack of purposeful mentoring by same-gender role models is contributing to this shortage' (p. 306) of women leaders. Mentors can take many roles, with 'influential mentors …[acting as] sponsors first, then counselors, coaches, and teachers' (Block & Tietjen-Smith, 2016, p. 312).

Ely and Meyerson (2000) have discussed the importance of values and approaches that reflect awareness of gender including valuing feminine leadership skills, creating equal opportunities, and revising the work culture. They have also suggested that the first two have no or limited impact on women as leaders; the last item though is critical to ensuring the success of female leadership. According to Morley (2014), gender is not simply a demographical variable, it is in continual production via sociocultural and organizational practices. Additionally, women in Morley's (2014) study reported how they are not, or are rarely, identified, supported, and developed for leadership. Nor do they achieve the most senior leadership positions in prestigious, national coeducational universities.

So how do we proceed? According to Morley (2013),

> a goal should be to make the academy gender-free. Leadership roles appear to be so over-extended that they represent a type of virility test. We need to ask how leadership practices can become more sustainable, with concerns about health and well-being as well as competitive performance in the global arena. In other words, we need new rules for a very different game. (p. 126)

Final Thoughts

As this chapter has revealed, the experience of women in leadership in universities remains difficult. For historic, gender-based, and diverse institutional reasons, many women do not sit at leadership tables without the company of dissonance, incivility, and microaggressions. It is, as Morley (2013) suggests, time to change the game.

Strong and capable women need to continue to aspire to leadership since women bring perspectives that their male counterparts cannot. The qualities that can make a woman's experience of leadership prickly are often the same qualities that universities need in order to evolve as places distinguished by a sense of community and social accountability. Concurrently, women are as capable as men in being clear thinkers and strong decision makers, particularly when perspectives about gender do not cloud the leadership experience.

Within the academy, the thriving of women as leaders is predicated on resolving a number of issues, some of which are not gender specific and which will support both men and women who actively seek leadership roles.

First, we need to change the self-narrative. We need to shout out our accomplishments and focus on our skills; in the case of women, this strategy disrupts the narrative that we are just supports and family-focused individuals. How we tell our stories impacts our 'placement' in the academy; how we view our experiences and strengths increases our viability and shows our right to leadership.

Women in leadership need to focus on their skills of speaking up and eliciting, integrating, and learning from feedback while also supporting younger women who aspire to be the next generation of leaders.

Extending support and providing mentorship to others are important signs of leadership. And, when women experience negativity toward their female colleagues who have gone on to leadership, it is important to take time to reflect on the motivations and drivers behind such situations.

Finally, women in leadership need to focus on what constitutes leadership today and how this understanding informs their shorter- and longer-term goals. Sollman (2012) suggests the following:

> The definition of leadership is changing for everyone and the news is good for women. As our economy continues to globalize, as the world gets "flatter" and as technology continues to change how we work, leadership is evolving into a relational rather than a hierarchical activity. We're transitioning from command and control to facilitative and collaborative leadership that works across teams, time zones, cultures and disciplines. What we think of as "soft skills" are becoming critical to leadership – and early career women, generally speaking, are comfortable and adept leading with these kinds of skills and abilities. (para 4)

Extending Sollman's ideas, women's capacity for relational, facilitative, and collaborative leadership foreshadows an important place for women in the twenty-first-century university. The academy, however, will need to work deliberately and strategically to oust vestiges of DIM thinking and practice. Although doing so will take time, through dispositional change and strategic effort, the university will be a stronger, more equitable, and more inclusive place for its female leaders.

REFERENCES

Bian, L., Leslie, S.-J., & Cimpian, A. (2017a). Why young girls don't think they are smart enough. *The New York Times*. Retrieved January 26, from https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/26/well/family/why-young-girls-dont-think-they-are-smart-enough.html?_r=1.

Bian, L., Leslie, S.-J., & Cimpian, A. (2017b). Gender stereotypes about intellectual ability emerge early and influence children's interests. *Science, 355*(6323), 389–391. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aah6524.

Bilen-Green, C., Froelich, K. A., & Jacobson, S. W. (2008). *The Prevalence of Women in Academic Leadership Positions, and Potential Impact on Prevalence of Women in the Professorial Ranks.* 2008 WEPAN Conference Proceedings. Retrieved from https://www.ndsu.edu/fileadmin/forward/documents/WEPAN2.pdf.

Bruner, R. (2017). The three qualities that make a good dean. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved January 15, from http://www.chronicle.com/article/The-3-Qualities-that-Make-a/238883?cid=trend_right_h.

Block, B. A., & Tietjen-Smith, T. (2016). The case for women mentoring women. *Quest, 68*(3), 306–315. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2016.1190285.

Cameron, E., & Green, M. (2012). *Making Sense of Change Management* (3rd ed.). Philadelphia: Kogan Page.

Caplan, P. J. (1992). *Lifting a Ton of Feathers: A Woman's Guide to Surviving in the Academic World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Carter, L. (2008). Perceptions of writing confidence, critical thinking, and writing competence among registered nurse-learners studying online. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education, 34*(2), 63–87.

Dickson, G., & Tholl, B. (2014). *Bringing Leadership to Life in Health: LEADS in a Caring Environment*. London: Springer.

Ely, R. J., & Meyerson, D. E. (2000). Theories of gender in organizations: A new approach to organizational analysis and change. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 22*, 103–151. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(00)22004-2.

Fisher, V., & Fisher, G. (2007). 'You need tits to get on around here': Gender and sexuality in the entrepreneurial university in the 21st century [Special issue]. *Ethnography, 8*(4), 503–517. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/24048095.

Graban, M. (2012). *Lean Hospitals: Improving Quality, Patient Safety, and Employee Engagement* (2nd ed.). New York: CRC Press.

Hannum, K. M., Muhly, S. M., Shockley-Zalabak, P. S., & White, J. S. (2015). Women leaders within higher education in the United States: Supports, barriers, and experiences of being a senior leader. *Advancing Women in Leadership, 35*, 65–75. Retrieved from http://awljournal.org/Vol35_2015/Hannum_Women_Leaders_within_Higher_Education2.pdf.

Jaffe, E. (2014). The new subtle sexism toward women in the workplace. *Fast Company*. Retrieved from https://www.fastcompany.com/3031101/the-new-subtle-sexism-toward-women-in-the-workplace.

Jones, S. (2013). The 'star' academics are so often white and male. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/education/2013/apr/22/university-jobs-not-being-advertised.

Katsinas, S. G. (1996). Preparing leaders for diverse institutional settings. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 15–25. https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.36819969504.

Kotter, J. (2013). Management is (still) not leadership. *HHR Blog*. Retrieved from http://blogs.hbr.org/2013/01/management-is-still-not-leadership/.

Kruse, K. (2013). What is authentic leadership? *Forbes*. Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/kevinkruse/2013/05/12/what-is-authentic-leadership/#5ddf732bdef7.

Langland, E. (2012). Cultural narratives of academic leadership at the dawn of the 21st century. *Forum on Public Policy,* 1–9. Retrieved from http://forumonpublicpolicy.com/vol2012.no2/archive/langland.pdf.

Laschinger, H. K., Wong, C. A., Cummings, G. G., & Grau, A. L. (2014). Resonant leadership and workplace empowerment: The value of positive organizational cultures in reducing workplace incivility. *Nursing Economics, 32*(1), 5–15.

Little, W., & McGivern, R. (2014). Chapter 5. In *Introduction to Sociology* (1st Canadian ed.). Rice University (CC international license 4.1). Retrieved from https://opentextbc.ca/introductiontosociology/chapter/chapter5-socialization/.

McKimm, J., & O'Sullivan, H. (2012). Developing and accessing medical leadership. *British Journal of Hospital Medicine, 73*(9), 484–485.

Morley, L. (2003). *Quality and Power in Higher Education*. The Society for Research into Higher Education. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Morley, L. (2013). The rules of the game: Women and the leaderist turn in higher education. *Gender and Education, 25*(1), 116–131. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2012.740888.

Morley, L. (2014). Lost leaders: Women in the global academy. *Higher Education Research & Development, 33*(1), 114–128. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2013.864611.

Oakley, J. G. (2000). Gender-based barriers to senior management positions: Understanding the scarcity of female CEOs. *Journal of Business Ethics, 27,* 321–334. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1023%2FA%3A1006226129868.pdf.

Roche, M., Diers, D., Duffield, C., & Catling-Paull, C. (2010). Violence toward nurses, the work environment, and patient outcomes. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 42*(1), 13–22.

Rochon, P. A., Davidoff, F., & Levinson, W. (2016). Women in academic medicine leadership: Has anything changed in 25 years? *Academic Medicine, 91,* 1053–1056. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000001281.

Rose, K. J., & Bergman, M. (2016). Reaction to leadership misplacement: How can this affect institutions of higher education? *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development, 28,* 26–29. https://doi.org/10.1002/nha3.20149.

Sherwin, B. (2014). Why women are more effective leaders then men. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from http://www.businessinsider.com/study-women-are-better-leaders-2014-1.

Sollman, K. (2012). How the definition of leadership is changing for women. *Forbes*. Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/85broads/2012/09/20/how-the-definition-of-leadership-is-changing-for-women/#64190c5a27a1.

Striffolino, P., & Saunders, S. A. (1989). Emerging leaders: Students in need of development. *NASPA Journal, 27*(1), 51–58.

Vessey, J. A., DeMarco, R. F., Gaffney, D. A., & Budin, W. C. (2009). Bullying of staff registered nurses in the workplace: A preliminary study for developing personal and organizational strategies for the transformation of hostile to healthy workplace environments. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 25*(5), 299–306.

Vongalis-Macrow, A. (2016). It's about the leadership: The importance of women leaders doing leadership for women. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education, 9*(1), 90–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/19407882.2015.1114953.

Zenger, J., & Folkman, J. (2012). Are women better leaders than men? *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2012/03/a-study-in-leadership-women-do.