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ABSTRACT

This qualitative phenomenological study examined emergent barriers revealed by analyzing data from job advertisements, structured survey results, and interviews with past and present women presidents and chancellors of public and private not-for-profit higher education institutions about their selection journey for these jobs. The purpose of this research was to engage women who were past and present presidents or chancellors of public or private nonprofit colleges and universities to explore their experiences with gender-bias during the president/chancellor recruitment, selection, and transition enactment. The first question was to study how gender-bias appears during the recruitment of women candidates for a higher education institution president or chancellor role. The emergence of first theme which was that institutional differences may influence gender equity supported the finding that there may be implicit bias in the recruiting process. The second question for exploration looked at how does gender-bias visibly manifest during a higher education institution selection process for president or chancellor. The second theme that evolved from data analysis was that stakeholders’ implicit bias may disadvantage women supported findings that there may be institutional implicit bias in the selection process. The final question assessed how woman presidents or chancellors experience gender-bias during transition events that communicate their selection as the higher education institution president or chancellor. The data analysis led to the creation of a third theme found that launch actions are institutional as well as individual symbolism and organizational communications goals may
introduce implicit bias into announcement activities such as press releases. The conceptual framework used the Four-Frame model developed from organizational theory and difference theory. These two theories provided a lens which guided the analysis and interpretation of data from the three data sources that allowed for enhanced validity through triangulation. The study’s findings demonstrate that some women presidents and chancellors have been successful navigating processes despite possible implicit bias forming institutional barriers. The insights from this study regarding barriers in the recruiting, selection, and enactment processes can contribute to future policies and programs.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Women are substantial contributors to every market, but noticeably lag behind men
achieving top leadership roles in almost every sector (Miller, Quealy, & Sanger-Katz, 2018;
Showunmi, Atewologun, & Bevvington, 2015; Mack, 2015; Thelin, 2011; Eagly & Carli, 2007;
Eagly & Karau, 2002; Ridgeway, 1997). Data from the Glass Ceiling Index (GCI), published by
The Economist, visibly demonstrates women’s slow attainment of job equality at the highest
levels within the global marketplace. GCI’s authors made the point that men named John
constituted only 8% of all males globally. They used this data point to highlight how Fortune 500
Presidents or CEOs named John outnumbered all women in this population (Miller, Quealy, &
Sanger-Katz, 2018, April 24). Research about chief executives in higher education reveals
similar findings (DeFrank-Cole, Latimer, Reed, & Wheatley, 2014; Lindsay, 1999). Lindsay
(1999) noted that "regardless of the indicator used, white males remain the favoured group in all
areas of higher education" (p. 187). Female undergraduate students continue to exceed their male
peers, but this majority status has not translated into proportional representation in the labor
market or access to leadership positions (Jaschik & Lederman, 2019; Enke, 2014; DeFrank-Cole
et al., 2014). Regrettably, tools such as the GCI have limited utility. This index provided new
insight as to the overrepresentation of men in power but offered few ideas as to why this
situation is not changing.

The higher education community of practice is aware that its university and college
president and chancellor population does not equitably represent the diverse demographics of its
overall staff and faculty (O’Connor, 2018; Reis & Grady, 2018). The Association of American
recognize this shortfall and explicitly developed goals to promote more representative university president populations. Regardless of published intentions, higher education has not met its stated goals concerning president demographics and making them more reflective of its entire population (AAC&U, n.d.; ACE, n.d.; ACE, 2017). The community of practice benefits from exploring the president/chancellor search process and identifying barriers that challenge women from achieving more equitable representation in these roles.

Recent studies show that universities should look for leaders with skills that help guide higher education institutions in an era that is increasingly diverse, virtual, networked, and global (Lindsey, 1999; Lipman-Blumen, 1998; Mack, 2015; Schein, E., 2010; Schien, V., 2002). External forces such as internationalism, interconnected networks, and more diverse workforces, which scholars often referred to as components of globalism, are transforming markets and countries from industrialized to digitized (Jackson, 2017; Mack, 2015). This globalism brings with it the need for higher education organizations to recruit, retain, and promote a more diverse group of academic leaders who can respond to these changing forces. This need for more varied higher education leaders is an area of tremendous opportunity as organizations strive to remain relevant in the digital era.

Research shows that women have strong collaborative skills necessary for leading in this more complex time (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Longman & Madsen, 2014). Hsieh and Liou (2018) recently found that women were influential by being collaborative leaders. These authors discovered that the collaborative approach improves organizational performance and is especially useful during times of inter- and intra-organization variations such as globalization (Hsieh & Liou, 2018). Also, persuasive data suggested that women leaders may be particularly helpful during transitions such as a current inflection point where organizations feel pressure to
become increasingly digitized and networked (Carless, 1998; Cubillo & Brown, 2003; Haslam & Ryan, 2008; Hironimus-Wendt & Dedjoe, 2015). Recent investigations found that diverse companies were as much as 15 percent more profitable than more homogenous companies (Hunt, Layton, & Prince, 2015). The current literature indicates that this transition to a more global and networked world requires higher education top leaders to influence diverse populations and employ unifying approaches to sustain their organizations’ academic competitiveness (Thelin, 2011, Wallace, Budden, M., Juban, & Budden, C., 2014). The need for differently skilled top leaders creates a sense of urgency to have a more diverse university president and chancellor population that align with its community demographics.

Women experience more barriers than men as they move through human resource (HR) processes that attract, assess, develop, retain, and promote higher education leaders (Bichsel & McChesney, 2017, February; BlackChen, 2015; Ibarra, Ely, & Kolb, 2013). One helpful visualization of this professional progression is a factory pipeline where people are both inputs and outputs (Bolman & Deal, 2013). The question explored in this study is the intersectionality of successful leadership frameworks with organizational processes to discover why women candidates might find hidden obstacles when competing for the job of president or chancellor. There is current research that suggests that women encounter bias due to perceptions of gender incongruent behavior associated with 19th- and 20th-century leadership theories (Ayman & Korabik, 2010, April; Debebe, 2011; de Vries & van den Brink, 2016). Studies show that many organizations prefer masculine leader approaches, but also demonstrate an aversion to women executives who use gender incongruent behavior (Enke, 2014; Ibarra et al., 2013; Robinson & Lipman-Blumen, 2017; Shein, V., 1973). Madsen (2011) documented tension between an urgency to provide a more significant opportunity for women to be presidents and chancellors
with current centralized search processes for top university and college leader roles. However, there is a gap in understanding how the organizational president and chancellor search functions might exacerbate or mitigate gender-bias as university and college boards look for more digital-era multidisciplinary leaders (Selingo, Cheng, & Clark, 2017; Thelin, 2011).

**Statement of the Problem**

Female university executives are at a disadvantage progressing through the ranks and reaching the president and chancellor levels in representative numbers (ACE, 2017; Madsen, 2008; 2011; Selingo et al., 2017). Research data suggests that bias projected toward women is due to perceptions of gender incongruent behaviors, but much of the data is anecdotal (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Goldin & Katz, 1999; Ridgeway, 1997). Dr. Carolyn Stefanco (2019, Jan 8), President of The College of St. Rose in Albany, NY described how gender bias is perceived by women at her level during their ascent up the higher education career ladder,

Like many women, I experienced gender bias and sexual harassment throughout my studies and continuing into my years as a tenure-track and tenured professor. What enabled me to persist, and to eventually rise through the ranks of higher education administration, was a fierce commitment to lead change so that others who have been denied access, opportunity and advancement could realize their potential. (para 6)

The literature about secondary gender-bias against women executives suggested external factors influence perceptions of women leaders’ behaviors when conducting transformation in organizations because of, "…male dominated beliefs as to how leaders should look and behave…” (Mayer, Surtee, & Visser, 2016, p. 3). Many researchers used this premise to explain male acceleration past their female counterparts into executive leadership positions even if they
encountered discriminatory behaviors (Hunt, Layton, & Prince, 2015; Tang, Zhang, Cryan, Metzger, Zheng, & Zhao, 2017; Williams, 1992). However, this view that male-dominated beliefs about leadership are universal barriers for women in education does not fully explain why women are underrepresented in top executive populations (Bowring, 2004; Longman & Madsen, 2014; Madsen, 2011; Wallace et al., 2014). There is a growing body of evidence suggesting that secondary gender-bias and a double-bind phenomenon hinder women’s career progress (Ayman & Korabik, 2010, April; Ibarra et al., 2013; Tannen, 1994; Visser, 2003). This study takes an in-depth look at past and present women presidents and chancellors to examine if gender biases manifest at the intersectionality of a woman leader’s approach and organizational processes.

Virginia Schien (1973) is a prominent scholar who conducted foundational studies that examined how gender-bias influences perceptions of those who lead. Her data showed, "...all else being equal, the perceived similarity between the characteristics of successful middle managers and men in general increases the likelihood of a male rather than a female being selected or promoted to a managerial position..." (Schein, 1973, p. 99). Researchers in various fields produced similar findings. The most prolific investigators of the impacts of gender bias in higher education are educator Enke (2014), psychologists Eagly and Karau (2002), and management expert Hogue (2016), and all of which have built upon Schein’s (1973) work. There is a gap in explaining why and how to alleviate this gender bias impact on women striving to be presidents and chancellors. Colleges, universities, and the community of practice may benefit from exploring how gender-bias may impede women from progressing toward the top leadership ranks in academia. Applying focus on the HR top executive hiring process has the potential to increase organizational awareness of obstacles that potentially undermine women candidates.
This study of women’s experiences undergoing the higher education president or chancellor centralized search process contributes to academia’s collective understanding of circumstances that produce inequities. It is critical to look at women’s perceptions during recruitment, selection, and transition to enactment as a president or chancellor against the context of organizational requirements or requests to discover which organizational structures might mitigate or accentuate impediments (Bichsel & McChesney, 2017; De Welde & Stepnick, 2015; Wolfinger, Mason & Goulden, 2008). One idea worth exploring is the interplay between these women’s leadership approaches and higher education HR structures that potentially amplify bias. This lens examines the juncture of leadership style and organizational frames. This unique view could shed light on how senior women educators tap into more communal leadership approaches but are still viewed with the same gravitas enjoyed by their male peers.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this phenomenological study is to engage women who have served or now serve as presidents or chancellors of public and private nonprofit colleges and universities that award at the baccalaureate level or higher to explore their experiences with gender-bias during president/chancellor recruitment, selection, and transition enactment. In many organizations, the role of chancellor is either equivalent to a president or senior to the president (Johnston & Ferrare, 2018; Thelin, 2011). These higher education roles are unique because presidents and chancellors usually are the only positions centrally selected by college or university governing boards, or search committees chartered by college or university boards (Johnston & Ferrare, 2018). This study examined experiences of both women chancellors and presidents since the search process is very similar, but still distinct from how subordinate positions such as vice presidents, deans, and provosts are selected (Johnston & Ferrare, 2018;
Thelin, 2011). This researcher surveyed and interviewed past and sitting university presidents and chancellors to document their perceptions about higher education’s recruiting, selection, and transition to role enactment processes.

The researcher seeks to understand and summarize any barriers revealed by participants about their journey from candidate through their transition into and starting to enact the president or chancellor role. Interviews with a small sample subset of the initially surveyed population allow for more detailed probing. The goal is to interview six to 10 of these initial survey participants via video conferencing to record and transcribe the session (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The time and number of interviews depend on when the researcher reaches data saturation. Saturation is a point where data starts to replicate, collecting new information culminates, and further coding is no longer feasible (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006). This small study is likely to achieve saturation somewhere between six to 10 interviews (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006). The researcher will sense saturation by developing meaning units that help explain: 1) if participants were part an inclusive pool or a single diversity candidate, 2) how the screening for the position is the same or different for participants due to gender, 3) how the interview process may be gender-neutral or gender-biased, and 4) how an organization’s launch actions may be different for women. The aim is to explore what barriers exist in higher education president or chancellor hiring processes and produce findings that might help colleges and universities achieve more gender equity at the top.

**Research Questions**

RQ1. How does gender-bias appear during the recruitment of women candidates for a higher education institution president or chancellor role?
RQ2. How does gender-bias visibly manifest during a higher education institution selection process for president or chancellor?

RQ3. How does a woman president or chancellor experience gender-bias during transition events that communicate her selection as the higher education institution president or chancellor?

Conceptual Framework

Behavioral and organizational theories inform current thought to explain bias encountered by women engaged in the top executive centralized search process. This study considers universities’ and colleges’ presidential and chancellor recruiting, interviewing, and launching operations through the lens of social constructivism. Creswell (2015) described the constructivist approach as less systematic than the grounded theory. The constructivist approach stresses flexible strategies that emphasize the participants’ experience and how they ascribe meaning to a situation (Creswell, 2015). This study uses this lens for gender equity observations to learn ways patriarchal power structures may constrain women (Hirschmann & Regier, 2018; Jamieson, 1995). Political scientists use the term “subjectivity freedom” to express the profound social construction where customer, ideology, law, language, and other social formations produce everyone’s subjectivity (Hirschmann & Regier, 2018). As women progress through organizational processes, they must understand the often-patriarchal organizational culture in higher education and make adjustments to have a realistic chance to successfully compete for the role (O’Connor, 2018; Reis & Grady, 2018).

Research completed by Lakoff (2004) and Tannen, Hamilton, and Schiffrin (2015) using difference theory proposed by Tannen (1990a) found that women are not “naturally” inhibited but have become reticent by the legal and social constraints placed on them. There is also
complimentary research built on work done by Bolman and Deal (2013) that established the benefits of organizational reframing for removing obstacles that inhibit women (Thompson, 2000). The use of Tannen’s (1994) difference theory against a backdrop of Bolman and Deal’s (2013) four-frame organizational leader model provides a conceptual framework that may help explain and describe how some women navigate president and chancellor search processes.

Higher education leaders deal with a myriad of forces in the new millennium that require an expanded set of skills for its top executives. The modern American college president or chancellor came from origins where a club of elite faculty members shared white, male, and financially privileged backgrounds (Thelin, 2011). The college and university top leadership evolved substantially from the 1800s ((Selingo et al., 2017; Thelin, 2011). Governing boards in the 1900s looked for these centralized leaders to be administrators, builders, and fiscal guardians so that they could produce useful graduates for the American economy (Selingo et al., 2017). The year 2000 is a significant point to observe how boards have evolved their thinking in terms of skills, knowledge, and capabilities expected of a college or university president or chancellor (Johnston & Ferrare, 2018; Selingo et al., 2017). The 21st-century is a period where higher education is dealing with technology because it changed the way people learn and work (Lipman-Blumen, 1998; Rhee & Sigler, 2015; Thelin, 2011). These dynamic changes have sharpened certain fiscal constraints caused by increased competition for a decreasing student pool (Selingo et al., 2017; Thelin, 2011). This multitude of challenges calls for college presidents and chancellors to be much more multidimensional leaders dealing with changing disciplines, evolving institutions, and outside stakeholder pressures (Selingo et al., 2017; Thelin, 2011). Research showed that women were particularly adept at this new multidisciplinary role (Carless, 1998; Cubillo & Brown, 2003; Hironimus-Wendt & Dedjoe, 2015; Haslam & Ryan, 2008).
This study will use difference theory to explore how gender-based language dissimilarities shape the visualizations of an organization’s leaders and may introduce bias into the higher education president or chancellor selection process (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Tannen, 1990; Tannen). Existing research shows that many of the challenges women encounter are due to 20th-century ideas of leader identity (Debebe, 2011; de Vries & van den Brink, 2016; Enke, 2014). Leadership theory originated by scholars who used trait-based leadership theories with male descriptors such as assertiveness, competitiveness, and decisiveness to define core leader characteristics and competencies (Enke, 2014; Ibarra et al., 2013; Shein, 1973). Organizations used these theories to train leaders and embedded male biases into their leader development programs as a matter of course (Enke, 2014; Ibarra et al., 2013; Robinson & Lipman-Blumen, 2017; Shein, V., 1973). However, the increasingly networked world of today is changing expectations of leaders in this 21st-century digital era (Ayman & Korabik, 2010, April; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Mack, 2015). The question is whether or not postsecondary HR processes in higher education have kept up with these leader behavior shifts.

This researcher will focus on the qualitative phenomena associated with the intersectionality of the four-frame leader orientation model using the tenets of difference theory to document perceived obstacles felt by participants during a university or college’s president or chancellor hiring process (Longman & Madsen, 2014; Tannen, 1994a; Tannen, 1994b; Tannen, 1990a; Tannen, 1990b). Tannen’s (1990a) difference theory is grounded in theories originating with John Gumperz (1983) who provided the original research on cross-cultural communication. Gumperz (1983) also first identified systemic misunderstanding between men and women due to different linguistic styles and strategies (p. 222). Tannen (1990a; 1990b; 1994a; 1994b; Tannen, Hamilton, & Schiffrin, 2015) presents male and female genders as separate cultures, and she
summarized them into six broad groupings. This researcher will use these categories to assess expectations when evaluating survey and interview data. These sets include:

1. status (male) versus support (female),
2. advice (male) versus understanding (female),
3. information (male) versus feelings (female),
4. orders (male) versus proposals (female),
5. conflict (male) versus compromise (female),

This study uses these classifications as part of the coding process. This research also incorporates this consistent vocabulary into interview questions for rigor and consistency. These classifications allow this researcher to examine the fundamental values of organizational connection with transformational leader alignment by melding this digital era leadership approach with Tannen’s (1990a) difference theory.

**Assumptions**

There are four significant assumptions as part of this research. This study starts with the assumption that there is some bias in university processes selecting university presidents and chancellors since these populations are not representative of the female faculty population (ACE, 2017; NCES, 2017). A complimentary assumption is that these biases are not flagrant because there are a substantial number of state and federal legal and regulatory processes that mandate gender equality in higher education. The third assumption is that participants will be open and transparent because their identity is protected and not published. Finally, this study assumes that this population is a representative of the broader community of women university and college
presidents and chancellors, despite self-selecting to participate in the initial survey and follow-on interview.

**Limitations**

Qualitative studies focus on human interventions for collecting interpretative data. This study limits collection to women who successfully navigated the president or chancellor search process at public or private non-profit higher education institutions. This inquiry does not get perspectives of candidates who did not get similar opportunities and so is not representative of all women in higher education. There are also associated limitations with the information used for meaning-making. Since interviews and observations are the primary sources of data, it is imperative that steps are put in place to mitigate any researcher ambiguity or bias (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Measures to assure validity, reliability, and ethical conduct are the only way to build trust with the participants involved in the study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). There are eight strategies for promoting validity and reliability: 1) triangulation, 2) member checks/respondent validation, 3) adequate engagement in data collection, 4) researcher reflexivity, 5) peer review, 6) audit trail, 7) rich, thick descriptions, and 8) maximum variation (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). These strategies to build trustworthiness and strict adherence to ethical research behaviors are integral aspects of this study’s methodology.

**Scope**

This study explores women’s perspectives of a university or college president or chancellor selection process to learn how possible gender-related biases influence the end-to-end experience. The study population includes past or present women presidents or chancellors of public or private nonprofit colleges or universities that award baccalaureate degrees or higher. The researcher will take advantage of social media and professional organizations to contact
potential participants for this study. The study will collect data from participants who meet the designated criteria and are willing to take the survey with a subset opting to allow time for interviews. This qualitative phenomenological study describes the perceptions of women presidents and chancellors regarding their selection process and analyzes data to find areas where gender-bias may be an obstacle for women.

**Rationale and Significance**

This examination may lead to insights about possible second-generation systemic bias in current traditional higher education institutions’ centralized hiring practices. Also, the elicited themes may help explain how president or chancellor search committees overlook high-quality female candidates for this crucial role. Women leaders still experience a backlash in situations where positional power and gender-incongruent behavior intersect, and they are perceived as unlikeable to both male and female followers (BlackChen, 2015, Ibarra et al., 2013; Schein, 1973). The literature chronicles that women executives in atypical positions experience internal and external discrimination (Hunt, Layton, & Prince, 2015; Ibarra et al., 2013; Shein, V., 1973). Research shows that women are perceived less favorably despite adhering to organizational cultural norms in situations where women behave similarly to male counterparts (Hunt, Layton, & Prince, 2015; Ibarra et al., 2013; Shein, V., 1973). Organizations seeking to expand their candidate pool by creating more significant gender equity should be reflective about their HR structures (Jaschik & Lederman, 2019). The selection boards are dealing with an inflection point from the industrial to the digital-era. As higher education president or chancellor search committees navigate this turbulent time, they should be sensitive about leader traits to create a diverse, and inclusive pool (Johnston, & Ferrare, 2018). It is imperative to explore an organization’s human resource, structural, political, and symbolic constructs to consider how
reframing might improve gender representations (Bolman & Deal, 2013; Bolman & Deal, 2006; Schein, E., 2010).

**Definition of Key Terms**

- **Artifacts:** The meaning of artifacts for the purposes of this study include, but are not limited to, applications, job descriptions, advertisements for search and recruitment, position profiles, templates or guidance to evaluate applicants, templates or advice for applicant interviews, hiring board/search committee guidance memorandums, hiring board/search committee selection criteria, hiring board/search committee demographics, and items from public websites used for communication with stakeholders about the search (Merriam, & Tisdell, 2016).

- **Community of practice:** The group of college and university institutions and their stakeholders. External stakeholders include private foundations, professional organizations, government agencies, regional boards, and alumni. Internal stakeholders include administration, faculty members, staff, and students (Thelin, 2011).

- **Dependent, also known as Traditional Student:** A student who does not meet any of the criteria for the school to designate that person as an independent student. These students are generally under 24, not married, not a professional, and not a veteran. Students who are under 24 cannot be an orphan, a ward of the court, or someone with legal dependents other than a spouse, an emancipated minor or someone who is homeless or at risk of becoming homeless to be identified as dependent or traditional students (Federal Student Aid, n. d.).
• Digital-era leadership: Leaders who are adept at working in more virtual and global teams and use more cooperative leadership styles (Enke, 2014; Sendjaya, 2015; Sugiyama, Cavanagh, van Esch, Billmoria, & Brown, 2016).

• Double-bind: Situations where a subject is presented with two possible options and is punished regardless of the alternative chosen. This paradox leads one to a sense of hopelessness and victimization (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Hall, 1995; Jamieson, 1995; Visser, 2003).

• Independent Students (also known as Non-traditional Student): An independent student is one of the following: at least 24 years old, married, a graduate or professional student, a veteran, a member of the armed forces, an orphan, a ward of the court, or someone with legal dependents other than a spouse, an emancipated minor or someone who is homeless or at risk of becoming homeless (Federal Student Aid, n. d.).

• Industrial-era leadership: The period between the mid-18\textsuperscript{th} and end of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century (Fernández, 2010). These industrial age theorists predominantly use male attributes to describe an executive’s appearance and conduct (BlackChen, 2015, Enke, 2014; Ibarra et al., 2013; Robinson & Lipman-Blumen, 2017; Shein, 1973).

• Intersectionality: The theory expands on Likert’s use of contingency theory to inspect how different types of discrimination interact (Burke, 2006). An intersectional approach takes into account the historical, social, and political context and recognizes the unique experience of the individual based on the intersection of all relevant grounds (Patton, Njoku, & Rogers, 2015). Many women experience discrimination in a completely different way than men. This gender discrimination experienced is related, encouraged, and shaped by external factors such as organizational frameworks.
• Second-Generation Gender Bias: Influences arising from cultural assumptions, organizational structures, practices, and patterns of interaction that benefit men and disadvantage women (Hirschmann, & Regier, 2018; Hogue, 2016; Iberra et al., 2013; Ely, Ibarra, & Kolb, 2011; Krause, 2017).

Conclusion

The purpose of this study is to document women presidents’ and chancellors’ perceptions regarding their centralized search experience as a participant. The study findings inform higher education boards and administrators as they respond to increasingly complex hiring demands. The literature review details the history of women in higher education and provides evidence-based explanations for president and chancellor search barriers involved with the recruiting, interviewing, and launching women college or university president or chancellors. Chapter 3 outlines the methodology used for this research and explains how the researcher collected data for a qualitative review. Chapter 4 presents the collected data and describes the analysis and synthesis behind meaning-making. Chapter 5 explains the findings and recommendations of the study and offers conclusions.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

I ask no favors for my sex. I surrender not our claim to equality. All I ask of our brethren is, that they will take their feet from off our necks and permit us to stand upright on that ground which God designed us to occupy. (Grimke, 1838, p. 10)

Women have long struggled for equality in the workforce. The Chronicle of Higher Education asked former and current women university presidents about their biggest challenge, and the overwhelming response was confronting and overcoming biases and stereotypes (Garcia, 2018, November 30). These biases and stereotypes are real and pervasive barriers for women and hinder them from being selected to lead higher education (HE) organizations (Bilimoria & Lang, 2011). The lack of progress drives leading professional organizations to continue to rally support for better representation of women at all levels of higher education leadership and advocate for explicit recruiting and retention goals (AAC&U, n.d.; ACE, n.d.). The American Council on Education (ACE) (2017) American college president study showed that the community of practice widely supports taking prescriptive action to improve the gender mix of candidates for university president positions. ACE (2017) found that the vast majority of presidents (89%) indicated that it was essential to undertake efforts to eliminate gender bias (Gagliardi, Espinosa, Turk, & Taylor, 2017).

Conversely, there are a significant number of top higher education leaders that are not convinced that there is a problem with the status quo (Ibarra et al., 2013; Lindsay, 1999; Lipmann-Bluman, 1998). Leadership in colleges and universities was mainly a male domain in corporate, political, military, and other sectors of society until quite recently (Thelin, 2011; Wallace et al., 2014). While women have gained increased access to supervisory and middle
management positions, female leaders remain rare as elite leaders and top executives (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly, 2005; Eaglyn & Carli, 2007; Wallace et al., 2014). The male elites did not view female underrepresentation as problematic until female activism raised this issue in the 1980’s (Soloman, 1985). Powerful male elites who influenced political, structural, and human resource processes threatened change efforts then and may do so currently.

This literature review examines the current understanding of the central phenomenon surrounding barriers that female university executives may sense when they are candidates for the pinnacle college or university leadership job. This chapter uses a constructivist lens to delve into the historical background and relevant theories that influence current executive hiring practices in higher education. The subsequent discussion offers new ideas about executive leadership grounded by frameworks such as difference theory, 21st or digital-era leadership, and organizational frame orientation. The resultant conceptual framework is distinctive because it shows how gender bias shapes the hiring and selection instruments used on the path to the university president position. There was an exhaustive review of the body of knowledge surrounding the evolution of leadership theories and how communications differences interfere with women ascending in representative numbers. This work extrapolates from both theory and practice to illustrate how executive leadership behaviors can be misinterpreted and hinder female candidates from selection for top executive leadership roles. Finally, this chapter concludes with a brief overview of a proposed study design that Chapter 3 expands upon in great detail.

Changing higher education with its associated complexities and well-established cultural norms will take systemic efforts to confront barriers to transforming and creating strategies to overcome resistance. Bolman and Deal (2013) offered an approach to revamp institutions challenged by transformational issues using Kotter’s (2012) change model (Table 2.1).
Table 2.1

Reframing Organizational Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Barriers to Change</th>
<th>Essential Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>Anxiety, uncertainty; people feel incompetent and needy</td>
<td>Training to develop new skills; participation and involvement; psychological support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Loss of direction, clarity, and stability; confusion, chaos</td>
<td>Communicating, realigning, and renegotiating formal patterns and policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Disempowerment; conflict between winners and losers</td>
<td>Developing arenas where leaders renegotiate issues, and new coalitions form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>Loss of meaning and purpose; clinging to the past</td>
<td>Creating transition rituals; mourn the past, celebrate the future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 378.

Table 2.1 details organizational symptoms that form obstacles to transformation as well as effective methods to mitigate these challenges. Research done by Bolman and Deal (2013) and Edgar Schein (2010) shows the efficacy of using organizational reframing tools to detect and remove barriers. While there is little research using this approach to investigate gender bias in higher education’s human resource processes, there is much in the literature to suggest the efficacy of using this model in scholarly inquiry (Thompson, 2000).

American higher education has experienced a long-term challenge attaining a representative gender mix for faculty and executives (AAC&U, n.d.; ACE, n.d.; ACE, 2017; Bichsel, & Chesney, 2017, February). Women gained parity in both attendance and college-graduation rates for traditional student cohorts born in 1960, and the female advantage continues to present (ACE 2019; Goldin & Katz, 1999). Data from the National Center for Education
Statistics (NCES) (2019a) indicates that 56 percent of the total undergraduate enrollment (9.4 million students) were women. However, men represent the leadership majority holding 53 percent of tenured faculty positions, 70 percent of president roles, and more than 80 percent of chancellor level jobs (Goldin & Katz, 1999; NCES, 2019a; NCES, 2019b; Shepard, 2017). Women continue to lag behind men achieving top executive roles in academia despite receiving more degrees at every level for over twenty years (DeFrank-Cole et al.; Lindsay, 1999).

This study focused on university president and chancellor leadership because of its unique centralized hiring process. This chapter reveals current thoughts and critical perspectives from the community of practice to discern relevant concepts, theory, and data surrounding the executive hiring process. Examining recent scholarly material offers a reference point for what is known and where there are gaps in shared understanding. This review highlights research gaps as they pertain to how and where to hire executives in representational proportions. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the conceptual framework that is used to explore critical higher education HR inflection points that may inject gender bias when selecting higher education presidents or chancellors. The intent is to identify those organizational barriers that hinder women from achieving top executive leadership roles in equal numbers. As Bolman and Deal (2006) warned, “changing always creates division and conflict among competing interest groups. Successful change requires an ability to frame issues, build coalitions, and establish areas in which disagreements can be forged into workable pacts” (p. 456). It is essential to examine and anticipate where barriers exist in the organizational change process to provide women an equitable opportunity to climb academia’s career ladder.
Women in Higher Education

The purpose of this phenomenological study is to engage women who have served or still serve as presidents or chancellors of public and private nonprofit colleges and universities to explore their experiences with gender-bias during recruitment, selection, and transition enactment. Data from the National Center for Educational Statistics (2016, December) showed that U.S. women have achieved near parity at 49% of the university faculty as a whole. Despite the appearance of a balanced population mix, there is less equity for women as they ascend academia’s career ladder. The 2016 data shows that women constituted 51% of assistant professors, 44% of associate professors, and only 31% of full professors (NCES, 2016, December). There is less data detailing male to female ratios about pipeline roles such as chief academic officer, deans, and provosts. ACE (n.d.) provides a 2013 snapshot that reported women constituting 41 percent of CAOs, 72 percent of chiefs of staff, 28 percent of deans of academic colleges and 36 percent of executive vice presidents. Examining how successful female candidates move through organizational hiring processes may help others do the same, ultimately reaching numbers proportionate to the demographics.

The current university leadership pipeline produces an unequal number of women as viable higher education president and chancellor candidates (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Enke, 2014; Hironimus-Wendt & Dejoe, 2015; Longman & Madson, 2014; Soloman, 1985). This researcher will review contemporary scholarly thought about these challenges with a focus on the intersectionality between the theories of collaborative leadership and gender-bias using difference theory terms. This researcher used theories about communications differences and the four-frame leader orientation to analyze survey and interview material. Analyzing the structured initial survey will help in the development of questions for the semi-structured interview with a
subset sample from the survey participants. These interviews of serving women university presidents and chancellors may expand upon data uncovered during the invitational survey review (Creswell, 2015). This qualitative data may uncover emerging ideas about impediments to a reasonable split of men and women taking university leadership. The challenge is to discover trends from each participant’s experience and categorize how they see organizational barriers manifesting and preventing women from getting hired in equal numbers as executive leaders.

Universities find themselves in a competitive environment that demands increasingly global, multicultural, connected, and collaborative skill sets from faulty and leaders (Ayman & Korabik, 2010, April; Hsieh & Liou, 2018; Lindsey, 1999; Lipman-Blumen, 1998; Schein, V., 2002; Tannen, 1994). Higher education needs the unique and data supported productivity that women leaders contribute (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Hsieh & Liou, 2018; Lindsey, 1999; Lipman-Blumen, 1998; Schein, V., 2002). However, even though women have made progress moving through the leadership pipeline in the past two decades, barriers to reaching the top job remain (Badura, Grijalva, Newman, Yan, & Jeon, 2018; DeFrank-Cole et al., 2014; Hsieh & Liou, 2018; Ibarra et al., 2013). The purpose of this study is to examine the organizational barriers women face that impede them from achieving representative numbers as university and college top executives. Current research points toward persistent pro-male bias in current HR processes such as hiring practices and professional development (Badura et al., 2018; Ely, Ibarra, & Kolb, 2011; Lindsay, 1999; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). However, gender bias assertions are generalized or anecdotal. This lack of specificity creates a gap in understanding as to the interplay of gender bias on organizational frames associated with executive leadership selection. The community of practice may benefit from studying higher education HR processes specific to
executive search and hiring to see if more gender-neutral approaches would potentially balance higher education’s top leadership gender mix.

A topic of similar importance is considering the interconnections among general leadership theories, executive leadership theory, social role theories, and organizational framework theory. The intersectionality of these areas as they pertain to the president and chancellor search process provides data as to university culture, values, and policies that may influence their selection criteria. The analysis of theories about individuals intersecting with those dealing with organizations helps frame the inquiry of bias in the president or chancellor search effort. This chapter will make use of the pertinent literature to offer a conceptual framework using a constructivist lens for qualitative inquiry surrounding university hiring processes for presidents or chancellors. This discussion of theory and research combine to fill in the gaps for the community of practice by helping to explain previously unknown barriers women encounter at the intersectionality of executive leadership, gender bias, and the organizational frameworks.

**Evolving Leadership Theory**

Technology and the ensuing globalization ushered in at the start of the 21st century continue to influence organizations to move away from traditional command and control types of leadership commonly characterized by male descriptors (DeFrank-Cole et al., 2014; Lindsay, 1999; Mack, 2015; Rhee & Sigler, 2015; Schein, V., 2002). Digital era research data showed organizations were more productive, and employees felt more positive when leaders use more inclusive and collaborative styles (Bass & Riggio, 2006; O’Roark, 2015; Rhee & Sigler, 2015). This body of research supports a shift where organizations embrace more cooperative types of leadership with feminine descriptors (Enke, 2014; Sugiyama et al., 2016; Wambura Ngunjiri,
McLean, & Beigi, 2016). Progressive and global organizations are attempting to both recruit and develop leaders with more collaborative styles for operational leadership and transformational efforts (Debebe, 2011; de Vries & van den Brink, 2016; Enke, 2014; Wambura et al., 2016). It is striking that studies looking at collective leadership approaches show that women are still perceived less positively than male counterparts regardless of leadership style (Enke, 2014; Hogue, 2016; Hsieh & Liou, 2018; Jackson, 2017; Sendjaya, 2015; Shein, 1973; Showunmi et al., 2015; Tannen, 1990). This negative perception, commonly referred to as second-generation gender bias, remains a barrier to women being afforded opportunities to take on increasingly demanding transformational leadership roles at the top of their profession (Preston-Cunningham, Elbert, & Dooley, 2017; Rhee & Sigler, 2015; Shein, 1973). The covert nature of gender bias and its impact on institutional change processes creates a greater need to ensure women have opportunities to lead and employ these collaborative skillsets (Bolman & Deal, 2013; Enke, 2014; Schein, E., 2010).

**Industrial Era Leadership Theory**

Formative thought about leadership theory taught widely in higher education traces its roots to male-dominated fields such as the military, politics, and business professions (Ely, et al., 2011; Hogue; 2016; Moorosi, 2013). Scholarly work surrounding leadership theory dovetails with the Second Industrial Revolution, which is generally accepted to be between the mid-1800s through the end of the twentieth century (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). Theorists from this time identified general leader behavior and traits. Soldiers, political leaders, people in business, and scholars read classic works by Clausewitz, Machiavelli, and Carnegie to glean leadership theory and approaches. Some scholars refer to this approach to leadership as the “great man” view of twentieth-century leadership doctrines (Burns, 1978). This idealized ideal imbued leadership
frameworks with inherently masculine characterizations and models (Enke, 2014; Rhee & Sigler, 2014; Shapiro et al., 2011; Schein, V., 1973). Near the end of the twentieth century, scholarly leadership literature shifted from historical description to a more focused analysis of specific leadership behaviors (Clerkin, 2015; Hambrick, Finkelstein, & Mooney, 2005; Mack, 2015). The three most examined theories of this era include transactional, transformational, and authentic leadership (Ely, et al., 2011; Hogue; 2016; Moorosi, 2013).

Transactional is the most muscular and hence masculine of industrial era leadership approaches and is characterized by leaders dominating followers (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). Transactional Leadership is a contingency-based approach prevalent in western cultures where “…one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things” (Burns, 1978, p. 19). This type of leadership is directive in nature as the leader mobilizes all resources to reach immediate objectives. These leaders also control or mediate the formal communications media to manipulate public opinion, the media, or both (Burns, 1978, p. 262). Transactional leadership relies on profoundly influencing an organization’s symbolic frame involving culture, meaning, metaphor, ritual, ceremony, and hero stories (Bolman & Deal, 2013). These autocratic leaders create a power-oriented organization dominated by masculine characteristics (Schein, E., 2010). Power is part of the political frame where the leader manages conflict, competition, and politics (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Female leaders are often reluctant to use this masculine power and contingency reward model because they encounter negative repercussions, known as the “double bind,” where followers view them as powerful but unlikeable (BlackChen, 2015, Ibarra et al., 2013; Rhee & Sigler, 2014; Shapiro et al., 2011, Schein, V., 1973).
Most women using industrial era styles gravitate toward transformational or authentic styles (Eagly, 2005; Rhee & Sigler, 2015). The characteristics found in transformational leadership theory are considered more gender-balanced than transactional approaches for women leaders (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Hollander & Offermann, 1990). Most scholars describe transformational leadership using the nine traits of charisma/idealized influence; inspirational motivation; intellectual stimulation; individualized consideration/attention; tied to a hierarchical position; change oriented; goal oriented; management of meaning/persuasion; and morality influenced purpose (Bass, 1985). This less direct and more collegial approach is attractive to women who more readily adopt this leadership style (Gumperz, 1983; Lakeoff, 2004; Tannen, Hamilton, & Schiffrin, 2015).

Organizations searching for transformational leaders are achievement oriented with a culture focused on achieving task results most often to introduce profound change (Haslam & Ryan, 2008; Schein, E., 2010). Usually, these institutions seek out transformational leadership during inflection points due to transition or crisis that forces reinvention (Haslam & Ryan, 2008; Hironimus-Wendt & Dedjoe, 2015). Interestingly, agencies appoint more female than male transformational leaders during these periods of change, where the job has an increased risk of failure and criticism. Coined the "glass cliff," the research indicated that women transformational leaders achieved top leadership positions for predominately failing institutions (Haslam & Ryan, 2008). This phenomenon of hiring women during change or crisis is consistent with universities and colleges selecting women to lead during times of profound challenge (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Longman & Madsen, 2014; Madsen, 2011; Madsen, 2008). These studies demonstrate that women face disadvantages using the transformational approach due to adverse reactions by stakeholders, especially in contrast to male peers.
Industrial era leadership approaches evolved as women moved into more senior leadership positions, and Eagly (2005) discusses how the authentic leadership style offered a more congruent style for women. Literature published after the year 2000 provides various versions of authentic leadership theory. However, most studies articulate and describe the authentic leadership as transparent, ethical, and motivated by self-improvement and self-verification of themselves and others (Eagly, 2005; Kapasi, Sang, & Sitko, 2016; Rhee & Sigler, 2014). Authentic leadership theory is described as an integrative model of gender, culture, and leadership that blend into leader identity which promotes more collaborative and communal interaction between leaders and followers (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Showunmi et al., 2015). Women in higher education use authentic leadership as a way to describe a collaborative style more and circumvent being labeled transactional or transformational (Krause, 2017; Longman & Madsen, 2014; Madsen, 2011; Moorosi, 2013). However, authentic leadership is an expression of self and a social construct rather than a method with repeatable traits. There can be situations where a woman leads using agentic behaviors, and a man influences through consensus, and both rightfully self-describe as using an authentic leadership approach despite these styles being gender incongruent (Kapasi et al., 2016). Authentic leadership describes using a style that is congruent with one’s sensibilities and not necessarily genders (Rhee & Sigler, 2015). Research confirms that if women use an authentic method that is gender incongruent, then they will still experience the double bind also known as second-generation gender bias when enacting this kind of leadership (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Kapasi et al., 2016; Schein, V., 1973).

**Digital Age Leadership Theory**

The maturation of the world wide web over the past two decades delivered unprecedented connectedness and required organizations to adapt to a more networked and global environment.
The influence of greater globalization makes higher education seek out improved communications, the desire for enhanced collaboration, and the impact of moving multicultural ideas at the speed of thought (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Jackson, 2017; Moorosi, 2013; Sendjaya, 2015). Leadership has changed as institutions have become more multicultural and automated (Mack, 2015). Studies show that virtual and global teams are more successful when leaders use more cooperative leadership styles (Enke, 2014; Sendjaya, 2015; Sugiyama et al., 2016). Collaborative and consensus-driven leadership traits most often are described using feminine characteristics (Haslam & Ryan, 2008; Jackson, 2017; Shapiro et al., 2011). Servant Leadership theory is a similarly embraced approach (Sendjaya, Sarros, & Santora, 2008). The traits that classically fit servant leadership include voluntary subordination, authentic self, covenantal relationship, responsible morality, transcendental spirituality, and transforming influence (Sendjaya et al., 2008). Similarly, Participative Leadership (Rhee & Sigler, 2014) or Ubuntu leadership (Ngunjiri, 2016) share the valuing of the common good but overlay this ethic with local values. Despite the subtle variation, the notions of collaboration, collective interests, and serving the needs of others are central components valued by twenty-first-century organizations (Badura et al., 2018; Mack, 2015).

Transformation of university HR processes requires new information era leadership approaches that are gender neutral and multicultural. Forms of collaborative leadership that concentrate on organizational outcomes show the highest efficacy (Hsieh & Liou, 2018; Rhee & Sigler, 2015; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Collaborative leadership is about organizational outcomes which made it different from trait-based servant leadership (Sendjaya, 2015; Sendjaya, Sarros, & Santora, 2008). Sendjaya (2015) defined servant leadership as a holistic approach with leader traits of service orientation, authenticity focus, relational emphasis, moral courage, spiritual
motivation, and transforming influence. The ethics of care most heavily influences this leader philosophy (DeFrank-Cole et al., 2014). Servant leadership is different from collaborative leadership because the former focuses on the follower while the latter centers on achieving organizational objectives (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Hsieh & Liou, 2018; Rhee & Sigler, 2015).

The literature reviewed shows traditional leadership theories as behaviors that help leaders achieve outcomes. Burns (1978) and later theorists describe transactional leadership theories as transactional behavior between leader and follower (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Fu, Tsui, Liu, & Li, 2010; Hollander & Offermann, 1990). Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) also advanced transformational leadership which centers on leaders facilitating changes in the mission, vision, value, and culture (Bass, Hollander & Offermann, 1990; Burns, 1978; Carless, 1998). This more agentic and masculine leadership is part of implicit general perceptions of leadership (Burns, 1978; Sugiyama et al., 2016). Conversely, the evolution of collaborative leadership theories emphasized working with groups inside and outside the organization thus being more inclusive and appealing to women leaders (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Lindsay, 1999; Sugiyama et al., 2016).

Collaborative leadership is not about spirituality traits or customer-focused collaborative business outcomes (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Lindsay, 1999; Rhee & Sigler, 2015). Some misuse the idea of collaborative leadership as a customer-focused point of view. Collaborative leadership is different because it focuses on leader actions and behaviors that support achieving the best outcomes for individuals, teams, and organizations (Hsieh & Lieu, 2018; O'Roark, 2015). Collaborative leadership, which is also called catalytic, integral, adaptive, or facilitative leadership, has power sharing among groups, departments, or organizations as its central emphasis (Hsieh & Lieu, 2018; Rhee & Sigler, 2015). The evolving digital era leader approach
also promotes structural goals while planning for the future direction of organizational success (O’Roark, 2015; Rhee & Sigler, 2015). The collaborative leadership philosophy and its organizational focus align well with feminine styles and makes women leaders very effective as university and college presidents (Bornstein, 2007).

**Executive Leadership Theory**

It is instructive to understand how executive leadership theory differs from general leadership theory while exploring why women are underrepresented as executive leaders in higher education. The current body of knowledge centering on executive theory literature is sparse. The small number of studies offer anecdotal support rather than research data describing how it differs from more generally applied leadership models. This dearth of scholarly research defining the unique behaviors expected of an executive is another area worthy of more study. It is fortunate that Chester Barnard (1938) provided foundational work to build on for the next generation of inquiry around executive leadership. An American industrial-era theorist, Barnard (1938) put the executive as a central element of an organization in his theory. This movement from historical description to research as to how organizations shape the behavior of those who lead them changed how the community of practice viewed executive leadership (Badura et al., 2018; Mack, 2015).

Barnard (1938) made an indelible mark in the psyche of today’s corporate executives through his treatise on management theory and organizational studies. Barnard’s (1938) central point was that an executive could not exist without an organization to lead. Organizations existence is defined by three key elements that include: (1) communication; (2) willingness to serve; and (3) common purpose (Barnard, 1938). This executive theory viewed executives as extensions of organizations charged with guiding their efficiency and effectiveness. Executive
leaders were responsible for activities such as communicating the purpose, setting goals, allocating resources, controlling and coordinating people, and adjudicating incentives (Barnard, 1938). Barnard (1938) fundamentally considered organizational control to be a central executive function. He explained, “If the work of an organization is not successful, if it is inefficient, if it cannot maintain the services of its personnel, the conclusion is …the executive department directly related, are at fault” (Barnard, 1938, p. 223). Yukl (2010) elaborated on Barnard’s ideas and noted that executives, more than any other leader, deal with organizational forces that shape leader action and behavior. Theorists in this area suggest that it is incumbent on the top leader in an organization to control resources and influence behavior to achieve institutional goals and objectives (Burns, 1938; Ngunjiri, 2016; Moorosi, 2013; Yukl, 2010).

Barnard (1938) explained that a top leader’s moral compass connects that leader to the organization's people and is a crucial part of influence. He articulated qualities that provided foundational elements for more generalized leadership theories. These qualities included the idea that, "executive positions (a) imply a complex morality, and (b) require a high capacity for responsibility, (c) under conditions of activity, necessitating (d) commensurate general and specific technical abilities as a moral factor" (Barnard, 1938, p. 272). Industrial era leadership theorists consistently reiterated similar behaviors described by Barnard in the subsequent models they offered (Bass, 1985; Clerkin, 2015; Fu & Bergeon, 2011; Schein, E., 2010). However, despite the gender-neutral language driven by organizational need, the historical symbology of leaders used by these authors was uniformly masculine. The pervasive use of male examples reinforces masculine leadership symbology for executive leadership, thus inferring that it was, and remains, a realm for men.
The ensuing industrial era researchers built upon the foundation for an executive theory that Barnard (1938) created by expanding his list of executive behaviors. Burns (1978) most notably leveraged Barnard’s (1938) ideas and interspersed his political science background to describe the political, social, and psychological dimensions of leadership. Burns model distinguishes between what he called "transactional" and "transforming" leadership.

Transactional leadership "occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for an exchange of valued things" (Burns, 1978, p. 19). The best way to describe this type of leadership is as an exchange between leader and follower. Said another way, the follower feels that he or she gets something from supporting the leader.

Transformational leadership differs by having an uplifting or moral dimension (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Yukl, 2010). Transformational leadership “occurs when one or more persons engage with the others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (p. 20). Burns (1978) describes transforming leadership in symbolic terms using four basic categories: intellectual, reform, revolutionary, and heroic leadership. It is critical to note that Burns (1978) established that ascribing masculine ideas to his theory is to misread his intention. To that point, he wrote,

The male bias is reflected in the false conception of leadership as mere command and control. As leadership comes properly to be seen as a process of leaders engaging and mobilizing human needs and aspirations of followers, women will be more readily recognized as leaders and men will change their own leadership styles. (Burns, 1978, p. 50)

This ubiquitous use of male examples by major leadership thinkers in the industrial age reinforced male leader symbology (Barnard, 1938; Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). This gender bias
places women at a disadvantage relative to men and suggests causality for men continuing to hold more powerful positions than women (Hogue, 2016). Institutions of higher education want to depict themselves as gender neutral but have gendered organizational processes that perpetuate pro-masculine biases (Enke, 2014; Ridgeway 1997).

The industrial era theorists who followed Barnard (1938) and Burns (1978) expanded both theoretical and masculine notions. Bass (1985), a significant theorist in the late industrial era, exemplified and summarized how industrial era leadership scholars articulate executive leadership. Bass (1985) characterized transformational leaders as synonymous with executives and necessary to achieve organizational outcomes. Bass (1985) used historical examples and case studies to show that executives required nine attributes: charisma/idealized influence; inspirational motivation; intellectual stimulation; individualized consideration/attention; a connection to a hierarchical position; change orientation; goal oriented; management of meaning/persuasion; and morality influenced purpose. Like Barnard (1938) and Burns (1978), his case studies and research invariably centered on western, Caucasian male populations. The result was that masculine symbology is deeply embedded in the leadership survey and interview instruments and, thus influences research findings. One can see that those who learned executive leadership from these industrial age theorists predominantly use male attributes to describe a top executive (BlackChen, 2015, Enke, 2014; Ibarra et al., 2013; Robinson & Lipman-Blumen, 2017; Shein, 1973). However, the advent of the world wide web in the digital era brought forth greater connectedness and globalization thus setting new conditions that challenged this male executive ideal (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Mack, 2015; Rhee & Sigler, 2015; Schein, V., 2002).
The Evolution of Women Leaders in Higher Education

American higher education started as a purely male endeavor, and so all of its organizational frames are steeped in masculine symbology, politics, and structures (Goldin & Katz, 1999; Thelin, 2011). It was not until the start of the industrial era that women could attend a college. Thelin (2011) detailed that no women received a degree until the introduction of women-only institutions starting in 1800. Higher education allowed women to enroll just as they also pivoted from liberal arts to more specialized education and training (Goldin & Katz, 1999; Thelin, 2011). The need for faculty grew with this explosion of increasingly narrow academic disciplines and universities could not keep up with the demand (Goldin & Katz, 1999; Thelin, 2011). This pressing need for more faculty and graduates opened the door for African Americans and women, though only in colleges expressly designed for them. Colleges and universities changed from centers of learning to centers for research by the turn of the century (Goldin & Katz, 1999). Governing boards now wanted its modern university to be a collection of higher education services brought together under one roof to provide the community with a trained workforce (Thelin, 2011; Goldin & Katz, 1999).

The post-World War II era emphasized growth to mitigate the negative impacts of this global war. This emphasis on manufacturing accelerated industrialization and increased the need for more technological research which benefitted minority students and faculty who were hired to fill the gap (Lindsay, 1999; Thelin, 2011; Goldin & Katz, 1999). Public sector higher education (HE) institutions, in particular, became more highly specialized over time to meet the demand for graduates skilled in the expanding scientific fields (Thelin, 2011). State-level college and university governing boards established separate public teaching, technical, and agricultural institutions for blacks and women during this time (Goldin & Katz, 1999). The United States’
desire to speed its industrialization pressured public institutions to open up integrated attendance to produce the much-needed larger specialized professional workforce by the mid-twentieth century (Goldin & Katz, 1999; Thelin, 2011). This expansion changed these universities and allowed for mixed students and faculty populations (Goldin & Katz, 1999; Thelin, 2011). More women were allowed into most HE institutions and by the 1950s women represented at least 10% or more of the post-secondary student population (U.S. Census Bureau, Women in the Workforce, n.d.). However, while entering college had opened up to some degree, there remained significant barriers for women entering the academic profession (Thelin, 2011; Madsen, 2011; Goldin & Katz, 1999). It would take prescriptive policy action that fosters equality in hiring at the institution, state, and federal levels to accelerate women as leaders in higher education (Jackson, 2017; Mack, 2015).

Women had a more significant opportunity to become university faculty and staff after the U.S. Congress passed Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and made employment discrimination unlawful by "race, color, religion, sex, or national origin" (Civil Rights Act, 1964). Academia’s power elite was white and male and had little motivation to change the status quo. However, even with prescriptive legislation, the reality is that Academia’s top leaders still do not look like its female majority of students (Jackson, 2017; Mack, 2015). That dissonance between university faculty and leadership with its majority constituency requires a review of scholarly thought surrounding higher education gender bias. More specifically, it is critical to review the research to see if it sheds light on executive leader visualization to see if higher education has evolved its executive recruiting and selection practices for the digital age. Since the HR frame covers a vast number of areas, this study limited the inquiry to obstacles women
encounter during college or university president or chancellor recruiting, hiring, and retention processes.

Numerous studies document the lack of gender equity at the top of academia. Women face significant headwinds when applying for executive roles in the current post-secondary environment. The four most substantial barriers include:

1. Men enjoy status processes that favor them for leadership role selections (Wolfinger, Mason, & Goulden, 2008; Ridgeway, 1997; Williams, 1992, August).

2. Some executives do not believe there are biased referential processes (Wolfinger et al., 2008; Ridgeway, 1997; Williams, 1992, August).

3. Masculine leadership traits are deemed most valuable by hiring managers (Schein 1973; Williams, 1992, August; Schein, 2001).

4. It takes an average of more than 22 years in higher education to achieve executive roles such as university president (Wallace et al., 2014).

It is remarkable to note that these four issues align to categories expressed by Bolman and Deal’s (2016) model, which parses categories into political, structural, symbolic, and human resource frames. Bolman and Deal (2013) explained that "framing involves matching mental maps to circumstances" (p. 12). The studies that used this organizational frame produced data showing a pervasive masculine preference in current post-secondary executive leaders' mental maps (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Mack, 2015; Rhee & Sigler, 2015; Schein, V., 2002). This "man as leader" symbology injects gender bias into organizational hiring processes.

Psychologists such as Ridgeway (1997) and sociologists such as Jamieson (1995) built on the generalized data about gender-bias and conducted studies that examined the phenomenon where a crisis or similar inflection point overcame organizational resistance to hiring women as
top leaders. Ridgeway (1997) explained organizations having a predominately homogenous leader lacked any urgency to change without a compelling event. Jamieson (1995) noted that higher education institutions denied women professorships and inhibited their research and recognition. The current literature continues to reinforce these findings. Jackson (2017) documented the double-bind continued to cause women to lag behind their male peers due to negative perceptions documented by student reviews. Haslam and Ryan (2008) showed evidence that women are over-represented in precarious leadership positions. These findings point to a need for prescriptive policy actions to help the organizations eliminate bias barriers that women face. The recency of these studies suggests that the lack of support in academia persists and reduces the available talent pool for positions at all levels of university leadership.

Jackson (2017) makes the point that colleges and universities should consider instituting policies to mitigate any backlash women leaders encounter when placed in situations where positional power and gender incongruent behavior intersect. This intersectionality creates a circumstance where people involved in the hiring action perceive the female candidate as less likable and suitable for an executive role (BlackChen, 2015; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Schein, V., 2002). Regrettably, the result is that the college or university hiring systems may not select a possible superior candidate because of a lack of policies that sufficiently assure equity are not in place (Bilimoria & Lang, 2011). Research on this matter shows that affirmative actions may compensate for the distortion discrimination imposes on the selection of candidates and incent hiring managers to give women a second look (Niederle, Segal, & Vesterlund, 2013). It is crucial that researchers explore those organizational frames where gender bias remains and seek ways to reframe hiring processes that continue to produce systemic female underrepresentation at the executive level.
Higher Education Executive Leadership History and Evolution

The earliest American higher education institutions were founded by politically, economically, and socially elite men to educate the next generation of elite men to sustain excellence for public service and private enterprise (Thelin, 2011). American universities emulated British institutions in many respects (Thelin, 2011). However, the expectations and empowerment of the American university president differed considerably (Thelin, 2011). European institutions diffused authority to their faculty, often using rotational systems (Thelin, 2011). Local boards founded American colleges, and it was these entities that created a strong President role where power was centralized (Thelin, 2011; Goldin & Katz, 1999). These state, local, and private governing bodies used financial support as a means to make sure that the President preserved their symbolic, structural, and political values at the college (Thelin, 2011). This very American way of education had profound consequences on institutional administrative and educational practices and policy (Thelin, 2011; Madsen, 2011; Goldin & Katz, 1999). These effects are still felt today in higher education symbolic, political, structural, and human resource frames.

The public and nonprofit college and university of today continue to be shaped by these external governing and bureaucratic forces that provide resources which are predominately male (Shepherd, 2017). These institutions often ended up penalizing the women leaders they try to recruit due to gender incongruent behavior (Jackson, 2017; Hogue, 2016; Longman & Madsen, 2014). This bias against women who use agentic expression is not a new challenge. Bass (1985) noted this particular challenge of the public university,

Instead of leadership which includes vision, individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation for the university's goals of conservation, dissemination,
and creation of information, a university's executives must focus other pressing issues. Often these HE leaders over-focus on items such as the use of the budget process to practice management-by-exception causing them to practice contingent reward. Much leadership is actually substituted for by organizational mechanisms such as mandated committee reviews, collegial decision-making, and tenure regulations. (p. 160)

A savvy university or college president or chancellor who is interested in longevity will remain responsive to the mandates of the governing board who hired him or her. This economic and political influence makes the board a powerful entity that figures mightily into the operation and culture of the institution. How a higher education board develops the job description, searches for highly qualified candidates, and interviews nominees for the President's role is not widely studied. There is not sufficient data to definitively point to this part of the human resource frame as an area that injects bias when hiring university presidents or chancellors. This knowledge gap about a critical executive role in Academia is worthy of more considerable investigation.

Notions about leadership style and approaches changed with the advent of the internet. Leadership theorists in the digital era offer updated frameworks based upon influences due to globalization and organization multiculturalism (Cubillo & Brown, 2003; Gagliardi et al., 2017; Wambura Ngunjiri, McLean, & Beigi, 2016). Organizations are expected to deal with a worldwide community of practice that interacts at the speed of the internet. Twenty-first-century researchers respond to the expansion of expectations by addressing gaps in the industrial era executive model. The information era leadership researcher is using data from adjacent areas such as psychology, anthropology, religion, and sociology to describe executive behaviors,
values, and actions (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Robnett, 2015, July 24; Yukl, 2010; Wheatley, 2006).

This intersectionality of adjacent field data with leadership and management research produced a more gender-neutral list of expected executive behaviors. These digital era executive leader behaviors include strategic decision-making, formulating a vision, strategic planning, managing through complexity, market expertise, leadership experience, multifaceted communications skills, perseverance, confidence, cognitive ability, listening skills, creativity, and fostering innovation (Dragoni, Oh, Vankatwyk, & Tesluk, 2011; Fernández, 2010; Fu, Tsui, Liu, & Li, 2010; Hambrick et al., 2005; Weiss, 2006). Psychologists Ayman and Korabik (2010) noted that there are five superordinate, universal personality traits of neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness that are widely accepted as gender-neutral. The digital era executive traits fall into these five categories and may provide higher education presidents and chancellors with an opportunity to reframe human resource, structural, political, and symbolic frames using gender-neutral terms.

**How Gender Bias May Manifest in Organizational Frames**

Globally relevant higher education institutions must embrace distance relationships, fluid leadership structures, decentralized power constructs, and different cultural norms. Unfortunately, many organizations use industrial era leadership models with associated male agentic behaviors which do not provide the requisite skills needed to lead in the digital era (Brands & Fernandez-Mateo, 2017; Ibarra et al., 2013; Rhee & Sigler, 2014). Ayman and Korabik (2010) found that this masculine image of a leader is detrimental to women’s ascent into leadership positions. This potentially damaging effect to women’s advancement is the reason behind organizations shifting toward more cooperative types of leadership with feminine
descriptors because members feel more valued when leaders are collaborative (Enke, 2014; Sugiyama et al., 2016). Mack (2015) performed a complementary study noting how globalization created an imperative for organizations to move leader training away from agentic and toward collaborative behaviors that strongly encourage relationships. Mack (2015) and similar studies suggested that women benefit as organizations shift to hiring more collaborative leaders.

Progressive and global organizations recruit and develop leaders with more collaborative styles opening the door for more women leaders (Debebe, 2011; Enke, 2014; de Vries, & van den Brink, 2016; Wambura Ngunjiri, McLean, & Beigi, 2016). However, research that started with Virginia Schien (1973) and currently replicated by her and others still indicates that women are viewed less positively than male counterparts regardless of leadership approach (Enke, 2014; Schein, V., 1973; Sendjaya, 2015; Showunmi et al., 2015; Hogue, 2016; Jackson, 2017). This negative perception referred to as second-generation gender bias remains an HR barrier to women being afforded opportunities to take on increasingly demanding transformational leadership roles at the top of their profession (Preston-Cunningham, Elbert, & Dooley, 2017; Rhee & Sigler, 2015; Schein, 1973). Today’s highly connected multicultural environment requires higher education organizations to be more prescriptive in both hiring and retention practices if they are to promote and retain leaders who are substantively different from their industrial age predecessors (Ely, et al., 2011; Miller, Quealy, & Sanger-Katz, 2018, April 24; Ridgeway, 1997).

The field of higher education continues to struggle to produce gender-balanced or neutral policies, processes, and procedures that improve the number of women reaching the president or chancellor role as biases changes over time (ACE, 2017). Gender bias in leadership has changed over time from first-generation, overt bias, and discrimination to second-generation, covert bias
(Ely et al., 2011; Hogue, 2016). The literature about secondary bias against women executives suggests both internal and external factors influence perceptions of women leaders.

The current literature documents a consistent representation near 30% for women presidents and at about 20% for women chancellor populations from 2000 - 2017 (Gagliardi et al., 2017). Ibarra, Ely, and Kolb (2013) found that "despite a lack of discriminatory intent, subtle, ‘second-generation’ forms of workplace gender bias can obstruct the leadership identity development of a company’s entire population of women..., and thus maintains the status quo" (p. 64). Heilman (2001) studied leader performance reports and found the correlation between universally negative reactions to women leaders who use behavior typically reserved for men and these women receiving less favorable performance reports. Heilman’s (2001) work helps explain the phenomenon that Lindsay (1999) described where white males were favored in all areas of higher education regardless of the indicator used in the study. Badura, Grijalva, Newman, Yan, and Jeon (2018) performed a recent higher education study that showed women leaders still struggle with preconceptions which put them at a disadvantage with committees, boards, and self-managing teams.

Similarly, Eagly and Carli (2007) presented data that unveils consistent bias for hiring male leaders even in women-dominated fields such as education, nursing, and social work. Men get promoted faster than their female peers despite encountering discriminatory behaviors (Hunt, Layton, & Prince, 2015; Tang, Zhang, Cryan, Metzger, Zheng, & Zhao, 2017; Williams, 1992). Understanding that organizations and executive leaders are intertwined, it is essential to look at the political, structural, HR, and symbolic factors that influence hiring practices that decelerate women candidates.
Organizational frames reflect an institution’s cultural biases (Bolman & Deal, 2013; Schein, E., 2010). Gender biases constitute a significant obstacle for women getting hired into executive roles in higher education (Bowring, 2004; Wallace et al., 2014). One of the most widely regarded gender bias theorists is Virginia Schein (1973) who explained this phenomenon as, "...all else being equal, the perceived similarity between the characteristics of successful middle managers and men in general increases the likelihood of a male rather than a female being selected or promoted to a managerial position..." (p. 99). Universities and the community of practice benefit by exploring the obstructions women encounter as they progress toward the top leadership rank. If researchers discern specific executive hiring impediments, they may be able to use insights gleaned to remove many obstacles that undermine women from reaching high level HE positions in representative numbers.

Organizations in a variety of fields are giving attention to the rising profile of successful women leaders. Higher education may consider following this example as a means to potentially increase relevancy and competitiveness (Mack, 2015). Highly competitive organizations are paying attention to recent research showing the need for women's uniquely collaborative talents (Ely et al., 2011; Hogue, 2016; Krause, 2017; Rhee & Sigler, 2015). Collaborative skills are increasingly valued as markets become progressively competitive, and multicultural institutions have more diverse workforces (Lindsay, 1999; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990; Schein, E., 2010). These pressures combine with pervasive digitization and globalization and become forces too powerful to ignore for boards trying to retain the status quo.

The digital era and the demonstrated value of women executive leaders are influencing universities and colleges to consider some intervention to make sure there are no processes that disadvantage minority leader populations such as women (Hogue, 2016; Ngunjiri, 2016;
The need for talented higher education executives with new digital era skillsets also is causing boards to make gender diversity a priority (Gagliardi et al., 2017). Institutions and their boards now communicate a goal of developing more balanced demographics, but they are not achieving substantively positive results (ACE, 2017; DeFrank-Cole et al., 2014; Ely et al., 2011; Gagliardi et al., 2017; Ibarra et al., 2013; Lindsay, 1999). The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) (2010) commissioned a higher education governing board study which found that men outnumbered women by more than two to one with an increase of 1.8 percentage points peaking in 2004 but slowing in recent years. Few studies examine how organizational processes may insert biases which could undermine efforts to make the selection process more equitable.

Higher education’s labor market differs little from similar market systems that endeavor to attract, hire, and retain top performers. People enter academia in a variety of roles and expectations, but very quickly learn what specific positions, skills, knowledge, and capabilities are required to reach the top. Each college or university has its unique HR practices, organizational structures, political pressures, and cultural norms that influence the credentials sought and the hiring practices followed. There is a gap in the collective understanding concerning how organizational HR processes such as in recruiting, selection, and launching a chosen candidate, may create or exacerbate gender-bias. Similarly, there is need for more exploration as to how women respond to barriers that may manifest during the centralized selection HR processes, or at the intersection of processes, to understand how they navigate impediment(s). Answering these questions may help create more insights as to why women, particularly at the university executive level, are still uniformly underrepresented and what are the factors that create obstacles.
**Human Resource Frame Impacts**

The literature on the underrepresentation of women in higher education predominately addresses human resource processes. Dominant themes include women’s slower promotion rates, challenges for women achieving equal standards of tenure, and pay gaps (Bichsel & McChesney, 2017, February; Hironimus-Wendt & Dedjoe, 2015; Wolfinger et al., 2008). Current studies show how problematic HR processes discourage women and contribute to their leaving academia’s pipeline. Lindsay (1999) studied the higher education hiring process and found that it took prescriptive policies that were reviewed by an independent entity to meet organizational goals for diverse candidate pools. Rhee and Sigler (2015) noted that the selection team’s unconscious bias still gets in the way of hiring women into top leadership roles. Enke’s (2014) research showed evidence that suggests that gender and gender-related traits are primary components of interviewers’ cognitive structures. Hence, they prefer men over women applicants for both masculine and gender-neutral jobs. Psychologists explain that humans overvalue agency and undervalue collaboration when selecting leaders and that it will take more extended interaction opportunities to reduce gender bias in the hiring process (Badura et al., 2018). Thus, despite a rosy snapshot that roughly 50% of all higher education women hold administrative positions, the trend remains that women are in lower paid and lower status staff roles. Women outnumber men 3:1 in gender congruent jobs such as HR, but in gender-atypical positions, men outnumber women 2:1 among presidents and chief business officers, 4:1 among chief information and athletic officers, and 9:1 as chief facilities officer (Bichsel & McChesney, 2017). The current statistical inequities suggest that exploring HR processes that help women advance in the professoriate and management areas of higher education might help reduce female attrition.
The HR processes used by centralized selection committees and staff tend to focus on individual candidate behavior and best practices as ways to help advance women nominees (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Johnston & Ferrare, 2018). Wolfinger, Mason, and Goulden (2008) found that there are three junctures where women leave the academic profession in more significant numbers than men. These tenuous times are during, "…(1) tenure-track employment; (2) promotion from assistant professorship to tenured associate professorship; (3) promotion from associate to full professor…” (p. 389). Bolman and Deal (2013) maintain that attrition like this is symptomatic of a lack of alignment in the HR frame responsible for aligning organizational and human needs. The essential strategy for reframing this area is training to develop new skills, involvement in team practices, and relational support (Bolman & Deal, 2013). These organizational strategies directly address gender bias that interferes with women climbing the hierarchical ladder.

Those researchers studying the human resource aspects of gender bias in higher education offer remediation by recommending development for women rather than addressing organization barriers (Hoffman & Borders, 2001; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). Researchers suggest that women benefit from more relational and identity-based leadership professional development (Sugiyama et al., 2016). Scholars suggest a female inclusive leadership pedagogy for training women executives (Badura et al., 2018; Beckhard, 2006; Schein, V., 2002). The leader development literature advocates strengthening female leadership identity, providing role expectation mechanisms, and supporting group affirmation (Debebe; 2011; de Vries & van der Brink, 2016; Ely et al., 2011; Moorosi, 2013; Preston-Cunningham et al., 2017; Sugiyama et al., 2016). However, training alone is inadequate to change organizations systematically. Change requires revision of roles in addition to professional development advocating new leadership
behaviors (Bolman & Deal, 2013). There is evidence to show that training-alone models help women remaining in higher education’s career pipeline cope, but do not remove the gender bias that will continue to frustrate them.

**Structural Frame Influences**

The policy frame and its interplay with gender-based HR processes are not fully explored by scholars who see this as an area that needs further inquiry. The structural frame involves the roles, goals, policies, technology, and environment of an organization creating a blueprint for formal and informal expectations between internal and external constituencies (Bolman & Deal, 2013). The group goals, environmental impacts, available talent, and available resources influence structural design. De Welde and Stepnick (2015) offer research data showing limited success with policy alone because institutions using top-down approaches to reduce barriers do not change the culture without other interventions. Organizational policies that assure equitable treatment of members and do not cause disaffection by the minority have to be accompanied by actions that influence power, politics, and culture.

Men continue to dominate and influence higher education’s structural frame (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Goldin & Katz, 1999; Lindsay, 1999; Thelin, 2011). De Welde and Stepnick (2015) point out that the majority of top leaders in higher education are men with wives who take care of family issues. These male leaders rarely are primary caregivers for children and historically have not valued benefits like flexible work hours, childcare, or other family-friendly policies which are needed to get more women to consider more demanding leadership roles (Goldin & Katz, 1999; Thelin, 2011). Wolfinger et al. (2008) echo this finding and attribute the lack of women professionals to an inflexible twentieth-century American model centered around a male career that forces women to choose family versus a job. However, there is a shift
occurring as colleges and universities fight for top talent. Aggressive competition for traditional and non-traditional students coupled with the reduction of state and federal funding is challenging higher education to retain the best candidates for all disciplines (Bichsel & McChesney, 2017; De Welde & Stepnick, 2015; Wolfinger et al., 2008). Further changing the higher education landscape is the proliferation of couples who are dual faculty earners and now constitute 60% of the workforce (Pew Research Center, 2015, June 18). These statistics indicate that cultures using industrial era traditional male constructs will not bring in the requisite diverse talent for higher education organizations to compete in an increasingly competitive higher education market.

**Political Frame Effects**

Researchers have primarily detailed the struggle women faced in the political arena in government, business, and the military over the past decade (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Lindsay, 1999; Lipman-Blumen, 1998). There is not a great deal of literature dealing with gender-related power politics in higher education. The political frame revolves around power, conflict, competition, and politics (Bolman & Deal, 2013). A recent study by Robinson and Lipman-Blumen (2017) noted that male and female educators are deploying lower levels of competitive behaviors in leadership roles and postulate the reason being a greater need for interdependence with increasingly diverse workers. Much of the political frame literature addresses a growing demand for leaders to offer cooperative behavior to reduce conflict and competition (Debebe, 2011; Ely et al., 2011; Moorosi, 2013; Sugiyama et al., 2016). Still, most researchers agree that male-dominated power structures still exist and strongly influence norms in higher education (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Goldin & Katz, 1999; Lindsay, 1999).
Universities and colleges remain fraught with power politics where the organizational cultures personalize power for status and personal advancement (DeFrank-Cole et al., 2014; Ely et al., 2011; Showunmi et al., 2015). Women have long pursued formal and informal lines of communication to increase political influence (Bolman & Deal, 2013). However, men have what scholars term *position power*. Positionality theory suggests that leadership identity and position are core components to successful enactment (Enke, 2014; Kezar & Lester, 2010). Scholars advancing this notion posit that organizations will reduce bias only if they demonstrate specific acts of intentionality to do so. However, there is not enough research to fully support that positionality theory works in higher education. It is essential to do more positionality theory study and to look at the interplay with reframing organizations in areas such as networking, mentoring and sponsorship for and with women, as well as accelerating women into cross-vertical roles (BlackChen, 2015; Hill & Wheat, 2017; Madson, 2011). The community of practice could benefit from understanding the interplay of regulatory efforts and leadership enactment instituted by higher education institutions to achieve more significant gender equity.

**Symbolic Frame Inspirations**

Masculine notions of influencing the look and behavior of leaders dominate higher education symbolism and stories. Universities and colleges use the symbolic frame extensively to communicate vision, values, cohesiveness, and reputation (Eisner, 2016). Masculine leadership representations still dominate (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Haslam & Ryan, 2008; Hogue, 2016; Rhee & Sigler, 2014) the culture, meaning, metaphors, ritual, ceremony, stories, and heroes in the university and college symbolic frame (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Bolman and Deal (2013) offer practices and scripts that can reframe academia’s use of symbolism. The four-frame model helps one visualize the forces that are pressing on a phenomenon such as the
underrepresentation of women as university presidents (Figure 2.1). De Welde and Stepnick (2015) underscore this approach and recommend actions such as leading by example in the promotion of women, using symbols to bring attention to the challenge, showing experiences of successful institutions with women presidents or top executives, and communicating the vision and execution plan for more equitable gender demographics. Reframing symbolic processes allows academia to create a new leadership story where all members see a fair distribution of leaders who look like them. That image could give hope and belief that they have every opportunity to ascend to the highest levels if they stay in the pipeline.

**Figure 2.1.** Bolman and Deal (2013) Four-Frame Model as Phenomenological Forces. This logic model shows how each of the four-frames offered by Bolman and Deal (2013) are part of the forces that work for and against circumstances dealing with gender equity for colleges and universities.
Four-Frame Leadership Orientation Model

Bolman and Deal (n. d.) created a survey instrument to operationalize their Four-Frame Model to explore leader efficacy (Figure 2.2). Their data using leader participants from both business and education found that the ability to handle multiple frames in specific sequences is highly correlated to effectiveness, but not gender (Bolman and Deal, 2013 and Bolman and Granell (1999), as cited in Bolman and Deal, 2013). The data on women defied expectations. Bolman and Deal (1991) saw equity between the sexes when expectations were taken out of a gendered context and placed into a frame model. The human resource frame provides a strong illustration of this finding. Rather than suggesting that warm, supportive, and participative was feminine, the researchers associated those qualities with human resources. Participants who used four-frame language to evaluate others provided feedback that showed no significant difference between men or women for any variable. The self-ratings were a bit different. Women rated themselves lower on the political frame despite their colleagues’ ranking them higher (Bolman & Deal, 1991).
Figure 2.2. Bolman and Deal (2013) Four Frame Leadership Theory. This figure is adapted from Bolman and Deal (n.d.) self-rating survey instrument that assesses a leader’s use of the four frames. This self-rating scale lets people see their leadership orientations. Participants learn about themselves and begin to understand the basic concepts behind the frames. Copyright 2010 by Lee Bolman. Reprinted with permission.

Bolman and Deal (2013) provide research findings that counter expectations and results by researchers focused solely on individual leader behaviors. This dissonance leads to a gap that is yet to be filled by current researchers. It may be instructive to use language from gendered approaches and this organizational approach to see if it is the language itself that creates bias into perceptions and ultimately, the president or chancellor selection processes. The Four-Frame Leader Orientation Survey provides community accepted organizational leadership
instrumentation and is a valuable tool to understand leaders of increasingly complex organizations competing in a global and turbulent environment.

**The Evolution and Impact of Gender Bias on Women Executive Leaders**

While substantial organizational leadership research suggested little difference between male and female executive leadership, there is a body of research that contradicts this notion (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Carless, 1994). The scientific research has produced sizable data documenting the unequal leadership representation for women in almost every industry or field. The analysis suggests that there might be organizational processes that are obstacles causing this disparity (Ayman and Korabik, 2010; Eagly & Carli, 2007). Scholars who study this phenomenon offer a variety of reasons, but three theories are most notable in the discussions. The first is the idea of role congruity which is an extension of social role theory (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Hogue, 2016; Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, & Ristikari, 2011). The second most prevalent school of thought is it is an integrative shortfall and that more leadership development and mentoring will accelerate women’s movement through an organization’s leadership pipeline (Preston-Cunningham, Elbert, & Dooley, 2017; Robnett, 2015, July 24; Reno, 2011). The final research area that offers significant traction in this debate is Tannen’s (1990) difference theory, which is an extension of ideas involving cross-cultural communications. A compelling aspect of this third theoretical framework is that it allows an in-depth view of gender discrimination during leadership enactment.

The social role theory builds on role congruency work which describes how gender characteristics interrelate with the role a person is enacting for a specific purpose (Badura et al., 2018; Eagly, & Karau, 2002; Sugiyama et al., 2016). The sociologists and psychologists who study social and gender interplay as it pertains to leadership and leader identity offer added
insight as to how cultural and organizational role expectations influence efficacy expectations more than gender stereotypes (Ayman & Korabki, 2010; Kezar & Lester, 2010; Koenigh & Eagly, 2014; Krause, 2017). The social role theory research done by Koenigh and Eagly (2014) showed that "…correspondent inference from group members' typical role behaviors to their group stereotypes is a key process for stereotypes..." (p. 388). Kezar and Lester (2010) expand on social role theory as a central component of positionality leadership theory where their research demonstrated that context and power shape leadership beliefs and practices. In other words, as this theory continues to evolve, researchers reject female-specific leadership approaches positing that women, "…share certain experiences and parts of their identity…” (Kezar & Lester, 2010, p. 169). This body of research dramatically influences leader professional development approaches for women in higher education (DeFrank-Cole et al., 2014; de Vries & van den Brink, 2016; Ely et al., 2011; Enke, 2014; Preston-Cunningham, Elbert, & Dooley, 2017). Ayman and Korabik (2010) used social role theory and found that the effects of gender and culture have the potential to change our definition of what constitutes leadership and what is considered to be effective leadership. Thus, social role theory provides a unique lens to inspect the level of gender equity on human resources, structural, political, and symbolic frameworks within higher education organizations.

The communications field offers compelling frameworks that complement the leadership and social theories detailed above, but the intersectionality of these frameworks is not well understood. Exploring possible amplification or mitigation effects amongst these theoretical models shed new light on why second-generation bias manifests into behaviors and processes. Highlighting intersections between the literature on gendered communications with the four-frame organizational leadership approach may produce a new lens to view the intersection of
digital era leadership and social role theory. This new model may illuminate why women are disadvantaged when pursuing top jobs.

The communications field extended the concept of a double bind first developed by psychologist, Gregory Bateson. Bateson (1963, as cited in Visser, 2003) used the example of a mother and child interaction to explain double bind, which is also known as pathological deuteron-learning. This situation is when a subject is presented with two possible options but gets punished regardless of his or her choice. This paradox, called a double bind, leads one to a sense of hopelessness and victimization (Visser, 2003; Jamieson, 1995). The linguist Robin Lakoff (2004) built on Bateson’s research. His work profoundly shaped Lakoff’s ideas about cross-cultural communications of subsequent theorists for both gender and communications studies.

Lakoff (2004) integrated ideas from psychology, sociology, anthropology, and other fields in her efforts to understand women’s language. Her extensive research on the practices and ideologies associated with women’s speech built on work done by gender researcher Sandra Bem (1993). Lakoff took the gendered language inventory established by Bem (1993) to understand Bateson’s double-bind notion as she set up her research efforts (Table 2.2).
Table 2.2

Bem’s (1993) Sex Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>affectionate, cheerful, childlike, compassionate, does not use harsh language, eager to soothe hurt feelings, feminine, gentle, gullible, loves children, loyal, sensitive to the needs of others, shy, soft-spoken, sympathetic, tender, understanding, warm, yielding</td>
<td>acts as a leader, aggressive, ambitious, analytical, assertive, athletic, competitive, defends own belief, dominant, forceful, has leadership abilities, independent, individualistic, makes decisions early, masculine, self-reliant, self-sufficient, strong personality, willing to take a stand, willing to take risks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Lakoff (2004) focused her inquiry on how a speaker might challenge gender norms of language use. Her use of research from communications, anthropology, sociology, and other associated field added to the reliability and validity of Lakoff’s analysis. She constructed her theory of politeness by using role theories as a backdrop for cultural understanding of gender as enacted through conversational style (Lakoff, 2004). Her work demonstrated that a double-bind rhetorical construct uniquely constrains and penalizes women. As Jamieson (1995) explained,

A double bind is a rhetorical construct that posits two and only two alternatives, one or both penalizing the person being offered them. In the history of humans, such choices have been constructed to deny women access to power and, where individuals manage to slip past their constraints, to undermine their exercise of whatever power they achieve. The strategy defines something "fundamental" to women as incompatible with something the woman seeks—be it education, the ballot, or access to the workplace. (pp. 13-14)
The next generation of linguists, like Deborah Tannen, built upon Bateson’s, Bem’s, and Lakoff’s models and theories.

Tannen (1990a; 1990b; 1994a; 1994b) asserted that gender is fundamentally a component of conversational style, and one is judged based upon one’s language use. Deborah Tannen recognized that Lakoff’s theoretical models were useful to her work on cross-gender communications as cross-cultural communications. Lakoff’s work and the ensuing collective research provide consistent descriptions of what constitutes gendered words. John Gumperz (1983) started this notion of gender as a cross-cultural type of communication and has different impacts from those experienced due to race, ethnicity, or culture. Tannen (1990a, 1990b) fused Lakoff’s ideas about female indirectness and Gumperz’s notions of cross culture to create a unique model that presents male and female genders as separate cultures that often misunderstand each other. Tannen (1990a; 1990b) used a non-judgmental evaluation of women and men’s discursive styles. Extensive and repeatable research found that gender-related style differences produced and reproduced asymmetries of common misunderstandings (Tannen, Hamilton, & Schiffrin, 2015). Six themes emerged in her study and provided general groupings in communications. The categories are generally:

1. status (male) versus support (female),
2. advice (male) versus understanding (female),
3. information (male) versus feelings (female),
4. orders (male) versus proposals (female),
5. conflict (male) versus compromise (female),
6. and independence (male) versus intimacy (female) (Tannen, 1990a; 1990b).
These categories provide useful tools for classification and aggregation juxtaposed with the Bolman and Deal (n. d.) four-frame leadership orientation survey instrument which the researcher will use for this study’s qualitative analysis.

The use of the four-frame leader orientation and difference theory provides tools to examine both external and internal factors influencing human resource processes in higher education. Pressures from the outside are both overt and subtle. Research on university hiring found that "regardless of the indicator used, white males remain the favoured group in all areas of higher education" (Lindsay, 1999, p. 187). Change efforts often suffer when a minority elite dominate the structural, political, and symbolic frames. Recent research about gender bias barriers described how some male board members, presidents, and chancellors circumvent or poorly enforce HR rules created to produce a more gender-balanced pool of candidates (Gagliardi et al., 2017; Lindsey, 1999; Wolfinger, Mason, & Goulden, 2008). Reports detail cases where departments halted their searches for other minority applicants and pulled their advertisements from minority publications, despite having some open vacancies once they met a minority hiring goal (Bichsel & McChesney, 2017, February; Lindsey, 1999). It will take determined change efforts to examine and eventually reframe higher education structural, political, and symbolic constructions to reduce barriers that women encounter as they seek to attain representative numbers at the executive level.

**Conceptual Framework**

The literature addressing executive leadership is sparse, and there are even fewer studies looking at higher education organizational barriers causing significant underrepresentation of women in these roles. Since few studies address this problem, this researcher will use an invitational survey to sitting public and nonprofit college and university presidents and
chancellors for this phenomenological research. The intention is to study the wholeness of these women presidents’ and chancellors’ experience, rather than objects or parts, in search of meaning based upon first-person accounts (Moustakas, 1994).

The study approach and design looks at the intersectionality of women presidents’ and chancellors’ leadership approaches with their organizational human resource processes (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Creswell, 2015; Creswell, 2013). Tannen’s (1990a; 1990b; 1994a; 1990b) difference theory definitions line up with Bolman and Deal (2013) four-frame model in patterns that may assist with overall analysis. A structural-frame-oriented leader may rely on information (male) or feelings (female) to analyze data and make decisions as an example. The use of theoretical underpinnings of the four-frame model and difference theory concerning centralized board decision making may help illuminate any bias phenomenon that occurs during the candidate recruitment, selection, and enactment support processes. The researcher used this information to evaluate the political frame with its associated notions about conflict versus compromise (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

Similarly, the conceptual model serves as a lens to evaluate the human resource frame where the Bolman and Deal (2013) language is about affiliation. The researcher used difference theory to show how hiring managers may glean second generation gender-bias using the conceptual model. Looking at structural components of a job description, the researcher would seek out notions of status versus support and advice versus understanding. If the hiring manager shows a preference for support which the difference theory categorizes as feminine, then there may be an acceptance of more feminine approaches of a candidate. If the selection board favors status, then they may seek candidates with more masculine approaches. This intersectionality between the two theories provides a valuable lens to evaluate documents, survey data, and
interview transcripts. Finally, the symbolic frame has a comparable matchup between Bolman and Deal (2013) and Tannen’s (1990a; 1990b; 1994a; 1990b) theories. The themes line up with gender conflicts surrounding orders versus proposals together with independence versus intimacy. This conceptual model will be useful when clustering and coding data (Figure 2.3).

This researcher follows a transcendental phenomenological approach to launch a study that is, “free of preconceptions, beliefs, and knowledge of the phenomenon from prior experience and professional studies- to be completely open, receptive, and naïve in listening to and hear
research participants describe their experience” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 22). This phenomenological study used an initial survey population to create this “epoché” or wide-open vantage taking in participant experience (Moustakas, 1994; Creswell, 2013). The researcher analyzed the online job postings search material first with the survey and interview material coded later. The intention was to look at a few key issues and analyze these themes to produce an in-depth understanding of how gender bias does or does not play into centralized executive search processes.

The purpose of this study was to examine gender-related barriers that past and present women presidents and chancellors perceived as influencing the human resource process during their recruitment, selection, and transition to the role. The focus was on exploring why public or nonprofit higher education top leaders have yet to achieve representative demographics. This researcher analyzed transcripts of invitational interviews and then followed up with targeted interviews of a small subset sample to elicit perceived barriers using the six categories found in difference theory. The analysis and synthesis provided greater insight into the president or chancellor selection processes. The goal was to discover the causal conditions for this underrepresentation phenomenon and offer ideas about what individual behaviors and organizational processes may add second generation gender-bias into the human resource system (Creswell, 2015; Creswell, 2013; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

**Analysis and Summary**

The underrepresentation of women in the president and chancellor positions in public or private nonprofit college or university indicates unresolved gender bias in higher education’s organizational frameworks. Gender bias constitutes a significant barrier for women getting hired into top leadership positions (Hironimus-Wendt & Dedjoe, 2011; Madsen, 2012; Wolfinger et
al., 2008). Schien (1973) suggests, "...all else being equal, the perceived similarity between the characteristics of successful middle managers and men in general increases the likelihood of a male rather than a female being selected or promoted to a managerial position..." (p. 99). These external factors make masculine leadership traits, and men by extension, more socially desirable for leadership roles (Schien, 1973). Stereotypical attitudes also adversely influence female educators’ advancement despite demographic advantages (Robnett, 2015). Higher education institutions may benefit from addressing organizational frameworks as one method that could help women move through the leadership pipeline. It may also be enlightening to seek out those who successfully emerge through the process to learn how they perceive currently used methods.

The literature specifically focused on searches for college presidents or chancellors with women in mind is predominately descriptive and anecdotal. Bornstein (2007), writing for the American Council of Education (ACE), noted that when a crisis precipitated the need for a change agent, many boards often selected a woman to help accelerated needed transformation. This phenomenon was coined the glass cliff by Haslam and Ryan (2008), where their research explored the dynamics surrounding women's appointment to precarious leadership positions. The researchers used a social role lens when noting in their findings of glass cliff appointments. Haslam and Ryan (2008) found that organizations thought women would be eager to take these precarious jobs because of beliefs that these jobs suit the distinctive leadership abilities of women and that the lack of other opportunities would make women more eager to take on a perilous appointment. Hill and Wheat (2017) also studied female paths to the presidency in higher education from a structural perspective. They hypothesized that women did not have enough support going through the organizational structures. Hill and Wheat’s (2017) data analysis revealed themes related to the need for mentors and role models. These researchers also
used a social role theory lens and noted increased complexity for women juggling multiple identities caused reluctance to pursue top jobs.

There is very little research that illuminates how organizations impede or improve the selection of women presidents or chancellors. Susan Madsen (2008) offers anecdotal experiences and recommendations from questioning women university presidents. This work uses extensive interviews to provide understanding for personal growth but gives little insight to organizations about matters they can influence to even up the odds for men and women competing for the president’s position. Reis and Grady (2018) provide the most recent study on women as university presidents. These researchers also interviewed women presidents. Their findings were similar to Madsen (2008) in the sense that they provided hiring tips for candidates but did not address the role of the organization in the centralized selection process. Reis and Grady (2018) suggested that women who aspire to the top should “Know the Rules, Hear the Message, and Opt-in” to get to the top. There is a gap identifying organizational tips that might help them create a more equitable centralized hiring process and that may help women more successfully navigate to a college or university president or chancellor role.

The literature is not clear as to how the organizational workplace processes interplay best to produce an equal number of top women executives. Reframing some or all organizational structures to enhance professional development interventions has the potential to reduce the prevalence of gender-bias, but more study is necessary (de Vries & van den Brink, 2016). Interventions that target gender-bias could take several forms depending on whether the goal is to reduce gender-bias itself or to reduce its negative consequences. However, scrutiny of individual leader enactment and the president or chancellor search process to find the source(s) of gender-bias has merit for triangulating some ideas about causality (Rhee & Sigler, 2014;
Ibarra et al., 2013; Robnett, 2016; Schein, 1973; Shapiro et al., 2011). Research suggests that institutional signals ought to be particularly robust and multi-framed if they are to make an impact (Bichsel & McC Chesney, 2017; Bolman and Deal, 1991; Jackson, 2017; Robnett, 2015; Showunmi et al., 2015; Wolfinger et al., 2008). Exploring barriers that candidates perceive may provide institutional insights and offer ideas as to changing signals that produce a more gender-balanced president and chancellor population.

**Conclusion**

The literature review identified the gaps in the current understanding of external factors that influence the underrepresentation of women leaders in higher education. There has not been enough research to determine which organizational actions serve as accelerators for women achieving executive leadership roles (Bichsel & Chesney, 2017; Cama, Jorge, & Peña, 2016; Hill & Wheat, 2017; Jackson, 2017; Robnett, 2015; Showunmi et al., 2015). There is more work to be done exploring the human resource area in higher education where organizational processes do not produce equitable results to uncover considerations that may create more gender-balanced career progression (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Eisner, 2016; Enke, 2014; Hogue, 2015). Scholars argue that more research is needed to understand actions that may reduce or eliminate the current competitive and political environment that favors men (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Kapasi, Sang, & Sitko, 2016; Kezar & Lester, 2010). Studying ways to influence higher education’s culture could improve women’s advancement as well (Koenig & Egly, 2014). A qualitative approach surveying and interviewing top-level higher education leaders will be a starting point to explore how leadership theories intersect with organizational structure influencing gender-specific barriers and start to fill this gap.
There is room to improve gender representation for women when they currently comprise 30% of all U.S. higher education presidents and only 8% of doctorate-granting institutions (ACE, 2017; Bichsel & McChesney, 2017, February). University leaders communicate concern about their gender imbalances for staff and leader roles but have not shown significant progress in solving this dilemma (ACE, 2017; Bichsel & McChesney, 2017, February; BlackChen, 2015; Madsen, 2012). Since public and nonprofit higher education leaders and professional organizations communicate a desire to achieve representative demographics across the organization’s leadership roles, an excellent starting point is examining what has slowed progress to date (Gagliardi et al., 2017). Qualitative research that surveys incumbent or former women presidents and chancellors followed by targeted interviews with survey participants who agree to a follow-up may provide the community of practice an opportunity to unmask obscured barriers hidden in higher education HR processes. The goal is to discover barriers that may exist but are unseen in the HR frame’s hiring processes to understand how they might prevent women from achieving more equitable gender percentages in top executive roles.

Biased processes reduce the available talent pool for positions at all levels of university leadership. Women leaders still experience a backlash in situations where positional power and gender-incongruent behavior intersect, and they are perceived as unlikeable to both male and female followers (BlackChen, 2015, Ibarra et al., 2013; Schein, 1973). The literature chronicles this notion that women leaders in atypical positions experience internal and external discrimination (Hunt, Layton, & Prince, 2015; Ibarra et al., 2013; Schein, 1973). Repeated works highlight situations where women behave similarly to male counterparts but are perceived less favorably despite adhering to organizational cultural norms (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Rhee & Sigler, 2015). Organizations seeking top talent through gender equity should be reflective to
discern if their human resource structures cause behaviors that adversely impact advancement for women. It is imperative to explore human resource, structural, political, and symbolic constructs to consider how reframing might improve gender representations. The community of practice may benefit from understanding the intersectionality of how bottom-up approaches (such as professionally developing women leaders) interplay with top-down approaches (examples include institutional roles, goals, policies, politics, and culture). This understanding will influence goal setting to produce a more gender-balanced leader demographic.

Studying this gap in current literature may contribute to a timely and essential aspect of leadership education, development, and training. Women in higher education represent the majority population for students and faculty. The skills, knowledge and capabilities of women leaders are beneficial to higher education institutions who endeavor to remain competitive in the digital era. This exploration as to why college and university executive leadership demographics do not align with the field may provide insights as to where processes are biased. This investigation helps practitioners find new process insights and offers recommendations that might help public and private non-profit higher education institutions achieve stated gender-diversity goals. The particular focus for this study was identifying gender traits in job descriptions to discover if they are gender specific, balanced, or neutral. That information was used to survey actual or former presidents or chancellors to ascertain how their personal experiences converge or diverge with the leadership themes that institutions publicly espouse. Interviews then shed more light on how individual actions were embraced or rejected by the higher education organizational structures as they launched their chosen candidate.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This study examined the experiences of public and nonprofit private college and university women presidents and chancellors to discover forms of gender-based biases that may have arisen during their centralized selection process. The intent was to explore how these participants dealt with gender-bias issues that may have emerged during their recruitment, selection, and transition to assuming the leadership role phases. The investigation sought to assess how gender-bias might manifest throughout female candidates’ top executive centralized search, recruitment, and selection processes. The researcher used a survey and interviews to collect data from individuals as well as gathering online organizational data in the form of job postings. The purpose of these activities was to analyze the material in search of new insights about the centralized selection process by contrasting data from the woman candidates and the institutions doing the hiring. This type of inquiry provided a more in-depth explanation for emergent bias as well as captured how the participants navigated barriers. This study contrasted self-reported data with an analysis of some president and chancellor job postings from the past year to analyze areas of convergence and divergence. Potential findings may provide helpful insight to women who are in candidates for upper echelon leadership in higher education. Also, the discoveries could provide practical considerations to help future higher education women leaders as they prepare for a president or chancellor candidacy.

This researcher used a phenomenological study method using both structured and semi-structured methods for collecting data. Phenomenology does not seek to explain, but rather facilitate more in-depth insight into an experience through a description (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016). However, phenomenological studies are not only descriptive. The phenomenological
investigator is expected to organize the data into meaning-making units that cluster into common categories or themes (Moustakas, 1994). Collecting data in many forms and using that information for spiral analysis will help with data management, coding, classifying, interpreting, and finally representing and visualizing the data (Creswell, 2013). This study used inductive reasoning to understand survey data, interview information, and contrasted the self-reported data with organizational president and chancellor job postings. The conceptual framework informed this effort as the researcher shape themes and categories (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). This data analysis was an iterative process requiring the researcher to frame, reframe, and interpret the information (Creswell, 2013). These actions may lead to a better understanding of how gender-bias potentially influences central search processes when selecting a higher education president or chancellor (Ravitch & Riggan, 2017).

Collecting and analyzing the job posting data was a separate and parallel activity to conducting the survey and interviews. Creswell (2015) pointed out that there are four basic types of information used for qualitative research, and they include observations, interviews, documents, and audiovisual material. Using online data collection such as gathering president and chancellor job descriptions offers an alternative for hard-to-reach groups (Cresell, 2015). The use of postings for new presidents and chancellors provided a depiction of the president and chancellor experience outside the context of the research project or a specific study (Creswell, 2015). The researcher used a criterion-based sample for this analysis. The sample only included postings for president or chancellor roles at public or non-profit private colleges or universities in the U.S. to mirror the participant selection model (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016). The researcher anticipated analyzing at least 15 job descriptions from years 2014 to present for this purposeful sample to reach a state where no new patterns emerge, thus achieving data saturation (Creswell,
This sample size is similar to the anticipated survey sample size and changed due to the quality of the posting data (Burmeister, & Aitken, 2012).

Many sites that have job postings for higher education president and chancellor positions. The researcher looked at twenty job sites recommended by higher education professionals, and there were six that had the most listings. These best sites were LinkedIn, University Jobs, Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC), Higher Ed Jobs, ChronicleVitae from the Chronicle of Higher Education, and Inside Higher Education. These media groups uniformly messaged that the postings were the property of the institutions listing and they did not retain them once the college or university pulled the data due to privacy concerns (A. Bogdan, HigherEdJobs Content Quality Coordinator, personal communication, June 5, 2019; Cody, LinkedIn Consumer Support Specialist, personal communication, June 4, 2019). Anna Bogdan (personal communication, June 5, 2019) shared that HigherEdJobs posted an annual average of 264 public and nonprofit president and chancellor job solicitations for 2014 through 2018 and there were 77 so far this year. There were sufficient numbers of postings from the current year to reach saturation.

The researcher contacted online public higher education organizations known for robust job search capabilities. The request was for access to search artifacts which include items such as job postings and like positional description material for public and private nonprofit colleges and universities president and chancellor advertisements. This data provided macro trends and themes about the skills, knowledge, and capabilities higher education organizations are seeking in their presidents and chancellors. The researcher collected attributes and then coded. The attribute collection included Carnegie Classification, institution type (public or private nonprofit, position advertised (president or chancellor), selectee gender, location, year open, and year closed. The intent of the coding was to see if these organizations were soliciting for presidents or
chancellors with more masculine, more feminine, or gender-balanced/neutral leadership approaches. Connections between the gender attributes of these job descriptions and the number of men and women selected over this five-year period provided insight as to how gender-bias appeared during the recruitment of women candidates for a higher education institution president or chancellor role.

Recruiting participants who are extremely busy and have numerous demands for their time means that the study must show relevancy and communications about the research must be meaningful (Fink, 2017). This researcher leveraged higher education and professional-centric social media sites, networking sites, and higher education professional organizations to reach out to former and current women college and university presidents and chancellors who met the selection criteria (Creswell, 2015). The examination was open-ended and exploratory (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Data from the survey and interviews was used to deepen the understanding of phenomena associated with the underrepresentation of women as public and private nonprofit higher education presidents and chancellors. The findings have the potential to broaden the community of practice’s understanding of the challenges women face during centralized top executive search processes.

Chapter 2 provided a comparative analysis of the historical, current, and emerging literature on leadership, organizational leadership, and the obstacles facing women who aspire to be a higher education president or chancellor. This chapter provides a thorough understanding of the research method and strategies. Chapter 4 presents the finding that led to recommendations outlined in the final chapter. This researcher described perceptions shared by public and private nonprofit college and university presidents and chancellors who are women. The centerpiece of
the exploration revolved around their personal selection experience. The participants answered survey questions about themselves, and their leadership approaches to create a dataset baseline.

This researcher adapted the structured instrument from the Bolman and Deal (n.d.) four-frame leadership orientation model for the participants’ self-assessment. This organizational leadership model helps stakeholders gain a more in-depth understanding by framing and deconstructing an issue or topic (Bolman & Deal, 1991; 2006; 2013). This study used this model to discern whether these women depended most on structural, political, symbolic, or human resource frames as leaders and during their journey through the president or chancellor selection process. This instrumentation design offered a useful cognitive map of participants’ decision-making strategies using personal, attitudinal, and behavioral questions to detect whether they lean toward more industrial-era or digital-era style (Creswell, 2015). A survey sample population between 15 – 20 participants provided a sufficient number of participants (Fusch & Ness, 2015). The structured survey offered a rich database of material to understand these women leaders’ experiences competing to lead a higher education institution (Fink, 2017; Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

This study used a subset sample from the survey population for semi-structured interviews to view the president and chancellor hiring process in detail. A secondary purpose was to explore how these perceptions may impact the representation of women at the highest levels. This study leveraged Tannen’s (1990a; 1990b) difference theory for the conceptual model. Chapters 1 and 2 describe the components of difference theory used in the conceptual model. The vocabulary from difference theory was used to help cluster meaning modules from the initial survey and a job posting artifact analysis. The researcher developed emergent themes from these sources of data (Moustakas, 1994).
This study used its conceptual framework as a centerpiece for the research design to provide consistency of vocabulary and analysis. The researcher incorporated concepts from Tannen’s (1994b) difference theory as well as Bolman and Deal’s (n.d.) four-frame leader orientation model for coding classifications to assure data consistency while developing emergent themes. Ultimately, the study provided a unique lens on the intersectionality of organizational leadership goals with the selection of its leader. The use of Bolman and Deal (n. d.) four-frame leader orientation survey with its associated categories juxtaposed with Tannen’s (1990a; 1990b) difference theory shed new light on current barriers to gender equity in higher education’s senior executive ranks (Figure 2.3).

**Research Design**

The choice of research methodology was a critical step for this researcher as was the use of participant data to develop reasons and evidence that answer the proposed research questions (Booth, Colomb, Williams, Bizup, & Fitzgerald, 2016). Creswell (2013) suggested the use of a phenomenological study to describe the common meaning for a number of individuals who share a mutual experience. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) advised researchers to use interviews as the primary method of data collection gets at the essence or basic underlying structure of the experience. Mosutakas (1994) recommended that a researcher take reflection time to assess and compartmentalize any personal biases during the data collection, which is termed as epoché. This reflective process allows one to become more aware of personal prejudices, viewpoints, and assumptions that can subsequently be bracketed or temporarily set aside when conducting qualitative analysis. Epoché and other reasoning strategies allow the researcher to isolate the phenomenon to its essence and make sense of the data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The foundation for this study is exploratory, and the centering on meaning-making supports the
qualitative phenomenological approach as the most appropriate fit (Creswell, 2015; 2013). Qualitative research allowed for an in-depth view of the experiences of women college and university presidents and chancellors.

The phenomenological approach allowed this researcher to deeply understand how the participants dealt with the scrutiny of the president and chancellor search process. This study used an interpretive orientation, which enabled this researcher to describe a unique experience of public and nonprofit college and university women presidents and chancellors (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Creswell, 2015). This phenomenological qualitative research approach did not seek to test the theories outlined in chapters 1 and 2 but instead use them to understand the experiences of women who have successfully navigated the higher education president or chancellor search process. The purpose of this kind of phenomenological qualitative research was to describe, understand, and interpret the participants’ experience (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

The study used a social constructivist lens to focus on the participants’ experience (Creswell, 2015). Social constructivism requires this researcher to focus on the participants’ definitions and descriptions of gender-bias in the higher education president and chancellor search process in contrast to positivist/postpositivist, critical, or postmodern/post-structural approaches which seek to predict, change or deconstruct (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Creswell, 2015). The phenomenological qualitative approach is particularly beneficial when using a constructivist lens. The use of a constructivist lens allowed this researcher to describe how variables are distributed across a population or phenomena when analyzing survey data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The procedure of survey and follow-up interviews being contrasted with the job posting artifact information assisted with triangulation to reduce any researcher bias.
(Creswell, 2015). This process was a systematic method to describe the participants’ view of
gender-bias in the higher education president and chancellor search process. The intention was to
discover relationships between recruiting, selection, and first role enactment events and the
phenomenon (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Creswell, 2013).

Phenomenology started as a twentieth-century idea created by philosopher Edmund
Husserl and later became a method to investigate the distinctive personal realities of research
participants (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Moustakas (1994) outlines
several steps that aid researchers to achieve optimal results. This study’s second chapter
described the crucial first step of epoché as a means to establish objectivity. The next step is
transcendental-phenomenological reductions, which are descriptions of “the meanings and
essences of the phenomenon, the constituents that comprise the experience of the consciousness”
(Moustakas, 1994, p. 34). The triangulation process using survey, interview, and artifact analysis
were central components of that reduction activity. The final phase calls for imaginative
variation where one uses the data to grasp “the structural essences of the experience”
(Moustakas, 1994, p. 35). This researcher used the phenomenological philosophy and this step-
by-step method to create a fresh picture of the essence of these participants experience during the
centralized selection process to be a higher education top executive.

This researcher subscribes to the open and unbiased philosophy that Moustakas (1994)
and Creswell (2013) espoused. This approach starts with the researcher putting one’s experience
into “brackets” and understanding the participant experience openly and without personal bias
(Creswell, 2013; Moustakas, 1994). Epoché and bracketing required researcher reflection and
strengthened the conviction that the phenomenological approach was optimal for reasons already
described (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The phenomenological approach supported this
researcher’s effort to understand an exceptional population and their shared experiences of gender-bias as a phenomenon during their president and chancellor selection process. Moving to the transcendental-phenomenological reduction step required the development of a conceptual framework with Bolman and Deal (2013) and Tannen (1990a, 1990b) theoretical underpinnings that captures participant experiences consistently and rigorously. The third step was to use surveys, interviews, and searches of online higher education job postings to gather data. The use of social constructivism helped the researcher frame and thoroughly describe how participants view the phenomenon while bracketing out the researcher’s personal bias (Creswell, 2015). These steps led to the study’s essence where synthesizing meaning happened through the identification and description of themes that define the phenomenon (Moustakas, 1994).

Identifying the researcher’s personal bias is an essential element of the study’s design (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Data analysis is a multi-step process requiring reflection about the study purpose, looking through the conceptual framework lens, coding data to find patterns and meaning, and then combining codes into more comprehensive categories called axial coding (Creswell, 2013). Merriam and Tisdell (2016) advised researchers to take time between steps to think about personal bias brought into the study and find ways to guard against projecting bias into the framework. This researcher used the technique of journaling to memorialize this type of reflection while collecting, analyzing, and drawing conclusions about the data. The NVivo 12 for Mac Qualitative Analysis solution has a notes section for memos, annotations, and memo links. This is the area that maintained literature notes, progress reports, project administration, and a reflection journal. Bloomberg and Volpe (2016) stressed the important of tracking thoughts and keeping careful records with an open-mind while using a critical approach. The NVivo tool
journal provided an audit trail which also provides useful material for making study validity claims.

Bloomberg and Volpe (2016) advocated meticulous journaling of activities, productivity, and reflections to maintain to create a link between the data collection and data analysis. The researcher’s reflections were a mechanism where reconstructing meaning of experience can yield learning (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016; Creswell, 2015). It was important to use language that reduces bias in both the journal and study (Creswell, 2015). Three fundamental techniques to help write in a sensitive, ethical and scholarly way were used and included appropriate specificity, being sensitive to labels, and acknowledging the people participants using preferred terms (Creswell, 2015). The use of peer review helped make sure that this researcher adhered to these techniques for bias reduction.

This phenomenological research design was most appropriate for this study as it allowed the researcher to make meaning from the participants’ experience. This design also made participant selection a vital decision. This researcher used purposeful sampling, which is criterion-based to assure that all participants studied have similar experiences and potentially faced the same gender-bias phenomenon (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016). The experiences of those selected to lead public and nonprofit colleges and universities are distinct from those in the “for profit” college and university experience, and so the latter was excluded from this study (Johnston & Ferrare, 2018). Finally, the study looked only at women’s perceptions to get a full accounting of the phenomenon and so excluded men from this inquiry. This purposive sampling is a non-probability sample based upon the characteristics of the population (Creswell, 2013). The study’s objectives and methods made a survey population between 15 and 20 suitable (Creswell, 2013). The sufficient subset for the in-depth interview pool was drawn from the first
six to 10 women presidents and chancellors responding favorably to the request integrated into the invitational structured survey (Dukes, 1984, as cited by Creswell, 2013).

Given these goals and the offered conceptual model, the following research questions steered this study:

RQ1. How does gender-bias appear during the recruitment of women candidates for a higher education institution president or chancellor role?

RQ2. How does gender-bias visibly manifest during a higher education institution selection process for president or chancellor?

RQ3. How does a woman president or chancellor experience gender-bias during transition events that communicate her selection as the institution president or chancellor?

**Study Setting**

This phenomenological research uses a process of bracketing personal biases to be open to the experiences of women presidents and chancellors as they encounter gender-bias during the top leader centralized selection process (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Moustakas, 1994). Moustakas (1994) describes seven methods and procedures when conducting phenomenological investigations:

1. Discover a topic that involves social meaning and significance.
2. Conduct a comprehensive review of the professional and research literature
3. Construct a set of criteria for research
4. Develop interview instructions that include informed consent, confidentiality and are consistent with the ethical principles of research.
5. Develop questions that guide the interview process.
6. Conduct and record person-to-person interviews that focus on bracketed questions.
7. Organize and analyze the data to develop individual and structural descriptions, a composite textural and structural characterization, as well as synthesizing textual and structural meanings.

The study followed the Moustakas (1994) methodology. Moustakas’ (1994) first three questions are answered in chapters 1 and 2 and set up the research design. The comprehensive review of the literature informed the survey creation. The instrument included demographic information, the four-frame leadership orientation questions, and open-ended questions concerning their recruitment, selection process, and transition to president or chancellor experiences (Appendix D). There was extensive planning to prepare for the semi-structured interviews. The researcher used the data to organize and analyze the material and develop the individual and structural descriptions, the composite descriptions, and the final synthesis of textual and structural meaning (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Creswell, 2015; Moustakas, 1994). This rigor enhanced the accuracy and veracity of this study (Creswell, 2013).

**Participants and Study Sample**

The researcher used purposeful sampling approaches to recruit participants from across the United States. Purposeful sampling means that the researcher selects individuals and sites because they can purposefully inform an understanding of the study’s central phenomenon (Creswell, 2013). This study used this type of sampling of a select group of women presidents and chancellors to provide a rich description of their perceptions. A collective picture of the processes helped to understand better how the human resource process that selected them either advantaged or disadvantaged them due to gender. Purposeful criterion sampling in this research ensured that participants are or were presidents or chancellors of U.S. public or private nonprofit institutions.
The recruitment process began after receiving approval from the University of New England Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. The researcher leveraged worldwide web-based professional networking platforms and higher education associations sites for access to past and present higher education women presidents and chancellors for survey participation. The correspondence described the researcher’s background, provide an overview of the study, and offer assurances as to the protection of member privacy, confidentiality, identity, and data security (Appendix A) (Fink, 2017; Creswell, 2015). The worldwide web-based sites that the researcher approached included LinkedIn, Women in Higher Education, Women in Higher Education Network, American Council on Education (ACE) Women’s Network, American Association of University Women (AAUW), Higher Education Resource Services (HERS), Association of Governing, and Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB), and American Association of University Professors. First, the researcher wrote to each of the network leaders to find out their process for solicitation of members for survey participation. Second, data on these organizations will be collected, organized, and tracked. The contact data for each professional and higher education organization was placed into a spreadsheet to manage information for each entity such as identify primary points of contact and identify the steps in each organizations’ approval process. The second part of the process was to use the journal and progress report areas within NVivo 12 for Mac to track each step in the approval process, track when following up emails and calls occurred, note the date when the survey started, and complete the entry with the survey closure date. There was a tailored request to the members to participate (Appendix B). A key component to successful data collection was remaining organized as this attention to detail will produce comprehensive, consistent, and complete data results to analyze (Fink, 2017).
There was a parallel effort where the researcher created a list of potential participants by U.S. region by collecting web-based information to identify past and present women presidents and chancellors and their contact information to request their participation (Appendix C). The researcher used UnivSearch.com for a list of colleges and universities by state and region. This site parsed university and colleges into nine regions which include New England, Mid East, Great Lakes, Plains, Southeast, Southwest, Rocky Mountains, Far West, and Outlying Areas (UnivSearch, n. d.). The researcher started with New England, which included Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. The study expanded to the Mid-East region as there was insufficient participants after going to professional and higher education organizations and contacting the New England colleges and universities. The researcher continued to expand the list until achieving a suitable participant sample size.

It is crucial to gain trust before launching a direct survey request (Fink, 2017). The researcher called and emailed the potential participants’ assistant to garner interest in survey participation. It was critical that the researcher gained support from each assistant before emails were sent directly to the potential participants. Equally important was the rapport that the researcher established with each participant regardless if they did or did not have an assistant. The intent was to get enough potential participants to have at least 15 surveys and six semi-structured interviews completed for this purposeful sample (Creswell, 2013). Fusch and Ness (2015) suggested that a researcher may attain data saturation by as little as six interviews, depending on the sample size of the population. This study’s sample size was dependent on the quality of both the survey and interview data as well as when data saturation occurs (Burmeister, & Aitken, 2012).
The researcher sent out an email explaining the study and inviting those potential participants to take part in the survey once the participant’s assistant has introduced this participation on the researcher’s behalf (Appendix C). The email gave a short description of the study and attached the researcher’s resume and an informed consent form (Appendix E). Those who agreed to participate received a follow-up email identical to the one used for members of professional organizations (Appendix B) that contains the survey link. The use of the second email was to keep the survey as anonymous as practicable. The researcher continued to search for participants until reaching a sufficient population size. It was also possible to augment the list with community college women presidents and chancellors if there were insufficient four-year institution leaders, but that was not necessary. The survey sent to each individual was timebound. Each participant had two weeks from issue to closure to the researcher could create a consistent tracking mechanism. The researcher sent the participant a follow-up request if the latter did not complete the survey in the first week.

It is important to note that surveys alone have limited utility delving into complex social relationships or intricate patterns of interaction and need a supplemental study (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016). The researcher supplemented the initial structured survey (Appendix D) with a smaller subset of semi-structured interviews (Appendix F). The study identified this subset by asking each survey participant to partake in a follow-up interview as a question in the first survey. The researcher started interviewing university presidents and chancellors agreeing to in-depth semi-structured interviews using Zoom video teleconferencing in the order of agreement and availability.

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) noted that technological advances make online interviewing a sound alternative to face-to-face sessions if one plans correctly. This study used considerations
such as preparation, establishing rapport, and providing multisensory information during the session to enhance the experience for participants (Finak, 2017; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The period for interviews closed as soon as the researcher reached data saturation. The study reaching data saturation occurs when there is enough information to replicate the research, it is not possible to collect new data, and when further coding is no longer feasible (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006). Merriam and Tisdell (2016) described data saturation as the beginning, “to see or hear the same things over and over again, and no new information surfaces as you collect more data” (p. 248). This inquiry population was small, and so the study reached saturation more rapidly than a larger study (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006).

The initial survey served as a conduit for recruiting interviewees. There was an embedded question at the end, asking the participant to agree to a follow-up interview. The researcher followed up with those participants who agreed to an interview through their assistants. This contact included information about the study, the researcher, and a request to schedule a time for the recorded video teleconference session using Zoom. The researcher asked women presidents and chancellors from New England, which consists of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. This process of reaching out directly to individuals by section continued by adding an additional U.S. higher education region until reaching a sufficient sample size that supported data saturation was achieved (UnivSearch, n. d.).

**Data Collection Methods**

Creswell (2013) describes data collection as a series of interrelated activities that include locating the individual, gaining access and making rapport, purposeful sampling, collecting data, recording the information, resolving field issues, and storing data. Moustakas (1994) suggests
that a phenomenological interview be informal, interactive, and uses open-ended comments and questions to get the participant to share their full story. This study followed Creswell’s (2013) steps at the macro level for its methodology. Also, this study used Moustakas’ (1994) philosophy for instrument construction. These frameworks provided useful synergies to reach an optimal research methodology.

The researcher worked with each professional organization’s internet platform point of contact to understand and abide by their policies for reaching out to their membership. The University of New England sanctions the use of REDCap as a secure web application for survey creation and management. REDCap provided the platform to build and manage this online survey and its associated database. Once the officials from the platform agreed to contact the membership subset, the researcher launched the survey for seven days. Follow on actions included identifying those participants who decided to participate in follow on interviews and following up with those who assist these leaders with their schedules.

A research database of universities by the state was established using UniverSearch (n.d.) (Figure 3.1). The database did not provide gender information about the institutions’ leaders.
The researcher went to every public and private non-profit institution that awards baccalaureate and/or higher degrees to determine the president and/or chancellor’s gender by reviewing the university or college website. The researcher tracked contact information for the potential participant and her assistant at the same time. This information was placed in a study Excel spreadsheet and used to send email requests and track responses.

The study’s investigator took a regional approach to keep numbers of participant requests to a manageable size. The researcher started by asking women presidents and chancellors from New England. This direct request approach continued by the researcher adding a second section...
of the U.S. higher education region until such time that enough people participated, and data saturation occurred. The researcher reviewed the region’s public or private nonprofit baccalaureate-granting institutions websites to see if these organizations had a woman president or chancellor. The next step for those who did have women leaders was for the researcher to find the directory and obtain email, phone, address, and assistant information. The researcher entered this information into the research database spreadsheet for survey engagement and tracking.

This researcher engaged each participant assistant by telephone and email to discuss the purpose of the study and how his/her principle volunteered for this follow-up session. The researcher provided an electronic version of a collated packet of information with each president or chancellor. This packet included a second informed consent letter (Appendix E) and a copy of the interview questions (Appendix F). The researcher used email and telephone calls to finalize survey collection and interview dates for each university president or chancellor. The video conferencing platform recorded every session. Immediately following the videoconference, these recordings were uploaded in NVIVO Transcription to produce a text form of the interview where each participant answered the same questions. The researcher contacted each participant to check the interview text and allow for additions, deletions, and other modifications, lending clarity to their content. The researcher then used difference theory (Tannen, 1994a) and the four-frame leader orientation themes (Bolman and Deal, 2013) for standardizing the vocabulary while doing the analysis and coding in NVIVO 12 for Mac.

**Instrumentation**

The study collected data using a survey, interviews, and online job postings. The first step was collecting structured data by the survey. The second phase, and sometimes concurrent stage, was conducting semi-structured interviews. The structured questionnaire collected
repeatable data from the participants and formed a demographic database. This researcher used the widely accepted questions from the Bolman and Deal (n. d.) Four-frame Leader Orientation Survey in pursuit of an objective assessment of each university president’s or chancellor’s leadership approach. This survey instrument was first published and used for scholarly research in 1988 and continually updated to include content from the 2016 edition. The researcher emailed the authors who granted permission (Appendix G).

Table 3.1

*Structured survey topics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women University Presidents and Chancellors</th>
<th>Age?</th>
<th>Marital Status?</th>
<th>Race?</th>
<th>Years in Education? Years in Higher Education?</th>
<th>Years in other fields?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of times serving as president or chancellor prior to this role?</td>
<td>Were you actively recruited for this role? If so, what was the affiliation of the person who reached out to you? Was this person male or female? Did they assure confidentiality during this process?</td>
<td>Did you apply for this role? How did you learn that there was an opening?</td>
<td>Did you attend this university?</td>
<td>Where you a faculty member or staff for this university in the past?</td>
<td>Perception of pay and benefit equity of the offer packet?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The follow-up interview used a semi-structured instrument designed for in-depth exploration of the intersectionality of organizational frames and the manifestation of gender-bias in the university president or chancellor selection process (Appendix F).

Interviewing people in-person is optimal to establish trust and intimacy, but technology such as web-based video conferencing provides suitable means to reach out to participants and still build sufficient rapport (Fink, 2017; Tuttas, 2015). The researcher solicited participants from across the U.S., which made the use of web-based video conference tools appropriate for this study (Creswell, 2013). Tuttas (2015) suggests that the interviewer take extra steps to assure the technology is working beforehand and to spend time establishing rapport. The study design included these steps for the interview protocol. The researcher set up a time with assistants of those presidents and chancellors who agree to participate in a one-on-one semi-structured interview to practice Zoom video teleconferencing session record before recording the participant. Some participants only wanted to record the audio portion of the interview and not use the video capability of the system. Zoom supported recording audio only. The researcher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in President Role?</th>
<th>How many people did you talk to during the screening process and what was their role?</th>
<th>Perception of the gender equity involved in the transition and launch planning?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree Awarded?</td>
<td>What was the role and gender of the people you used as references?</td>
<td>Bolman and Deal (n. d.) four-frame leadership orientation questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Before to Presidential role?</td>
<td>How many people were on the search committee and what was the gender breakout?</td>
<td>Open-ended questions on president or chancellor recruitment, selection, and transition activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
worked with the assistant, or the participant directly when there was no assistant, to get preferences prior to the meeting date.

Preparation is key to successful interviewing (Fink, 2017; Creswell, 2013). The researcher used the collected background information gained through internet searches. Also, the researcher asked each assistant for the participant’s curriculum vitae study before the interview in order to understand the participant better and accelerate building rapport. There was also a need to research the institution that the participant currently or formerly led using internet searches of the organization’s website. This preparation provided context for the semi-structured interview. This information also helped the researcher gain added trust and rapport with the participant.

The actual interview discussion was expected to take approximately 45 minutes to one hour. The researcher provided an advanced copy as well as an electronic share copy of the questions during the teleconference session. The researcher served as the facilitator and added conversation to establish rapport, and then use the questions to guide the discussion (Fink, 2017; Creswell, 2013). Moustakas (1994) suggests this brief social conversation aimed at establishing rapport by relaxing the individual and creating a trusting atmosphere. The video conferencing tool was Zoom, and it recorded the president’s or chancellor’s video as she verbally answered the questions. The researcher also had a backup hand digital recorder and took manual notes as well. The participants were reminded that they could ask to stop the recording at any time. All files are password protected and stored in a secure setting and transcribed using NVIVO transcription. The researcher emailed the transcript to each participant through their assistant, unless otherwise directed, to check if they was anything that they wanted to add, delete, or modify in the transcript from the recording.
Qualitative inquiry requires open-ended interview questions to allow the participant to tell about their perceptions of the central phenomenon studied (Moustakas, 1994; Creswell, 2013). This study developed open-ended questions specially constructed to answer the three research questions about bias during the president or chancellor search, interview, and transition to enactment processes. All audio and video files were uploaded into NVIVO Translate to create text-based verbatim narrative transcriptions. Each participant received a copy of this transcript to review for accuracy and meaning.

**Member Checking**

Bloomberg and Volpe (2016) recommend documenting feedback on the interpretation of data from study participants and call this process “member checks.” Implementing member checks, also known as respondent validation, confirms the researcher’s meaning-making and validates the meaning clusters, codes, and themes (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Thus, doing member checking may help reduce researcher bias or influence during interviews and data analysis (Bloomberg & Volpe; 2016; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The researcher took preliminary or emergent findings to interviewees directly during the transcript validation process to make sure that the interpretations made by data analysis and triangulation was true.

The researcher used a qualitative software analysis tool called NVIVO 12 for Mac to augment analysis and synthesis of the interview data. This study also used NVIVO and Zoom transcription, which provides automatic transcription of video recordings. The video was uploaded in NVIVO Transcript as an intermediate step to get the video session translated into a text file. After NVIVO Transcription converted the interview data from video to text, this researcher conducted member checks to validate the data. The researcher sent the interview participants their transcript and requested that they make any additions, deletions, or
modifications that they deemed appropriate as well as requested that they validate the meaning-making clustering the researcher derived from the interview data. The interviewee’s confirmation about content and new concepts helped reduce researcher bias, generated additional data from their review, and provided consistent data for triangulation (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016; Schwandt, 2001). The participants had two weeks to respond to this member check request, and the researcher tracked progress with each interviewee’s assistant.

**Data Analysis Methods**

Data analysis involved a detailed process of coding, pattern-matching, and meaning-making (Creswell, 2015; 2013). The researcher created and administered the survey. Also, the researcher performed all interviews and transcriptions. The investigator worked with participant assistants for member checking completions. Reading all the material with the research questions in mind helped the researcher use the raw material for contextual explanation building. Roberts (2010) mentions that software tools help researchers remain objective and be rigorous in their analysis. Yin (2018) provided a useful approach to using computer-assisted qualitative analysis software (CAQDAS) such as Atlas.ti, HyperRESEARCH, NVIVO or The Ethnograph. A strategy is required for the successful use of this type of software to include putting information into thematic arrays, creating a matrix of contrasting categories and placing evidence underneath, creating visual displays, tabulating the frequency of different events, and creating a chronological or other type of sequence (Yin, 2018; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). This CAQDAS strategy was a useful approach to develop meaning units, how they cluster into common categories, and develop textual descriptions of the participants’ experiences (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Moustakas, 1994).
The researcher’s analysis consisted of iterative review, comparison, grouping, clustering, and meaning making of the survey, interview, and online postings data. The conceptual framework provided the central focus for organizing and managing the data to reduce it in a meaningful way (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016). The survey was constructed using the Bolman and Deal (2013) four frame leader orientation as well as vocabulary that draws on definitions on Tannen (1990a) and her difference theory. The conceptual framework was used for categorizing and coding raw survey and interview data (Bloomberg and Volpe, 2016). Participants in the pilot were five colleagues who took the survey and were interviewed. They served as peer reviewers throughout data collection, analysis, and interpretation (Creswell, 2013). The information was synthesized using both automated and manual tools to create visualizations such as tables, figures, and graphs to report on connections between emergent themes (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, Creswell, 2013). This study also used participant’s statements to reinforce and elaborate on identified themes and sub-themes that develop. These thematic portrayals validated the researcher’s analysis and conclusions (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Creswell, 2015; 2013; Moustakas, 1994).

The use of verbatim statements as part of the findings made it essential to collect the data in a way that preserved and protected each university’s and president’s/chancellor’s identity. Each participant in the structured survey was assigned a number to conceal identity (for example, President 1, Chancellor 1). These labels were preserved and used for those agreeing to participate in the follow-on interviews. However, anonymizing is also more than changing names because the qualitative data can contain other identifying information such as demographic and other data that can identify a participant (Bloomberg and Volpe, 2016; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The small number of women presidents and chancellors meant that this researcher had to take great
care not to disclose the location, type of institution, and other information that others could use to identify the participant.

The next step was to code each transcript to capture emerging patterns (Stake, 1995, as cited in Creswell, 2013). The coding process served as a way to create transcendental-phenomenological reduction that helps this researcher grasp the structural essences of the president or chancellor search experience (Moustakas, 1994). This process was systematic but not linear (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016). The first step was to develop categories that were derived from the conceptual framework and served as the centerpiece for the study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The following step was to develop descriptors for each category, and iteratively go through a reduction process (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016; Moustakas, 1994). This process required rereading, coding, journaling, creating summary tables, and testing/retesting as a central part of the process (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016). The imaginative variation occurred as the research triangulated data, cross checks assure credibility and validity, and the thematic essence derived was translated into findings (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Moustakas, 1994). These steps helped formulate meaning making and allowed for essential truths crystalize for this study (Figure 3.2).
Analysis

Creswell (2013) considers validation in qualitative research as a process where researchers assess the accuracy of the investigation if it closely describes the participants’ perceptions. Validation strategies are used to make sure researchers use systemic procedures depending on the qualitative approach used (Creswell, 2015; 2013). Often, the most rigorous qualitative research uses triangulation of multiple methods and sources to shed light on a theme or perspective (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Creswell, 2015; 2013). Bloomberg and Volpe (2016)
describe how surveys, interviews, observations, focus groups, critical incidents, and document reviews are a means to accomplish triangulation. This study used surveys, interviews, observations, and an extensive artifact review for its analysis. The surveys, interviews, and online document was used for triangulation to eliminate researcher bias to the greatest extent practicable (Creswell, 2013). The use of qualitative analysis software helped minimize bias and kept the researcher objective while developing and grouping themes (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016).

The researcher used NVIVO Transcription to get a verbatim text document of each semi-structured interview. The next step was to have it member-checked and then loaded into qualitative coding software called NVIVO 12 for Mac. NVIVO assisted with annotating, coding, and analyzing structured data (documents) and unstructured data (video, pictures, etc.). This tool helped to store, organize, categorize, analyze, and visualize to discover new connections about the data collected. This software assisted with thematic analysis by using text, audio, and video files. It took the material and allowed the researcher to create different visualizations such as mind maps, word clouds, comparison diagrams, and project maps to identify emergent themes. This software helped with objective connections and assures validity and reliability (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Creswell, 2015).

After coding, the researcher aggregated the data into categories and then collapsed this categorical aggregation into themes (Creswell, 2013). The next step was an analysis that performed sensemaking generalizations to capture the story around the phenomenon in this case. Bloomberg and Volpe (2016) suggested that reconstructing meaning yields learning and this sensemaking process will make comparisons by gender, age, and experience to provide insight on gender bias in the president or chancellor selection process. At this point, the researcherl
drafted preliminary findings and then reached out to participants as a member check to review and reflect on the accuracy of the perceptions depicted. Individuals had two weeks to reflect on the depiction, and the researcher will use these responses to eliminate inaccuracies.

External validation is essential so that the findings are useful for generalization to the broader population (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Merriam and Tisdell (2016) advised one to think of the reader and how they can apply the findings to their particular setting. This study has great potential for providing transferable insight to the community of practice through detailed descriptions and interpretations of the underrepresentation of women as college or university presidents and chancellors. However, the community of practice will only accept findings they deem credible by this researcher taking considerable precautions against inserting bias.

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) offered that humans can rarely capture objective truths unless they use strategies to improve validity. Triangulation is the most substantial qualitative strategy for internal validity and credibility (Bloomberg and Volpe, 2016; Merriam and Tisdell, 2016). Another technique is to use external strategies to corroborate evidence, and the use of peer review is a best practice (Bloomberg and Volpe, 2016; Merriam and Tisdell, 2016). This study employed both triangulation and peer debriefing to mitigate the researcher’s personal bias.

**Participant Rights**

The researcher attained approval from the University of New England Institutional Review Board (IRB) before contacting participants. The participants’ anonymity was guaranteed to protect them from any retribution that could occur if the research revealed their identity (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Creswell, 2013; Moustakas, 1994). The researcher redacted names and identity references from the transcripts and replaced that information with pseudonyms. Audio files will be retained, and video files were destroyed. Security of all files was also a
primary concern (Fink, 2017; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Creswell, 2013). The researcher secured all data by password protection of both the computer and the files. A good practice is to back up all files (Fink, 2017), and these backups were password protected as well. The researcher will store these materials for a minimum of three years.

Participation in this study was voluntary, and each participant electronically consented to be involved before launching the rest of the structured survey. The researcher used a second consent form for follow-on in-depth interviews. Participants were reminded that they could discontinue answering questions and withdraw at any time. The participants were also reminded that they could elect to use both audio and video for the session or just audio (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). All names for people and universities were re-labeled with numbers to prevent identity exposure (for example, President 1 from University 1, Chancellor 1 from College 2, etc.). The researcher also redacted names from transcripts.

There are ethical considerations for participant privacy when preparing findings and using data that will be disseminated widely (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The underrepresentation of women at the highest levels of academia is a sensitive topic (DeFrank-Cole et al., 2014; Enke, 2014). It is an ethical imperative to protect participants and avoid any embarrassment or retribution due to disclosures made for this study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). This researcher took a multi-step approach to protect each participant and their rights. The researcher used pseudonyms for participants to preserve anonymity since they were candid about sensitive topics embedded in the survey and interviews (Creswell, 2015). Protecting identity in this way protected participants from professional retribution for expressing honest perceptions (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Creswell, 2015). The study did not use any identifiable or attributable detail in the data collection, analysis, interpretation, or findings communications. For executives who had
an assistant who serves as a scheduler, the researcher emailed the questions with the interview request and arranged a time. This researcher used Zoom for interviewing since it has a built-in recording function and encouraged the participants to use both audio and video to build rapport and trust (Fink, 2017; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The researcher uploaded interviews into NVivo Transcription for verbatim transcription. The interviewer also used a separate digital recording device recording the session as a backup.

The researcher communicated with each participant initially by email and then by telephone to discuss the purpose of the study, to build rapport, and schedule interview times. When analyzing the data, this researcher maintained confidentiality by disassociating participants’ identifying information from all data collected and uploaded into the tools. The presidents or chancellors reviewed and released the interview transcripts to ensure the accuracy and clarity of their comments. Finally, all data was in encrypted files to guarantee security. These password-protected data files reside only on the researcher’s laptop and a separate hard drive. This hardware is an encrypted backup drive with a secure password. Once the study is published and the dissertation complete, the researcher will use U.S. federal government-approved removal software to delete the files from the laptop permanently. The encrypted drive will remain in a lockbox for three years from publication. It will be reformatted using U.S. government standard wipe-drive software after the three years elapse.

**Potential Limitations**

This study is particularly narrow in scope, and there are several inherent limitations. It is not possible to study all university presidents and chancellors because of the sheer number and diversity of this population. The sample bounding to the public and nonprofit private colleges and universities assured the researcher of the most like comparisons practicable. Creswell (2013)
reminds that “the intent of qualitative research is not to generalize the information…but to elucidate the particular” (p. 157). The use of indirect and direct solicitation of participants is the most significant limitation because the researcher cannot control for geography or type of institution. The method of inviting women presidents and chancellors to self-select into the study means that control is limited. This lack of control limits the researcher from creating a more random array of participants, and so clustering of respondents may skew some of the findings (Creswell, 2013). Also, by conducting the case study on women presidents and chancellors, there are limits as to be able to generalize the results and implications to the broader U.S. or global public university president and chancellor population.

There are challenges with both sample size limits and the qualitative methodology itself. There are many advantages to using interviews for qualitative inquiry, but limitations persist. Bloomberg and Volpe (2016) remind scholars that interviewees are very different offering disparate levels of cooperation, erudition, and perception; that interviewers may not be skilled; and, bias may creep in as part of the process of gathering data (p. 155). Qualitative researchers must put mechanisms in place to mitigate these limitations (Creswell, 2013). This study improved quality through triangulation with survey and interview data with job postings analysis.

**Conclusion**

This chapter detailed the methodology and offered insight and rationale for this phenomenological study of women who presently serve as presidents or chancellors of public higher education (HE) institutions to explore their experiences with gender-bias during president or chancellor recruitment, selection, and transition enactment. It showed how the methodology is used to answer the research questions which were grounded in the intersectionality of difference
theory and organizational leader theory as part of the conceptual framework. Ethical considerations were used for setting, access, and participant rights to shield those involved from any implications made by the study. The researcher discussed the rationale for the qualitative data collection by being very specific as to how, where, when, and by whom. The chapter described the data collection process and the use of NVivo software to conduct data analysis and accurate node coding. This rigor led to a discussion on data source triangulation to assure validity. Finally, the chapter outlined how the study’s research processes created a solid foundation of trustworthiness that protected participants, reduced bias, and mitigated any conflict of interest.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The purpose of this qualitative phenomenological study was to explore possible barriers that may exist in higher education centralized president or chancellor hiring processes. The intention was to explore hiring artifacts and perceptions from women presidents and chancellors from public and private non-profit colleges and universities. The triangulation of artifacts, surveys, and interview data created a picture that may shed light on reasons for a lack of gender equity in top executive positions. The low percentages of women presidents and chancellors suggest barriers exist despite a long history of female leadership in higher education.

Women were first introduced as higher education leaders when Frances Elizabeth Willard became the first female college president of the private Evanston College for Ladies, associated with Northwestern University, in 1871 (Gangone & Lennon, 2014). It was not until almost a century later that women gained leadership roles in some public institutions (Thelin, 2011; Madsen, 2011). A crisis erupted in 1975, and the University of Texas at Austin and its board selected Lorene L. Rogers to deal with turbulence resulting from her male predecessor’s ouster (Solomon, 1985). The leadership of Ivy League institutions remained all-male until 1994, when Judith Rodin became the first permanent female president of Columbia University and an Ivy League institution (Jamison, 1995). The American Council on Education (ACE) College President (2017) cited, “women and racial/ethnic minorities were underrepresented among the presidency” as a key finding which highlights the slow progress women are making as they endeavor to ascend to top leadership (p. ix). The 2018 data showed women representing only 30.6% of university presidents despite this number being three times the share in 1986 (Pew
Research, 2019, January). The research findings in this chapter identified perceived obstacles encountered by women seeking higher education executive positions.

**Brief Review of the Methodology**

The researcher sought to understand and summarize any barriers revealed through the analysis of job advertisement artifacts. This study also used information from participants about their journey from candidate recruitment, through selection with its screening, interviews, and associated winnowing activities, and, finally, the methods such as communications used to announce the board or selection committee decision. Three data sources were necessary to validate accurate analysis for this exploration and reduce researcher bias. All three data items used were part of an analysis spiral where this researcher engaged in the process of organizing the data; reading and writing memos; describing, classifying and interpreting; and then representing and visualizing the data (Creswell, 2013).

The first source of data was president and chancellor job advertisements with associated job descriptions posted from 2014 to 2019. The researcher contacted eight major professional and higher education career sites that post president and chancellor job announcements. The researcher requested copies of all public and private non-profit university and college president and chancellor advertisements published from 2014 to present for this study. The Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC) and the ChronicleVitae staff from the Chronicle of Higher Education provided the data. There were 714 job descriptions offered. The breakout by year was 177 for 2014, 173 for 2015, 177 for 2016, 172 for 2017, 152, for 2018, and 35 for 2019.

The next avenue for data collection came from conducting a structured survey. The researcher tested the survey using three different email addresses from home, work, and school email accounts. The REDCap survey tool successfully contacted all three email locations during
this test run. The home email address was used to make sure those who retired could use the survey as easily as those participants still working at a university or college. One important logistical note was that the survey email from the REDCap instrument occasionally went into individuals’ spam folders. That information was noted and used later when following up with assistants to see if potential participants missed the request due to the misdirection of the request into the participant’s spam folder. The next step was to conduct a pilot test (Fink, 2017). Fink (2017) reminded that this practice of piloting helps produce a survey that is usable and provides the information needed. The test validated the importance of the survey pilot test. Eleven test subjects pretended to be presidents and chancellors and took the survey. The researcher shortened the survey and modified questions for greater precision and clarity after receiving participant feedback. The pilot test participants also shared insights as to how best compose the invitation notes. This process also allowed the researcher to refine the use of the REDCap automated survey generation and tracking process.

The researcher launched the final survey on a Monday with the researcher sending out requests to all 214 possible participants and posting on 16 social media sites. The 16 sites included three separate platforms. The first was LinkedIn where the researcher posted to the main site and five groups: 1) ILA Women and Leadership Affinity Group (WLAG); 2) West Point Women; 3) American Association of University Women Standard group; 4) Women in Technology (WIT) and, 5) AIGA Women's Leadership. There were postings on eight groups sites on Facebook: 1) Networking within the Academy; 2) West Point Women; 3) Women of Influence; 4; Institutional Leadership in Higher Education; 5) Progressive Women of Maine; 6) Leadership Educators in Higher Education; 7) American Association of University Women (AAUW); and, 8) Doctor of Education (Ed.D) Network. Finally, there were posts to the
International Leadership Association’s (ILA) HubILA and Women & Leadership Affinity Group discussion sites. The REDCap tool provided a mechanism to send out and track requests without jeopardizing participant anonymity once the investigator put the survey into production. The survey remained open for two full weeks. The researcher put the survey in offline status after the pre-determined dates ended to prevent any additional participation outside the designated period. A total of 214 women presidents or chancellors received a direct request in addition to the use of 16 social media sites. There were 21 surveys returned with 19 completed and two incompletes, thus representing a 10% return rate. Ten participants agreed to participate in a semi-structured follow-up interview.

The semi-structured interview was the final means for collecting data. The last questions in the structured survey requested participation in the semi-structured interview. Participants who were willing to partake in a follow-up interview provided their name, contact phone number, and, if they had one, their assistant’s name and contact information. The researcher contacted each assistant by phone and email to schedule the interview. The coordination email had more detailed information and included a copy of the interview questions, consent form, and the researcher’s resume. Each participant was asked to execute a second consent form before the scheduled interview. All but one of the meetings were done by Zoom video teleconferencing, which allowed the researcher used to record and use the automated transcription feature. A handheld Zoom microphone provided a backup audio recording. There was one participant who did not want a video interview. The alternative was to do a phone interview with the device on speaker mode. The interviewer used Zoom videoconferencing to record only herself on video but also capturing the participant’s audio. The Zoom handheld device was the backup again. This technique allowed for capturing the participant's response in a way that the researcher could
make use of the automated transcription capability of the Zoom videoconferencing tool. The transcripts were anonymized versions checked by peer reviewers. There were several instances where the peer reviewer detected language that appeared inaccurately transcribed, and the researcher corrected those before sending to the participant for member checking. Several participants made additional corrections, and those changes were in the final versions. The member checked transcript was then anonymized by taking out names and replacing them with “P” and a number that also appeared on in an Excel spreadsheet tracker. Also, the researcher removed locations, other people references, and place references to achieve confidentiality. The researcher uploaded the anonymized transcript into NVivo 12 for Mac and coded the data.

**Analyzing the Job Description Data**

The job description data was managed and organized using the conceptual lens heavily relying on the Bolman and Deal (2013) Four Frame Model and the difference theory devised by Tannen (1990a). The researcher used a systematic procedure for data analysis. The researcher consolidated the ChronicleVitae and Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC) data into one large Excel spreadsheet. Coding began with uploading the spreadsheet into NVivo 12 for Mac for initial coding. This data was both rich and thick, meaning that there was a lot of data, and it was multi-layered, intricate, detailed, and nuanced (Fusch and Ness, 2015). The first coding allowed the researcher to winnow the data into useful meaning clusters (Saldaña, 2016; Creswell, 2013). The second and subsequent coding spirals required the researcher to re-read and examine data, code data, and place data in categories (Creswell, 2013). The final coding allowed the researcher to represent the data in various forms of abstraction that facilitated the interpretation and reporting of the findings (Saldaña, 2009).
Receiving and cleaning the data guided the analytical approach for coding and categorizing. Patterns evolved into themes as the data was collected, cleaned, structured for the automated tool, and evaluated. HERC and the ChronicleVitae agreed to release their data after securing a signed release that protected the confidentiality of the data by limiting the scope for research purposes. HERC provided data in spreadsheet and picture formats. The researcher used a portable document format (PDF) file to convert the pictures into a Microsoft (MS) Word file. The researcher then used Acrobat to save the file into an MS Word document with text. The conversion process was not wholly accurate, and the data had to be corrected and checked against the original job description picture to assure accuracy.

Fixing the job descriptions provided a hidden opportunity to be deeply immersed in the data. This concentration on data format and accuracy accelerated the process determining which approach to use for first cycle coding. Saldana (2016) explained the seven initial coding subcategories being “grammatical, elemental, affective, literary and language, exploratory, procedural, and theming the data” (p. 69). This inquiry used the In Vivo Method for coding derived from the actual language of the job descriptions versus the participants (Saldana, 2016; Creswell, 2013). Using the conceptual lens that incorporates language from both Tannen (1990a) and Bolman and Deal (2013), the codes and following categories came from both difference theory and the four-frame leadership orientation model.

Coding the job advertisements by year gave the researcher an insider’s view into the selection process (Saldaña, 2016). The researcher coded the entire 2014 set consisting of 177 job descriptions. Fusch and Ness (2015) guided the pursuit of saturation by offering that this occurs when reaching the point of no new data, and this most likely is the point of no new themes. Data saturation for this research happened by the 75th instance during the first coding of 2014 data.
However, the researcher coded the entire 2014 set to be both rigorous and assure time for reflection and peer review to eliminate personal bias (Figure 4.1).

**Figure 4.1.** Word cloud generated by NVivo 12 for Mac of the top words that appeared in the first coding.

Figure 4.1 is a visualization of the key terms that began to emerge when using the conceptual model to shape meaning clusters. The word cloud produced shows patterns that eventually distilled into 25 traits as dominate skills, knowledge, and capabilities desired by the advertising higher education organizations. The researcher coded 10% of the ensuing annual data sets for 2015 though 2019 to validate that data saturation remained consistent over time. Ultimately, there were 226 of 714 (32%) coded, and this rigor confirmed data saturation identified by 25
nodes. This initial coding broke down the job description qualitative data into discrete parts that allowed for a close examination, comparison, and deep reflection (Saldaña, 2016).

The second coding used the concept or analytical approach where a series of codes or categories from a meta-theory is used to organize the data (Saldana, 2016). This type of classification allowed for the aggregation of broad units of information into representational themes (Creswell, 2013). The researcher used a deductive analysis, which is a theory-driven approach (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016). The job description codes started to present patterns that the researcher refined in subsequent coding spirals that used the conceptual framework as a guide. Gender coding showed balanced results.

Table 4.1

Adapting Difference Theory to Categorize Nodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic/Charisma</td>
<td>Creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Leadership</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Change Agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Leadership</td>
<td>Student Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Social Consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>People Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>Openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational excellence</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiator*</td>
<td>Advocate*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Negotiator and Advocate became one coding node, but the theory defines the former as more male and the latter more female (Tannen, 1990a).

The first coding cycles showed that the advertisements posted from 2014 to 2019 were substantively gender-balanced as they listed their desired executive traits.
The nodes also sorted into the structural, political, human resource, and symbolic frames during the first coding cycles. The Bolman and Deal (2013) four-frame leader orientation model shaped the four categories (Figure 4.2). The next step was examining data to discern if organizations favored certain frames over others. The four-frame model was an excellent conceptual tool for sorting attributes into nodes and useful in developing meaning-making categories (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Numbers of Attributes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The progressive coding cycles produced more granular insights. The researcher found that institutions were most interested in the symbolic frame where a good leader is a prophet and visionary, who uses symbols, tells stories, and frames experience in ways that give people meaning and hope (Bolman & Deal, 2013; Bolman & Deal, n.d.). The last phase of the coding spiral allowed this researcher to package the data into tabular (Table 4.3) and figure (Figure 4.2) representational formats.
Figure 4.2. Job description nodes develop into categories using the conceptual framework. This figure is an adaptation of adapted the Bolman and Deal (2013) Four-Frame Model.

The symbolic frame emerged as most highly prized as evidenced by the number of traits falling into that area. Higher education organizations comparably valued political and structural frames with a slight edge given to political acumen based on the number of attributes expected. The human resource frame that emphasized people skills and interactions was the least developed orientation described by the job description data.

Bloomberg and Volpe (2012) recommended the use of tables and figures as ways of summarizing and representing the data as a means to examine and present the findings. The use of visualizations was an essential tool for interpretation of the job description data. The process went from formulation of codes to organization of themes, and those themes were used in larger
units of abstraction to make sense of the data (Creswell, 2013). It was at this point that the researcher obtained feedback from colleagues acting as peer reviewers for the initial and subsequent coding of transcripts findings. The peer debriefs asked tough questions about methods, meanings, and interpretations and helped clarify impressions to eliminate any researcher assumptions or biases (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Creswell, 2013). Final coding followed this external check.

This coding cycle process also drew on executive theory with the four-frame model for other facets of meaning-making from the data. The emergent 25 attributes fell into the Barnard (1938) model of executive leadership, which is defined by the three key elements of communication; willingness to serve; and, common purpose.

Table 4.3

*Adaptation of Barnard (1938) Showing Alignment to Twenty-five Highly Preferred Traits*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Willingness to Serve</th>
<th>Common Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Community engagement</td>
<td>Financial Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Operational excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Student development</td>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>People oriented</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Social consciousness</td>
<td>Change agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic/Charismatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate/Negotiator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 showed the 25 traits showed how higher education organizations used job advertisements to traditional industrial executive leaders described by Barnard (1938). This industrial era view of a trait may also account for some associated biases. Allen (2015) noted that
even well-intentioned approaches to gender equity are "framed through dominant discourses that are rarely questioned" (p. 294). Organizations put an exhaustive list of executive skills, knowledge, and capabilities into their advertisements. One participant observed that they, “generally, they want a perfect person. They want a person who's done academics, student affairs, fundraising -- you know—facilities --everything.” It appeared that higher education boards and search committees sought highly skilled executives that had a strong symbolic orientation to represent the institution but may let industrial era biases influence how they evaluated candidates.

Continued analysis by sorting the data in various ways brought forth greater insights as to understanding what colleges and universities wanted for their executive leaders.
Table 4.4

*Categorization of coded nodes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nodes</th>
<th>Number of coding references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural Frame\Operational excellence</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Frame\Financial leadership</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Frame\Diversity</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Frame\Community engagement</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Frame\Commitment</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Frame\Leadership</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Frame\Collaboration</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Frame\Experience</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Frame\Student development</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Frame\Vision</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Frame\Strategic</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Frame\Communications</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Frame\Intellect</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Frame\Political</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Frame\Innovation</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Frame\Integrity</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Frame\People oriented</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Frame\Energetic&amp;Charismatic</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Frame\Openness</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Frame\Global leadership</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Frame\Creative</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Frame\Social consciousness</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Frame\Inspirational</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Frame\Change agents</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Frame\Advocate&amp;Negotiator</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: All 226 ended with a Title IX equal opportunity disclaimer*

Table 4.4 depicts the frequency of each meaning unit by node and category sorted by highest to the lowest frequency. Organizations used the top 12 traits twice as much as the bottom items. This frequency suggested that higher education institutions particularly valued organizational excellence, financial leadership, diversity, community engagement, commitment, leadership,
collaboration, experience, student development, vision, strategic, and communications.

Figure 4.3. Coded job description data hierarchical tree. This diagram represented another means to present the data. Here the color scheme is not consistent across the four categories. However, it does show the greater proportionality of the top twelve categories in a visually compelling manner.

Figure 4.3 is a visualization that shows the magnitude at which each node was valued. The largest presence fell predominately into the symbolic and political categories. The nodes that showed up the least of the four categories were in the human resource frame area.

Data streams were managed using Excel spreadsheets and visual charts. This data control technique helped the researcher organize data collection, data analysis, and report writing.
throughout the multi-coding process. These three steps are essential and interrelated activities that often coincide in a research project (Creswell, 2013). The researcher used NVivo 12 tools to code and annotate prominent words and phrases as emergent patterns developed. Visualizations such as the hierarchical tree in Figure 4.3, highlighted interpretive patterns (Creswell, 2013).

The significance of this data stream was that the researcher ascertained meta information from distilling the 25 traits that were most important to public and private not-for-profit institutions. The finding was that these institutions substantially prized the symbolic frame. This gravitation toward the symbolic influenced their review process during the recruiting stage and when interviewing candidates during selection activities. Both survey responses and in-depth interviews substantiated the emphasis on vision. A participant with a high symbolic frame orientation expressed it this way,

I put together my vision...you might consider it an application letter, but it was more than that. It was more of what I would do if I were selected. This is what I do and how I approach everything.

The finding that institutions also prized political acumen was noteworthy. Most of the survey respondents shared that financial leadership items like fundraising and operating budgets came up frequently along with strategic questions. Another participant related this importance,

It may have been a reflection of the fact that they thought those were areas where a female candidate will be a little weaker than a male candidate. They were more concerned about that. They want to explore it more. I'm not sure. But there were a lot of questions about finances and comfort level with economic analysis and business models.
The final major insight derived from the job advertisement analysis was the appearance of institutional differences based upon US geography, male or female genesis of the institution, and whether or not the organization was secular or religious. These institutional differences were discussed with participants in the semi-structured interviews.

**Analyzing the Structured Survey**

The structured survey provided trend information about presidents and chancellors. Interviews with a small sample subset of the initially surveyed population allowed for more detailed probing. The goal for this small population of past and present women presidents and chancellors was to get at least 15 participants. Twenty-one individuals took part in the survey which represented roughly a ten percent return rate from the 214 direct requests sent out via REDCap. The goal for follow-up participants was six. Ten individuals agreed to these subsequent sessions, which represented a five percent interview participation rate.

The participants' demographic data was useful in the overall analysis. Current or former presidents made up 90.5% or the respondents. Fewer than 15% were under 55 years old. There were 90.5% who were the first time in the role. The majority of the participants (58%) were between 55 and 64 years old. Roughly 90% of those surveyed were not previous alumni or faculty of the institutions they led. Also, most were in the role for the first time with slightly over 57% having had fewer than four years of experience in the position. Whether or not organizations actively recruited the president or chancellor for the role was for all purposes split with 57.1% actively pursued. The provost role appeared to be the previous prevailing role with slightly more than 47% of the respondents in that role when contacted by a recruiter. These participants experienced an average of three to four finalists for the position. Fifty-five percent of those surveyed perceived that their offer packets were less favorable than those received by male
counterparts. Finally, less than 10% expressed any perception that there was special consideration made in their selection announcement due to gender. The overall sample pool sufficiently reflected the diversity of the US public and private, not-for-profit institution presidents and chancellors with representation from all regions.

The second portion of the survey assessed the respondents’ leader orientation against the Bolman and Deal (2013) model. Bolman and Deal (2013) developed their questionnaire from research where the majority of the population was male, but not exclusively. These frames provide a mental model with particular ideas and assumptions that a leader carries in their head to help understand and negotiate a particular “territory” (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 10). The data from the participants correlated highly with the authors’ leader orientation scales from the larger sample population (Figure 4.4).
Figure 4.4. Adapted from Bolman and Deal (n.d.) research using the leader orientation survey instrument population data. A comparison between the participants and the broader executive population suggested that this is a highly reliable and valid model to use for this analysis.

The scores suggested that this study’s surveyed population tilted heavily as structural leaders.

Bolman and Deal (2013) provided detailed descriptions for the four difference frames leader orientations, which helped understand the results. Figure 4.5 shows the breakout:
The participants self-reported on their four-frame leadership orientation with 58% describing themselves as structural leaders. Bolman and Deal (2013) described this leader as emphasizing rationality, logic, facts, and data. This type of leader tends to emphasize the importance of clear structure, well-developed management systems, and to be highly analytical (Bolman & Deal, 2013). The next two areas were weighted relatively evenly, with 28% identifying as symbolic leaders and 26% percent as human resource leaders. Symbolic leaders rely on personal charisma to get people energized and concentrate on providing vision and inspiration as essential management tasks (Bolman & Deal, 2013). The human resources leader emphasizes the importance of people and believes in the importance of coaching, participation, motivation, teamwork, and excellent interpersonal relations (Bolman & Deal, 2013). None of the participants...
identified as having a political orientation. The political frame orientation has leaders who are comfortable with conflict, advocacy and fighting for an organization’s goals and objectives and emphasize the importance of building various power bases using allies, networks, coalitions (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Overall, women participants oriented toward structural, symbolic, human resource, and then political frames. This ranking of the four frames contrasts with the job announcement data for higher education public and private, not-for-profit organizations. The qualitative job analysis showed that higher education institutions valued symbolic, political, structural, and then human resource frames. The misalliance between individual and organizational frame orientations may introduce implicit bias at the point where expectations between the two are different.

The participants' strengths and weaknesses also bore out the broader trends described in the literature, and this information aided behavior analysis of participant self-reported leadership orientations. The sample population identified the political frame as their weakest area (68%). Research showed that women must understand the often-patriarchal organizational culture in higher education and make adjustments to have a realistic chance to successfully compete for the role as women through executive hiring processes (O’Connor, 2018; Reis & Grady, 2018). It was also significant to note that participant data highly correlates to the overall sample population. However, these women leaders consistently scored themselves lower than the predominately male total sample population in every category. The current body of research captured his inhibition to self-promote or "brag" about themselves. Tannen, Hamilton, and Schiffrin (2015) found that women are not “naturally” inhibited but have become reticent by the legal and social constraints placed on them. One participant spoke about causes for this reluctance,
It is hard because we are socialized in certain ways. I think that it's hard to tease that out. When you have to demonstrate your competency continually, it gets emotionally tiring. I think that sometimes women may labor under that more so than men. I can't speak specifically to men's experiences, but being colleagues with men, and seeing in my own experiences, I'm not sure that they labor under that same sense of "I'm always trying to prove my myself and my competencies."

I think over time it's a little bit of the "death of a thousand cuts"… why subject yourself to that?

Women’s socialized resistance to self-promote may explain why they scored themselves lower than the predominately male population who were initially studied. The data also showed that female leaders scored themselves lower than their male counterparts. Another example of women being reticent to promote themselves found in this study was from the survey where only 68% rated themselves in the top 20% as leaders and only 47% rated themselves in the top 20% as managers despite having reached the presidency which puts them at the pinnacle of their profession. This documented avoidance of self-promotion may be seen by the hiring boards and committees as a woman candidate being less prepared than male counterparts for the job.

The behaviors section provided more fidelity behind the macro trends offered by the initial four-frame leader orientation results. There were eight sets of choices that forced the respondents to rank their perceived strengths between the four frames. The structural questions received the highest scores. All participants rated themselves in top categories for clear and logical, and 95% approached problems with facts and logic using rational analysis and careful thinking. Eighty-nine percent rated themselves highly for setting specific, measurable goals and holding people accountable, and 84% responded in the top category for developing and
implementing coherent policies and procedures. The only low categories were in the areas of having extraordinary attention to detail, where only 63% rated themselves highly. Finally, 53% believed in a clear structure and a chain of command for the organization. It is possible that these participants who were highly oriented toward the structural frame could be seen as acting in gender incongruent ways when creating and implementing their organizational change blueprints (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

The structural frame can be perceived by team members as prescriptive since it involves the roles, goals, policies, technology, and environment of an organization and the creation of a blueprint for formal and informal expectations between internal and external constituencies (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Followers may see actions that support the structural frame as masculine or dominating by those forced to change (Hironimus-Wendt & Dedjoe, 2015; Kotter, 2012; Haslam & Ryan, 2008). Kapasi, Sang, and Sitko (2016) shared findings about women who used hierarchical or agentic leadership approaches in response to organizational expectations, or cultural norms were viewed negatively by their stakeholders (Kapasi et al., 2016). Seven of the 10 women interviewed discussed feeling this double bind when using agentic behaviors because of coaching they received from male mentors or board feedback. Men using similar agentic behaviors were viewed positively. In contrast, the women received negative feedback due to gender incongruency (Rhee & Sigler, 2015; Eagley & Carli, 2007; Jamieson, 1995). A participant recounted a situation this way,

…we had a consultant in to do my 360…they interview students, faculty, staff, and trustees. There are paper-pencil interviews, etc., etc. When he gave me the feedback, he used the words “be more warm and fuzzy.” I said to him, “What exactly does that mean? Let me make sure I understand.” He said, “You know;
when guy presidents go to a basketball game, they might not wear a tie. I said, “Is that really what you mean? I never wear ties. What does that mean for me? The literature supports this finding where women executives oscillate between agentic and consensus behaviors because of conflicting feedback (Tannen, Hamilton, & Schiffrin, 2015). An interviewee shared this reflection about Board interaction,

Smile…but not too warm! This is the problem! You don't want to be too female…it goes back to that masculine language…like "dominate" [and] "be aggressive." Because…they are thinking that some things about me being warm make me come across as weak. The trustees want to reinforce that I need to be harder. The interesting thing is when I am, oh boy, do I get called out IMMEDIATELY! Now I am too aggressive and too directive. I need to be more collaborative. It is really a tough one, and that makes me nuts.

This desire for respect and collaborative approaches appears in the symbolic and human resource frames. Conflicts between the frames may not mitigate the women participant's strong structural inclinations. The literature supports the use of symbolic and human resource frames to mitigate structural inclinations (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Digital era challenges call for college presidents and chancellors to be much more multidimensional leaders who can use changing approaches to deal with evolving institutions, and outside stakeholder pressures (Selingo et al., 2017; Thelin, 2011). Research showed that women were particularly adept at this new multidisciplinary role (Hironimus-Wendt & Dedjoe, 2015; Haslam & Ryan, 2008; Cubillo & Brown, 2003; Carless, 1998). The need for presidents with a stronger human resource orientation may reduce board demands for agentic behaviors from women presidents and chancellors in the future.
The symbolic frame was the second most robust frame for the participants, with 28% identifying it as their strongest area. The respondents’ highest self-scores were in two sub-areas for this frame. The first sub-area was communicating vision and mission and the second inspiring others at 89%. The areas of strength were quite a bit lower than the first. This category had 79% of the respondents using “always” or “often” for the actions of generating exciting new opportunities and generating loyalty and enthusiasm. Seventy-four percent self-scored “always” or “often” as being an inspiration to others. The self-assessing questions got lower responses. Only 63% strongly identified themselves as charismatic, and 53% considered themselves as highly imaginative and creative. The inspirational traits are the area of most significant alignment between the area that both organizations and participant value. Two interviewees had high symbolic orientation and expressed the least amount of perceived gender bias in the interview and launch questions. This finding suggests that this is an area of congruent value between higher organizations and women executive candidates and further and perhaps one that women candidates may emphasize during their centralized selection journey.

The number of respondents identifying the human resource frame as strongest was close to the same as those who identify as symbolic orientations, but it was still three in a list of four overall orientations. The participants' human resource orientation results were bifurcated between collaborative actions versus sensitivity traits in a substantial way. The participants scored themselves “in the top” or “near the top” 95% of the time. The first of these collaboration questions was about building trust, open, and collaborative relationships. The second question asked how they fostered participation and involvement in decisions. These female presidents and chancellors showed deep concern as evidenced by scoring 84% for being consistently helpful and responsive to others as well as giving personal recognition for work well done. They also
scored themselves strongly with 79% “always” or “often listening well and receptive” to other people's ideas and input as well as providing high support and concern. The lowest areas were their self-reported score as a highly participative manager and showing high sensitivity and care about needs and feelings with both areas scoring 74%. The respondents tended to score questions about themselves lower than questions about how they interact with others. The literature reflected the value of collaboration rather than sensitivity. This strong orientation to drive consensus may influence activities supporting greater globalization. Global leadership is an area where higher education organizations seek out leaders who can improve communications and enhanced collaboration (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Jackson, 2017).

None of the participants considered themselves as politically oriented leaders, and the behavior breakout substantiated this self-assessment. The respondents rarely answered “always” to any of the questions in this category. The most robust area in this category was mobilizing people and resources, which scored 84% and possibly underscoring their structural preferences. The next highest area was 79% for the two traits. The first asked about their perception of their effectiveness in getting support from people with influence and power. The second was to succeed in the face of conflict and opposition. However, all responded as “often” and none for “always” for these two questions. The questions moved from actions to traits, and the scores descended between the two as they did for the other three frames. Seventy-four percent of these women presidents and chancellors judged themselves as politically very sensitive and skillful and strongly developing alliances to build a strong base of support. The weakest areas were for questions that asked about personal characteristics with only 68% who rated themselves highly for being persuasive and influential and 58% as skilled anticipating and dealing adroitly with conflict. It is not clear if women do not have the political orientation or do not acknowledge it
because of the masculine implications of behaviors such as conflict and power acquisition, thus warranting further study.

Regardless of actual avoidance or lack of acknowledgment of political orientation, a board's perception of a lack of political savvy may work against women candidates. Thelin (2011) noted that state, local, and private governing bodies used financial support as a means to make sure that the President preserved their symbolic, structural, and political values at the college. There is literature that suggested that male and female educators are deploying lower levels of competitive behaviors in leadership roles citing a greater need for interdependence with increasingly diverse workers (Robinson & Lipman-Blumen, 2017). However, male-dominated power structures remain and strongly influence expected behaviors in higher education (Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Goldin & Katz, 1999; Lindsay, 1999). This influence may manifest in the perceptions of board or committee members evaluating finalists for the president or chancellor role. It appears that some universities are farther along than others, but gendered organizational frames remain, and women candidates must show board and selection committees strength in symbolic and political frames.

**Analyzing the Interview Data**

Mears (2009) synthesized that there are three approaches to interviewing, which are as an oral history, as educational criticism, and using a gateway approach. The purpose of the gateway approach is to deepen understanding using open-ended interview questions supported by secondary sources to build an appreciation for an insider's perspective (Mearns, 2009). This study used the gateway approach to interpret the job description data and the survey results from a robust conceptual model basis. This data analysis and reporting assisted in the evaluation of
factors influencing women presidents’ and chancellors’ success navigating the centralized search process.

Nine presidents and one chancellor responded favorably to the follow-up request in the survey. There were three public and seven private higher education institution leaders from six states across the United States. This mix included three participants who led all-women universities. Two leaders were from institutions with religious affiliations. One participant was a past president. Nine of the 10 had a traditional path to the presidency, and one came from the state government. All of them agreed to a recorded virtual interview using the Zoom video conferencing tool. The cloud-based Zoom tool has a built-in transcription feature that produced an initial transcription text. The researcher then validated the generated transcript, corrected the contents, and then sent the draft to the participant or the interviewee's assistant to have the transcript member checked (Creswell, 2013). Several participants made minor corrections to punctuation and grammar during member checking, but none had significant objections concerning the verbatim transcription. The researcher tracked data by participant number and redacted all references to names, geography, institutions, and states for confidentiality. The redacted version was uploaded into Nvivo for Mac12 for analysis.

Fusch and Ness (2015) published an empirical analysis that determined that six to seven interviews were the minimum sample sizes needed to reach data saturation for themes and meta themes. Thus, this researcher looked at the small size of the female president and chancellor population and the scholarly guidance about minimum numbers of interviews. The result was to establish a goal to interview six to 10 of these initial survey participants via video conferencing to record and transcribe the sessions (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Guest et al., 2006). The strategy of keeping an intense focus on answering the research questions during the interviews helped
align the use of meta themes. This technique increased the likelihood that the researcher would reach data saturation for a small study within six interviews (Guest et al., 2006). Saturation is a point where data starts to replicate, collecting new information culminates, and further coding is no longer feasible (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006). This small study achieved data saturation at seven interviews (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006). The researcher sensed saturation by developing meaning units that assisted understanding about the following areas: 1) if participants were part an inclusive pool or a single diversity candidate; 2) how the screening for the position is the same or different for participants due to gender; 3) how the interview process may be gender-neutral or gender-biased; and 4) how an organization’s launch actions may be different for women. The aim was to explore what barriers exist in higher education president or chancellor hiring processes and produce findings that might help colleges and universities achieve greater gender equity. The research questions that guided this study asked:

1. How does gender-bias appear during the recruitment of women candidates for a higher education institution president or chancellor role?

2. How does gender-bias visibly manifest during a higher education institution selection process for president or chancellor?

3. How does a woman president or chancellor experience gender-bias during transition events that communicate her selection as the higher education institution president or chancellor?

Three themes emerged from an in-depth probing of about their recruitment, selection, and communications transitioning them into the role. The rest of the discussion thoroughly documents each theme.
**Theme 1: Institutional differences may influence gender equity**

The recruiting process starts equitably with the job advertisements, but the geographical and cultural influences and board dynamics may introduce explicit and implicit bias during the interview through the selection processes. More than 94% of the institutions coded used consulting firms to produce job advertisements and structure the search process through completion. The ads were very similar in the content they highlighted, and this was consistent over the five years with one president coding showed them as predominately gender-balanced. Most of those interviewed saw these consulting firms and the advertisements that they produced as fair. One interviewee expressed it this way,

I have participated probably in eight chancellor/president searches before I actually was offered this position. I worked with search firms in every one of them. I felt as if the process coming from search firms was pretty even and several times the representatives from the search firm were female. I thought that we all got information that was pretty…factual that had come from the institutions.

The preparation of materials for the search committee is the first time that the organization’s people are inserted into the process as they judge the candidate submissions. It is during the initial submissions period where women may start to face some initial barriers. As one participant explained,

The cover letter for the number two position was easier to write because I was focusing in on my academic credentials only. Leadership in part, but mostly what I had accomplished individually, academically, in terms of my scholarship, tenure, promotion. And, also…what kind of academic leadership I had provided at the institutions where I worked as examples of why I should be hired for the
position I was applying for. In the presidency, it was much more complicated because there you're not just zooming in on one area. You're zooming in on multiple areas depending on what's accentuated in the job description.

Every participant interviewed spoke about board dynamics and using information gleaned from a variety of areas to understand the culture and inclinations of the board and/or section committees. It appears that bias in the form of board and selection committee culture and conduct may introduce implicit bias as part of the institutional dynamics that intersect the selection and transitioning into role activities. Johnston and Ferrare (2018) point out that selection boards need implicit bias training to be impartial and fair, but that this group bears, "the weight of the entire community's expectations" and often its biases as well (p. 30).

An institution’s genesis, geography, and culture appeared to influence those from the organization involved with the selection process, and this is where implicit bias may start to emerge. The genesis of the college or university as all male or all female appeared to profoundly influence the institution’s culture, which in turn got reflected in the selection process. Indeed, the experiences of those participants competing for president or chancellor roles at all women colleges or university differs from those competing for positions at historically all-male higher education institutions. One of the participants explained, "...obviously gender was -- in any of the processes that I was involved with -- one of the major components." Many of these all-women schools are becoming increasingly co-educational or have a graduate and certificate course that is coeducational and has taken to interviewing men for leadership roles (ACE, 2017).

It is interesting to note that these institutions appeared more keenly aware and solicitous to the minority male candidates as indicated by a participant, “I've seen that across even at co-ed
schools where students just defer more to a man.” This juxtaposition where the man is the minority candidate was captured in this way,

…it's a different thing, and you have to think about how you position yourself if you're male coming into that environment and how you are not center. And if you try to be center, you will be rejected. Because you don't need to be center, people here feel like we don’t need a male at the center.

Women who competed for historically male president or chancellor roles did not share comparable stories about those organizations trying to make them more comfortable as candidates.

The commitment to gender equity also appeared to be different regionally with equitable treatment, and opportunity may be uneven across the nation. An observation provided by an interviewee was,

Whenever I was applying to positions I would -- when I got on the finalists list -- I would look to see where the other people were from geographically. What were their backgrounds? What was their ethnicity, and what was their gender? Because all of those, I think, played a factor in the decision making for the institutions.

Universities and colleges in the United States (US) South were perceived to have more significant barriers than institutions in other regions. One of the participants observed, “I interviewed out west, in the south. you know I think I would say that, pretty much, people are more matter of fact when you get out of the south.” Regional cultural norms may introduce explicit and implicit barriers into the execution of the selection process by the higher education organization.
The data showed that participants had a perception that organizational dynamics weigh more heavily than the equity that search consultants may try to create. Regulatory guidance requires higher education to comply with equal opportunity mandates. The consequence of these laws during the search process was that institutions studiously tried to find finalists that reflected compliance with the law. At the same time, almost all of those interviewed spoke about how the selection committee and board member focus differed from the job advertisements. One president described it this way,

There was a lot of difference between what they said they wanted and what they asked about. They said they wanted to a leader with higher-order administrative skills and a good fundraiser who was good at diplomacy, in building relationships, and public speaking, et cetera. Particularly, the faculty focused on scholarship, and particularly the staff focused on administrative capability. But all that other stuff was hardly asked about.

Often women as diversity finalists were often not seriously considered. One participant spoke to her experience,

What you would feel on the campus visit was who was being treated more seriously than others. For example, the kinds of questions -- softball questions -- you might get as a woman would not be the questions that they would generally ask a man. The interviews varied with different constituent groups, and those groups usually ask the same question, but I think overall, the finalists were treated slightly differently depending on how hot a commodity you were in the pool.
The resulting feeling that many of the participants offered was one of not being sure they were a legitimate candidate or a token. This uncertainty made some women candidates wary as they compete for roles. A participant shared an anecdote to this point,

I said, “You have no females…in the system, so I need to know if there's a reason for us to be talking?” He and I talked about it, and he said it was long overdue in the system to have a woman at least one.

Open searches may have gender and diversity candidates who are not in serious consideration by the board but create favorable optics for stakeholders such as legislators. Women candidates were wary of the possibility of not being sincerely considered, and they may inadvertently behave in ways that were seen by the board as guarded and not open. A respondent explained it this way,

…the group dynamics and the search committee can make all the difference in the world. There was another one, and this was with a major regional. I just knew -- I knew --when I walked in the room that I was not going to get another interview because it was very confrontational.

These illustrations of implicit bias show how a universities history, geography, and its culture may inadvertently insert barriers into the new president or chancellor’s selection processes.
Individual and board dynamics

The board and selection committee biases may be exacerbated by a female reticence to promote themselves. The universal perception is that men do not question their readiness for the role and do a better job selling their candidacy. About half of those interviewed perceived implicit bias in the questions posed by the board or committee. One participant shared the following experience,

I would experience lines of inquiry from the committees, the various groups, that it was clear they were looking for certain answers. If you could not give them, then that was a ding against you. Things such as career patterns. For example, why would I take a lesser job? There is a point in my career where I left a very good job in the academy and took [work] in order to care for my [family member]. That clearly is not valued and so you always have to come up with the reasoning as to why you would do that. My feeling was that women have that more so than men, and that felt like a gender imbalance…I was never convinced that the male finalists got questions about their family and living in the President's house the way that a woman got questions. They didn't do anything illegal, but it was just questionable to me. In that, I think there was a gender bias there.

Women are especially constrained by social norms that complicate board and selection committee dynamics with them as candidates. To that point, a participant detailed,

…women are less likely to sell themselves in an interview process in a very boastful way. And I had trouble with that. I had trouble with saying, “I am the greatest thing since sliced bread because…” I would talk about what I had accomplished, but modesty is part of my culture. It's the way I was raised as a woman. You don't brag about yourself. You
let somebody else brag about you. I want to say that men probably are more comfortable doing that. I think they are, but I think that there's a real gender difference between men and women when it comes to tooting your own horn.

Most of the participants shared the perception that the need to explain themselves more so than men and that may have a dampening effect on their desire to pursue presidencies and chancellorships. This too may help researchers understand why women have to be convinced by their trusted circle rather than going after the leadership opportunity on their initiative. Another participant observed,

I think...they are seeing a need for more women coming forward. And they also recognize this continued dilemma that we have that -- it's like you have to invite women to do it.

So, I think that that, overall, I think there's still an incredible old boys’ network that's prevalent…you know it certainly is. But I think it's changing. I think there's an understanding that bringing in diverse candidates and having diverse presidents and having diverse leaders you know changes the conversation -it enriches. We get something much, much closer to right when we do that because we've got wisdom from different lived experiences.

Thus, the selection process starts with consultants who try to be very gender-equitable at the start of the process. However, organizational dynamics, in most notably the symbolic and political frames, appear to highlight biases that may impede women candidates.

The organizational emphasis on symbolic and political frames may also cause undercurrents of implicit bias to appear at the point where the search consultant hands-off finalists to the board or committee for vetting. Until this point, the job advertisement artifacts and follow-up interviews suggest a very purposeful gender-balanced approach to building the
candidate pool. Demographics of the men influenced by industrial era leadership symbolism dominate the search committee, board, and trustees, may affect how they deal with candidates of different genders. One of the participants explained it this way,

…search consultants are expected to create a robust, diverse pool. That's what the expectation is, and they meet that expectation. On the one hand, that's a good thing because it lets people into the pool. The real question is what happens next? If you were to ask me, if you line ten presidencies up, would search pools still prefer to hire men? I would say yes. That that has been my experience. I think that women, when they win these positions, they win them because they are -- by far - - the strongest candidate.

Seven of the ten participants indicated a perception that male-dominated boards look more favorably on masculine leadership behaviors and symbolism. One of the participants told this story about her experience,

My favorite line that sort of characterizes the whole thing is when [the Board Member] said to me, "Oh do you know [MALE NAME] of [PUBLIC University]." I said that I know about his work and so on. He said, "Now HE looks like a college president!" I thought, "Gee, thank you! I am a foot and half shorter than [MALE NAME] for starters. Thank you very much." That was not implicit bias! That was pretty explicit!

This situation where men dominate the boards or committees and have very masculine ideas as to how leaders look and behave was expressed by participants from male genesis higher education institutions. This bias may also influence the board and selection committee’s gravitation toward the political frame.
Those interviewed expressed the perception that the political frame influenced the predominately male boards to be skeptical about women and their ability to fundraise, budget, and create useful institutional alliances. Many of those interviewed expressed the view that bias has changed from explicit to implicit over the past 10 years. Describing this evolution, one participant shared,

It was one of the early days in history when you look at what we know about women in leadership roles. There was a strong emphasis on fixing the women. You know that was what we had to do in order to prepare women to succeed; we were going to just have to fix them. We have abandoned that, but I don’t know if you really abandon something like that. There is still an element of that. But I do still think that there is a convergence of so many different threads in our society these days. I do think people are getting clearer line of sight into the idea that there are real differences gender differences in how we behave. It’s a good thing to have gender differences but being able to articulate that it is both different and good – that has not sunk in yet.

The explicit and implicit organizational biases of boards and search committees toward a masculine symbolic and political frame are also in juxtaposition the reported strengths based on survey results. Women candidates might benefit from knowing more about institutional preferences for the symbolic and political frames. Their professional development and candidate artifacts might be stronger if they show enhanced experience, exposure, and education in those key areas. Older participants over 55 appeared to have experienced this bias more profoundly than their younger female peers. However, the 54 and younger participants shared the opinion that they felt that they had a greater opportunity than the previous generation of women.
Theme 2: Stakeholders’ implicit bias may disadvantage women

The actions of higher education leaders may inadvertently disadvantage their female subordinates who are on a path that usually supports bids to be presidents and chancellors. The participants often spoke about the limitations of their succession training to get essential executive skills.

With presidents now being so much more outward-facing and rather than occupy a scholarly platform from which they represent the institution, they are out fundraising all the time, doing deals, building partnerships, and all those things. I think it's going to be harder for people, especially if they come from faculty and work their way up like I did, it's going to be harder for people to make the leap unless you have, like I did, a break in an academic career and actually went out did all those things. I don't think I would have gotten a presidency otherwise from traditionally being Provost. I don't think anything from the provost job prepared me for the Presidency.

The participant view that implicit bias may have made male leaders less socially conscious and open to making sure women got essential executive skills indicates weaknesses in the institutions’ human resource frame (Marsh, 2015). For example, in one case a participant shared that men worried about appearances if they spent a lot of time off campus with women provosts. This is but one example of situations where women provosts and deans did not get valuable skill exposures that their male counterparts enjoyed. The way one participant described the situations was that,

I think that the presidents that I was working with could have brought me along more on fundraising trips, on fundraising meetings, contacts with potential
donors, and they didn't do that. I think where I would say there might be a gender
difference would be a male president is more inclined to take another male with
him on a trip then he would be to take a female with him. I think -- that was my
impression -- that they were much more comfortable around the guys and less
comfortable about around women. So, those opportunities were very limited for
me where I know other men who were number two had more access to the
President in terms of fundraising.

The participants also pointed to the boards, which often view women candidates differently than men. Speaking plainly, one participant said, “…boards look at women who have not had presidencies before as not being ready.” This implicit bias shows weaknesses in people-orientation and diversity sensitivity.

This implicit prejudice also seems to manifest in different way boards treated women as opposed to men during selection negotiation. One participant recounted, “I have with, every ounce of my being, I know that -- had I been a male -- I'd been offered a much different starting salary. And would have been able to negotiate.” Many of the participants conveyed stories where boards used thinly veiled prejudicial rationale for offering a lower package to women selectees than the sitting presidents or male candidates by pointing to some deficit in their credentials. Those interviewed perceived that the boards felt more emboldened to negotiate with women aggressively. To this point, one participant quoted Sandberg (2013) that “…men are promoted based on potential, while women are promoted based on past accomplishments.” This board perception that only achievements matter may be due to the committee seeing the candidate’s strength being in the structural versus more coveted symbolic and political frames. Half of those interviewed spoke about how they excelled in all areas of operational excellence once in role and
boards eventually compensated them better. However, the sense was that they were at the mercy of the board to recognize the value of these structural frame activities and reward them accordingly. A participant described in this way,

They tried to pay me about 25% less than my predecessor. I said to them, “Why would you do that?” We did talk about it. It made them uncomfortable. I said to them that I won’t sign for longer than a one-year contract and, in a year, you’ll want to fix this. And they did...They made a couple of big exceptional adjustments, but that is unusual. Usually when women start low, they end low. Most of those interviewed felt that they were judged and rewarded on their achievement. There was a universal opinion that they did not get the consideration of potential that they perceived the boards gave to male candidates. Eagly and Carli (2007) characterize these barriers to promotion and pay equity as complex leadership “labyrinthine barriers that women encounter – barriers that sometimes can be overcome and often are not obvious to casual observers” (p. 81). The participants universally recounted frustrating times where they and others dealt with obvious and subtle personal labyrinths in the quest to be presidents and chancellors.

**Theme 3: Launch actions are institutional as well as individual symbolism**

The communications and support offered by the institution were perceived to be very important by all of the interview participants. The long list of executive traits requested by universities and colleges in their job advertisements supports the notion that their leader is a symbolic reflection of the institution. The women leaders interviewed for this study were acutely aware of expectations and the need to manage perceptions moving into the role. Explaining this idea, a participant noted, “I perceived that some of them wanted someone who could come in and basically work miracles. I mean they really had a disconnect between what a president or a
chancellor does and what they did.” Many of those who were involved in the interview shared that they wanted to be very sensitive to these expectations and often tried to tone down the releases. This desire to tone down the symbolism may reflect many of the survey respondents’ comfort level about structural frame areas such as operational excellence, student success programs, and personal scholarship.

However, higher education institutions are under stakeholder pressures to show excellence and achievement, and that translates into often effusive announcements. The communications are enlisting stakeholder buy-in by assuring the community, legislators, staff and faculty, students, and alumni that the person selected is a bold reflection of an enlightened hiring body. A participant reflected,

They were proud that they had chosen a female leader. They were proud that they had broken new ground … They were they were thrilled with themselves that they had kind of the foresight and courage to say, “You know what, we’re not a normal college, we’re not a normal board, we don't think like you old bureaucracies.”

It is interesting to highlight that organizations tend to highlight different items when the selectee is a woman. One of the participants offered this recollection,

What I couldn't control, which nobody could, is them telling age and salary. Everybody wants to know that. I thought that was interesting -- especially age -- that would be important. I'm not sure it's important for men. I mean look at [Male University President]. I mean I can't even remember how old [Male University President] is, but he is not young. They wouldn't think a thing about that with a man.
Those interviewed provided similar commentary about how university system and board leaders may see the hiring of a woman president, especially a first women president, as reflective of their own open-minded leadership. Sharing her experience, a participant noted, “…in both cases, the Chancellor and the system was clearly focused on increasing the number of women presidents.” Thus, the common theme was that the communications often were as much about the people deciding or the institution as they were about the individuals selected.

The heavy use of launch symbolic language may have set up expectations that the new woman president was strongest in this frame. The participants' data, both from the survey and interviews, showed them the strongest in the area of the structural frame. This mismatch about the orientation that was presented, and the actual orientation of the new president or chancellor may cause stakeholders to perceive a disconnect. This disconnect was seen negatively due to gender incongruency coupled with geographical or cultural dynamics thus exacerbating a double bind effect (Kapasi et al., 2016; Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Schein, V.,1973).

Table 4.5

**Summation of Themes, Categories, and Interview Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Verbatim Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional differences may influence gender equity</td>
<td>Symbolic Frame</td>
<td>&quot;I can't overstate how important that is because I still see women in these incredibly powerful positions and then defer at moments when they shouldn't defer. It just drives me crazy, but part of it is that it goes against the grain because that's how many of us were brought up -- to be polite and not make anybody uncomfortable.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Frame</td>
<td>&quot;...one of the board members said to me..., 'We had a woman here once, and she didn't work out. What makes you think that you can do this job?'&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ implicit bias may disadvantage women</td>
<td>Human Resource Frame</td>
<td>&quot;...opportunities were very limited for me where I know other men who were number two had more access to the President in terms of fundraising.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Frame</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I thought I'd really, really like to have an opportunity to tell other women who are trying to move into leadership positions that the reality is that it's a tough climb. They have to mentally not let themselves waiver and not let boards fool them into seeming more powerful than they are. We have to recognize the role of the board and the fact that you do work for them. But there's a difference between being subservient and doing your job. I think that a lot of times we approach a board as being the sacrosanct group that knows everything, and you have to defer. You don't. You have to be prepared for that. Also, just to have confidence in yourself.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch actions are institutional as well as individual symbolism</td>
<td>Symbolic Frame</td>
<td>P: I always got the feeling that where I was going wanted to show that they were bringing on somebody from a very good place. They emphasized the good places where I had been in in the in the announcement [named universities and systems] which are in a very prestigious system. They emphasized the things that would bring prestige to the appointment. And that was unusual because I wouldn't necessarily have started there. I would have emphasized more my academic background because I thought that was so important. They emphasize more my administrative background. I think that was a difference. I: So, prestige over academic excellence? P: Right, prestige in terms of the institute -- not the not the substance of my work -- but the institutions where I had done the work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis Findings**

Creswell (2013) notes that data compilation and analysis are parallel activities. The researcher used three data streams to triangulate and validate conclusions. Table 4.5 summarizes themes, categories, and examples that support the findings. The conceptual framework was
useful when examining the constructs, relationships, and ideas of the four-frame and difference theories used (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016). The three research questions and conceptual framework guided this effort.

**Research Question 1: Gender-Bias During the Recruitment Process**

The first research question studying possible gender bias in the recruitment process was answered by contrasting the job description information with the survey and interview data. Women face barriers at the start of the recruitment process in two ways. The first is that the areas that they are most comfortable do not match up with the areas that the institutions seek. The Bolman and Deal (2013) four-frame model helped show how universities and colleges most value the symbolic frame traits being almost double the number as both the political and structural frames. The human resource frame was the smallest area and could be inflated because of the mandated affirmative action language in the job announcements.

Conversely, the women were profoundly structural leaders. There was double the number of structural leaders as those who identified with a symbolic or human resource orientation. None of the participants identified as having a political orientation. This mismatch between what institutions identify as desirable traits and how the participants view their areas of strength may be a barrier. It may also explain why women are not selected or do not self-select to pursue president and chancellor jobs.

The second area that may prove to be a barrier for women is in the area of getting equitable experience, exposure, and experience at the executive level. The participants used a number of examples, but the topic of travel came up often. The participants explained that if men were reticent to travel with their women deputies and take them to events such as stakeholder and donor meetings as is often done with male subordinates, then women will remain
disadvantaged. Women who do not get to go to executive fundraising and similar events get less exposure and training then male peers. A lack of exposure may exacerbate background gaps for women. This gap was discussed in detail by one of the participants,

it's become more fiscally challenging for small universities -- especially liberal arts universities. There's going to be more and more emphasis in the process of identifying presidents. There will be more emphasis on understanding business models, understanding finances, economics. And, to the extent that men do traditionally have more background in those areas -- it's just been the history that women were less likely to go into those disciplines -- I think it may work against women in terms of becoming presidents.

Equitable candidate pools can only happen if fair succession planning and development occurs. Finally, there is a conflict between women seeing themselves as strong structural leaders who achieve operational excellence and their level of confidence ascending to the top leadership roles in higher education. Those interviewed almost uniformly speak about women and their reluctance to self-select themselves for president and chancellor jobs. Many expressed the view that women needed to be “invited in” and relied on their network to tell them, “you are ready.” Those interviewed acknowledged that they rarely saw their male peers exhibit similar hesitation, which may be perceived by the selection team as a lack of confidence.

**Research Question 2: Gender-Bias During the Selection Process**

The researcher addressed the second question while investigating the selection process using both the structured survey and the in-depth interviews. The female interviewees consistently expressed the perception that boards, especially those with male-dominated
composition, questioned their experience and potential more than their male counterparts. The supporting evidence for this observation was provided by a participant who said,

There were at least two searches where my credentials were much better than the male who got the job. I felt that the men on the boards identified more with the man, and it was like the good old boys’ club. That they just weren't comfortable with a woman.

It appears that boards and selection committees that are mostly male may have some preconceived ideas that are male-dominated about what the new president or chancellor should look like or how one behaves. This sentiment is captured by one of those interviewed,

I think it's the unusual board who is comfortable with a woman being the symbolic leader because it’s not traditional and they don't identify with women. I think that a lot of boards, especially the traditional boards with older men, are very uncomfortable.

The situation is complicated because search firms, trying to be fair and comply with legal mandates, create a finalist list that does not match these board perceptions. The result is that these all or mostly male boards may not seriously consider the woman candidate. Six of the 10 participants discussed board perceptions in generational terms. They noted that it might get better over time as more women become top executives. A participant explained,

When I deal with donors in their seventies and eighties, their priorities are different than the donors that I deal with who are in their forties and fifties. They look at philanthropy differently. They look at the role of women differently. They just are shaped by the way they were in the world, in the workplace, and that was a very different place 40 years ago.
All 10 of those interviewed expressed optimism that more diverse boards would be less biased and that will happen as more women enter the president and chancellor ranks in more representative numbers.

The selection process may also be influenced by gender makeup of the board or search committee. Participants describe situations where male-dominated boards or committees were more aggressive, and sometimes hostile, with female candidates. One participant described her experience,

You know that were talking about [the salary offer]. It was very clear that that was a male-female decision. Incredibly clear. And we couldn't even talk about it. And, as a female, I've never been good at advocating for myself, never.

The participant view was that male-dominated boards and committees often negotiate in a more aggressive or confrontational manner with a female as opposed to male candidates. Salary negotiations were most commonly used to illustrate this point. Over 55% of those surveyed perceived their offer packages to be less pay and benefits proposed to male candidates. It appears that male-dominated boards or committees may treat women candidates differently. These biases may create barriers that disadvantage or adversely impact women candidates.

**Research Question 3: Gender-Bias During the Transition Process**

The third research question exploring post-selection communications that launched a new president or chancellor into the role was mentioned most often in the in-depth interview process. The board or system leader most often controlled the selection communications with a review process from the candidate. The emergence of implicit bias may occur in the organization’s desire to emphasize the values of the institution and those of key stakeholders. A participant shared the following reflection,
When I think about the announcement that they wrote about me it was probably different. It's hard to know because we don't have blind tests. They didn't hire three people to write announcements, but I can imagine that they wouldn't have talked about the other candidates’ families. I know that the other two candidates were men. I imagine they wouldn't have done that. I imagine they might not have focused as they did on my announcement about the reception I got from the community. They touched on those more emotional pillars that people like to depend on when it comes to feeling comfortable with women.

Those interviewed shared the insight that their hiring communique to faculty, students, alumni, and community members were often to bolster the organization and its decision-makers rather than a celebration of the new woman president or chancellor. More than half of those participants who were the first female president hired by their institution mentioned that the selection or “launch” communications equally weighted the progressiveness and social justice consciousness of the board and/or hiring a leader in the overall message.

Many of the announcements were to underscore the institutional symbolic frame by touching on critical values or the university or college. A participant described that there were people who thought it was a big deal initially. Those were largely the feminists and the activists who saw this as an important change...appointing the first woman to lead the institution could be perceived as connected social justice, there were people who supported the decision for that for that reason.

There were also elements in the transition communications that spoke to key stakeholders for the board or selection committee itself. The participants perceived the institutions as desiring to use the selection of a woman as a means to communicate open-mindedness and sense of social
justice. A participant joked with her board about this point, saying, “I hope you hired me for my competency and not necessarily for my gender.” Many of the participants made similar statements to their system leaders and boards after seeing the transition communications emphasis placed on that individual being the first woman in president or chancellor.

The launch into role communications was, in many ways, an effort to reduce resistance to the selection of a woman leader. However, achieving acceptance was not always successful as an interviewee shared, “At least the first year I was here, there were people -- both on campus and off-campus -- who referred to me as “that woman chancellor…or “the girl chancellor.” I was shocked.” Geographical and cultural norms often exacerbate supervisor and board dynamics and may reduce the effectiveness of even some of the most celebratory communications of a woman president or chancellor’s selection. Many participants observed that the most significant resistance to women leaders in higher education was in the US South. More than half of the interview participants discussed a perceptible power dynamic change they accepted the role. Three participants explicitly mentioned that boards wanted the women president or chancellor to feel subordinate and “carry out their orders.” This power dynamic may have exacerbated biases due to gender incongruency. The added factors of male-dominated geographical or cultural dynamics seemed to heighten the double bind effect (Kapasi et al., 2016; Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Schein, V.,1973).

**Summary of the Findings**

The data from the job advertisements, the structured survey, and the semi-structured interviews suggests that this is a time where universities and colleges are looking for fresh, dynamic leaders to help institutions move forward in a move complex, globalized, and resource-constrained environment. Many of the participants share the sentiment that higher education
organizations will need to build gender-balanced pipelines to get the best talent possible at the helm. One of the participants described it in this way,

There aren't enough people coming up through the pipeline right now. It used to be the provost position. But now provosts just actually don't want to be presidents it turns out. It didn't look so great, and they're not staying in their positions as long either. So, it's kind of an interesting time. We've been talking a lot about this, but I think one of the biggest things is helping. First of all, just getting people to think about this level of leadership. You know it's still predominantly male in higher ed, in both Catholic and secular, public and private, it's predominantly male. And, so I think it's still hard for women to see themselves in that position. And, because of all the things that we know, and all the research has shown that women think they need to be 100% prepared. And of course, you can’t be. And that's all just very true. I really think about how -- and that's something I really think a lot about -- and try to work on.

The reduction of barriers to women in the centralized process has the potential to allow women to attain these positions in representational numbers and help meet the executive leadership needs of higher education.

The three themes are instructive to help identify barriers to representational numbers of women presidents and chancellors. The researcher derived the first theme from the exploration of the recruiting process. The finding was that women candidates might benefit from knowing more about institutional preferences for the symbolic and political frames. The second theme was a discovery from the in-depth investigation of the selection process. Women may benefit as candidates if their professional development and candidate artifacts use the 25 major areas
highlighted in the job announcements. Finally, the study's third theme focused on the candidates’ transition into the actual role. The data analysis found that institutions may need to educate and revitalize their boards so that they mirror the institution's student and faculty composition. The mismatch between board and selection demographics and institutional staff, faculty, and student demographics may impede efforts to attain gender equity at the president and chancellor levels. These three emergent themes described elements of variance in organizational frames where explicit or implicit bias may have occurred.

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to engage women who have served or still serve as presidents or chancellors of public and private nonprofit colleges and universities as a way to explore their experiences with gender-bias during recruitment, selection, and transition enactment. This chapter represents the data collected from three sources to triangulate and validate this study’s observations. The data was thoroughly examined using the conceptual framework to guide systemic coding techniques as a means to make a complete analysis. The results are three major emergent themes listed under the following categories:

1. Institutional differences may influence gender equity
2. Stakeholders’ implicit bias may disadvantage women
3. Launch actions are institutional as well as individual symbolism

Based on the data collected, there was evidence throughout this study to support the findings that explicit and implicit bias plays a role in creating barriers for women during the recruitment, selection, and even in transition to role activities for presidents and chancellors in higher education. The institutional differences that influence gender equity may explain some of the challenges with women candidates face during the recruitment processes. There is similar data that demonstrates that stakeholder biases may disadvantage and create barriers during the
selection process. Finally, the organization's focus on its reputation rather than a nontraditional candidate's successful launch may not help women leaders overcome resistance to their appointment.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

The literature and this study affirm that the roles of higher education presidents and chancellors are uniquely evolving, complex, and demanding positions requiring experienced leaders with multifaceted skill sets. However, aspects of gender bias may continue to hold women back from successfully navigating the centralized selection and hiring process for these executive jobs (Eagley & Carl, 2007). The American Council on Education (ACE) (2017) underscored the need for purposeful action to reduce bias barriers. ACE representatives stated, “developing a more diverse pool of senior leaders should be a priority for the entire higher education community. Colleges and universities can make intentional efforts to improve the pathways to the presidency for women and minorities” (ACE, 2017, p. 61). This research looked at recruiting, selection, and transition processes that were part of the higher education centralized selection process for public and private not-for-profit institutions. This study documented three dominant themes that may help the education community understand the current implicit and explicit bias in this human resource process. The first theme was that institutional differences might influence gender equity. The second emergent theme was that stakeholders' implicit bias could disadvantage women. Finally, the third theme was about launch actions introducing implicit bias when messaging institutional symbolism that may be at the expense of the individual candidate. This work also may provide insights for institutions to make intentional efforts to improve women's pathways to either a presidency or chancellorship.

The purpose of this research was to engage women who were past and present presidents or chancellors of public or private-not-for-profit colleges and universities to explore their experiences with gender-bias during the president/chancellor recruitment, selection, and
transition enactment. This study built upon research that showed women experienced more barriers than men participating in centralized search processes (De Welde & Stepnick, 2015). Organizations designed this process to attract, assess, develop, retain, and promote higher education leaders (Bichsel & McChesney, 2017, February; BlackChen, 2015; Ibarra, Ely, & Kolb, 2013). This qualitative research used difference theory and the four-frame organizational model as part of a broader conceptual model to make sense of three disparate data streams (Bolman & Deal, 2013). This phenomenological study engaged women who have or currently serve as presidents or chancellors of public or private nonprofit colleges and universities that award at the baccalaureate level or higher. The intention was to explore their experiences with gender-bias during the president/chancellor recruitment, selection, and transition enactment. This chapter provides a summary of how this researcher evaluated the data to reach conclusions about the phenomenon in question. The analysis was guided by the conceptual framework and the research questions to explain how the examination produced the three dominant themes. The chapter summarizes the exploration, draws inferences from the findings, and ends with recommendations for further study.

The researcher used three data streams from public and private-not-for-profit institutional data for analysis. The first was president and chancellor job advertisement postings from 2014 to 2019. These recruitment artifacts were used to understand what skills, knowledge, and capabilities that organizations were seeking in a new top leader. The second collection method was from a structured survey of past and present women college and university presidents and chancellors. This instrument provided insight as to these leaders’ four-frame orientation as well as strong and weak leadership areas. The final means of attaining information was from semi-structured discussions with survey participants who agreed to a follow-up interview. These
sessions explored the selection process from candidate recruitment, through the selection process, winnowing activities, and, finally to enactment activities surrounding their selection as president or chancellor. These three data sources were necessary to triangulate analysis, validate findings, and reduce researcher bias (Creswell, 2015). All three data sources were qualitatively coded and used for sensemaking (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The researcher used an analysis spiral, and concurrent activities included organizing the data; reading and writing memos; describing, classifying and interpreting information; and then representing and visualizing the data (Creswell, 2013). This methodology kept the researcher organized and helped with analysis and synthesis.

The researcher sought to understand and summarize any barriers revealed by survey and interview participants about their journey starting as a candidate, during their selection, and transition as the president or chancellor. The researcher interviewed a small sample subset of the initially surveyed population which allowed for detailed probing (Fusch & Ness, 2015). Ten of the 21 survey participants agreed to a follow-up interview that the researcher recorded and transcribed (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006). Saturation of job description data, survey data, and interview data occurred during a spiraled qualitative coding approach (Fusch & Ness, 2015; Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006). The emergent themes helped explain: 1) if participants were part an inclusive pool or a single diversity candidate; 2) how the screening for the position is the same or different for participants due to gender; and, 3) how the interview process may be gender-neutral or gender-biased, and 4) how an organization’s launch actions may be different for women. The researcher analyzed findings from each data stream and then went through iterations that compared and contrasted the material. This iterative analysis of the disparate data streams produced three dominant themes and subsequent findings. The
researcher documented insights in the field journal. These results might help colleges and universities see where they may have inadvertently introduced implicit bias and help them remove those barriers for their women candidates.

**Review of Research Question and Summary of Responses**

The purpose of this qualitative phenomenological study was to explore possible barriers that may exist in the higher education centralized processes for hiring a president or chancellor. The intention was to analyze data from hiring artifacts, a structured survey, and semi-structured interviews with women who were past and present presidents and chancellors to gain insights about this phenomenon. The researcher triangulated results from the quantitative coding of artifacts, surveys, and interview information to analyze similarities and differences. The following questions guided the researcher during the conduct of this study:

- **RQ 1:** How does gender-bias appear during the recruitment of women candidates for a higher education institution president or chancellor role?
- **RQ 2:** How does gender-bias visibly manifest during a higher education institution selection process for president or chancellor?
- **RQ 3:** How does a woman president or chancellor experience gender-bias during transition events that communicate her selection as the higher education institution president or chancellor?

This process required rereading and iterative coding. This researcher used journaling, created summary tables, developed sensemaking figures, and tested/retested data to draw conclusions (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016). Bloomberg and Volpe (2016) noted that journaling makes the researcher more meticulous and orderly about research activities, and they were correct that this process improved productivity. The tables and figures showed the data in novel ways of
abstraction that developed comparisons and contrasts (Creswell, 2013). This exhaustive and iterative process shaped imaginative variation as the researcher triangulated data, conducted cross-checks to assure credibility and validity, and the developed thematic essence that translated into findings (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Moustakas, 1994). These steps helped formulate meaning-making and allowed essential truths to crystalize for this study.

**Research Question 1: Gender-Bias During the Recruitment Process**

The literature described numerous examples where gender-atypical behavior was a particular disadvantage for women, and this research found evidence of this phenomenon (BlackChen, 2015; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Schein, V., 2002). The first theme captured institutional differences that may influence implicit bias in the recruiting process. The recruitment process appeared profoundly affected by cultural and geographical circumstances during the selection phase. Both survey and interview data substantiated participant perceptions of organizational culture resulting from its genesis as a predominately male or female institution. The artifact analysis showed that institutions were sincere in their desire to conform to affirmative action laws (Niederle, Segal, & Vesterlund, 2013). The proliferation of consultants used by public and private, not-for-profit colleges and universities helped institutions comply with affirmative action mandates (Johnston & Farrare, 2018). These consultants created job announcements and recruiting postings that almost uniformly drew upon 25 characteristics in relatively gender-balanced ways for hiring advertisements. However, participants perceived that not all of the candidates that the consultants put into the diverse pool were seriously considered or equally weighted. This perception led to a level of skepticism about the process.

Many of the participants surveyed and interviewed talked about some institutions not fully embracing the diverse pool that the consultants developed. Half of those interviewed gave
specific examples where selection teams did not provide each finalist equal consideration. The
participants perceived, in these cases, that committees intended to hire traditional presidents or
chancellors who were usually white men. This situation where boards or committees create
skepticism may be a reason that many women must be persuaded to go for these executive roles.
The surveys and interviews also depicted situations where women did not get similar career
preparation for top executive positions, as did their male peers. A specific participant example
was that her male president was uncomfortable traveling with her when she was a provost. She
missed out on getting exposure and experience to financial leadership processes and events,
which made it difficult for her to demonstrate this competency as a candidate. It was during these
stories that the notion that male presidents often took subordinate male provosts to these events
also surfaced. It appeared that women did not get the same level of professional experiences and
exposures in the role due to their male president's bias. These are two explanations that may
explain why women may not aggressively seek out a president or chancellor opportunity.

There is also a situation where women candidates and higher education institutions are
misaligned when it comes to the four-frame leader orientation model. The job artifact coding and
analysis showed that higher education organizations most value the symbolic and political
frames. The survey and interview data suggested that higher education women leaders tended to
orient toward structural and human resources frames. This misalignment as to the Bolman and
Deal (2013) leadership orientation frames may account for the circumstances where women
candidates may not stress their symbolic and political skillsets sufficiently to intrigue the
screening teams. Women candidates might need to be more mindful to communicate strengths in
all four frames to the hiring agents. They might benefit from starting with symbolic and political
competencies to make sure they do not only emphasize their orientation areas. The candidates
will have to approach this discussion deftly. The need for care is due to board dynamics that are often influenced by geography or culture, causing the committee to view women as promoting themselves in a gender-atypical fashion (Tannen, 1990a). Candidates may benefit from using a balanced four-frame discussion about their strengths which may prevent situations that cause them to fall into a double bind. The finalists may profit from showing the hiring committees compelling achievements from all four leadership orientation frames. This technique where female candidates present all four leader orientation frames in a balanced approach may assist them to advocate as a suitable executive without becoming unlikeable (BlackChen, 2015; Marsh, 2015; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Schein, V., 2002). This four-frame model mismatch between institutions and female candidates could be an area causing implicit bias and producing barriers for women if not properly navigated.

Additionally, participants perceived selection committee dynamics differently across America. The participants noted that organizations in the US South showed the starkest contrast between committee behavior and the advertisements. Regardless of the US region, all the participants noted occasions where search committees or boards demonstrated either explicit or implicit bias. These demonstrated stakeholder biases weighed heavily with the candidates. A participant characterized it as a kind of weariness felt when fighting harder to get equal consideration as, “a little bit of the ‘death of a thousand cuts.’” It is important to note these observations came mainly from women leading historically male institutions who were led by men for most of its existence.

The three participants from all-women universities did call out a significant difference as a candidate for a historically female institution. The data also did not show disadvantages to men in the reverse situation. These discussions included anecdotes about men competing for a
predominately female institution. The participants in these cases highlighted how hard their organizations worked to make the man, as the minority candidate, feel comfortable. Women competing for leadership roles at traditionally male institutions did not receive any equivalent solicitous behavior from the search committees and boards of historically male universities and colleges. These male-dominated institutions stakeholders appeared more hostile than hospitable to the women candidates.

The participants also spoke to their perceptions that generational differences may influence biased behavior by an institution’s search committee or board members interfacing with the women candidates, especially for the first time. Older participants over 55 appeared to have experienced more bias during their competition for president and chancellor positions than did their younger female peers. However, the 54 and younger participants shared the opinion that they felt that they had more opportunities than the previous generation of women. This generational benefit is particularly true of participants who were younger than 54 and in the role for the first time. Hence, leadership orientation, region, culture, and generation may account for some implicit biases that form barriers for women during the recruitment process.

**Research Question 2: Gender-Bias During the Selection Process**

This study found that participants felt that the selection committees and boards questioned their readiness more than their male colleagues. More than two-thirds of those interviewed expressed the perception that boards questioned their experience and aptitude more than their male counterparts. It appeared that boards and selection committees, especially predominately male ones, may have some preconceived ideas that are male-dominated about what the new president or chancellor should look like or how one behaves (Mayer, Surtee, & Visser, 2016). The situation was complicated because search firms, trying to be fair and comply
with legal mandates, created a finalist list that did not match these masculine preconceptions. The result was that male-dominated selection committees or boards might not have seriously considered woman finalist(s). Six of the 10 participants discussed board perceptions in generational terms noting that as more women become top executives and boards get more diverse, then it is likely that more women will be hired and representation will get better over time.

The gender make-up of the board or search committee and their resultant biases were a more significant influence than the advertised criterion on the selection process. Participants described situations where predominately male boards or committees were more aggressive, and sometimes hostile, with female candidates. These actions or communications were often more aggressive or confrontational than similar language or actions used with male candidates. Salary negotiations were most commonly used to illustrate this point. Over 55% of those surveyed perceived their offer packages to be less pay and benefits proposed to male candidates. It appears that male-dominated boards or committees may treat women candidates differently to the female candidate’s detriment. These biases may create barriers that disadvantage or adversely impact women candidates.

**Research Question 3: Gender-Bias During the Transition Process**

The survey and interview data provided the most insight as to how implicit bias may appear during the post-selection and transition planning activities. The board or system leader frequently controlled selection communications with accuracy versus content review from the candidate. The participants related that the press releases heavily used symbolic language to shape the selectee's profile into one as an ideal leader that reflected institutional values and branding. More than half of those participants, who were the first female president hired by their
institution, mentioned that the selection or "launch" communications highlighted the progressiveness and social justice consciousness of the board and/or hiring leader.

The heavy use of symbolic language may have set up mismatched expectations. The institutional launch communications were most often about the symbolic and political prowess of the new woman president. The messaging appeared very focused on areas that were not the candidate's leadership orientation. This misalignment between the college or university orientation and that of the new president or chancellor may create some disconnects as the new president sets out to enact her agenda. The participants communicated the need to manage early expectations to avoid perceptual disconnects. The participants related that stakeholders negatively perceived disconnects between a candidate’s actions with expectations created by organizational messaging. This disapproval exacerbated any preliminary skepticism about the candidates thus heightening a double bind effect (Kapasi et al., 2016; Ayman & Korabik, 2010; Schein, 1973).

**Interpretation and Alignment of Findings with Literature**

The study data was consistent with the current literature detailing women’s challenges to gain equality of opportunity at all levels in the workforce. This study supports research done in higher education demonstrating an urgent need for organizations to make sure there is a level playing field when preparing or considering women for the role of president or chancellor (Gagliardi, Espinosa, Turk, & Taylor, 2017). The American Council on Education (ACE) (2017) American college president study showed that the community of practice widely supports taking these kinds of prescriptive action to improve the gender mix of candidates for university president positions, but it may not be enough to prevent implicit bias as this study shows. The ACE (2017) found that the vast majority of presidents (89%) indicated that it was essential to
undertake efforts to eliminate gender bias and this study offers some observations about the centralized search process that may help illuminate current gaps (Gagliardi, Espinosa, Turk, & Taylor, 2017).

Changing higher education with its associated complexities and well-established cultural norms will take top-down efforts to confront barriers to transforming and creating strategies to overcome resistance. Bolman and Deal's (2013) Four-Frame Model is an approach that is useful when examining processes that may have intrinsic barriers about which the organization’s leadership is unaware. The starting place for recruiting a new president or chancellor is the institution’s job announcement. The qualitatively coding of the 2014 to 2019 job advertisements using the four-frame lens led to the emergence of 25 attributes that higher education institutions sought for their university or college leader. These attributes fell into the seminal model that Barnard (1938) developed concerning executive leadership which is defined by the three critical elements of communication; willingness to serve; and, shared purpose. The three executive components described by Barnard (1938). Yet, these job announcements were more neutral than the committees that were to evaluate them based upon these public criteria. As one participant explained,

There was a lot of difference between what they said they wanted and what they asked. They said they wanted to a leader with higher-order administrative skills and a good fundraiser who was good at diplomacy, in building relationships, and public speaking, et cetera. Particularly, the faculty focused on scholarship, and particularly the staff focused on administrative capability. They hardly asked about all that other stuff.
The participants perceived that the higher education organization committees and board members were the dominant sources of explicit or implicit biases in the search process.

Bias appeared to be introduced by members of the selection committees during the selection process, where they participated in winnowing processes to select a finalist. The boards and selection committees exhibited leadership orientations that tended to gravitate toward masculine frames and traits despite gender-neutral job postings. The job announcement data indicated that institutions sought digital era executive leaders with an ability to handle complex issues in an increasingly global and international education market. The next step was to drill down on specific traits to see if organizations favored specific frames over others. The four-frame leader orientation model proved to be an excellent lens for exploring these attributes and was useful as meaning-making categories (Bolman & Deal, 2013). The detailed analysis suggested that institutions were most interested in the symbolic frame where a good leader is a prophet and visionary, who uses symbols, tells stories, and frames experience in ways that give people meaning and hope (Bolman & Deal, 2013; Bolman & Deal, n.d.). The application of the Difference theory to the nodes after the first cycle that sorted them into the four-frame model category also yielded critical insights.

The use of difference theory provided a deeper understanding of how gender might play into the centralized selection processes (Tannen, 1990a). The definitions from this theory allowed the researcher to sort nodes and categories using a gendered lens. The result was more clarity surrounding the women participants' reluctance to tout their leadership skills and abilities highly. The literature supports this finding concerning men being more willing to boast about their leadership skills and abilities than women (Dragoni, Oh, Vankatwyk, & Tesluk, 2011; Fernández, 2010; Fu, Tsui, Liu, & Li, 2010). Female reluctance may stem from significant
societal constraints placed on women (Tannen, Hamilton, & Schiffrin, 2015; 1994a; 1990a). The introduction of affirmative action legislation sought to counterbalance these past social and legal barriers for women (ACE, 2017; Gagliardi et al., 2017; DeFrank-Cole et al., 2014; Ibarra et al., 2013; Ely et al., 2011; Lindsay, 1999). The effect on the president and chancellor recruitment, selection, and communications processes was an institutional desire to appear affirmative in their hiring actions (De Welde & Stepnick, 2015). All president and chancellor job postings examined had language explicitly stating the institution to be an equal opportunity employer and that they followed guidelines mandated by national and state authorities. The breakdown of specific solicitation language in the job postings by frame and gender categorization seemed to demonstrate an effort to produce as balanced a pipeline of candidates. The finding of gender equity in the job advertisements led the researcher to look at the selection and enactment processes for instances of implicit and explicit gender bias.

The understanding of industrial and digital era leadership approaches helped inform the analysis of the structured survey and interview data. This element created a more productive conceptual framework and supported the constructivist lens for qualitative inquiry surrounding university hiring processes for presidents or chancellors. The participants’ perceptions supported the research about adverse reactions to the use of industrial era leadership styles and the expectation that they would use a less direct and more collegial approach (Tannen, Hamilton, & Schiffrin, 2015; Lakeoff, 2004; Gumperz, 1983). This study was also consistent with the phenomenon of hiring women during change or crisis (Longman & Madsen, 2014; Madson, 2011; Madsen, 2008; Eagly & Carli, 2007). The participants perceived that search board and committee dynamics might run contrary to the ideals established in the advertisements by colleges or universities.
The institutional boards and selection committees were looking for digital era traits such as strategic decision-making, formulating a vision, strategic planning, managing through complexity, market expertise, leadership experience, multifaceted communications skills, perseverance, confidence, cognitive ability, listening skills, creativity, and fostering innovation for their presidents and chancellors (Dragoni, Oh, Vankatwyk, & Tesluk, 2011; Fernández, 2010; Fu, Tsui, Liu, & Li, 2010; Weiss, 2006; Hambrick et al., 2005). The 25 traits align closely with these ideals. However, some industrial era notions that influence an institution's symbolic frame often introduce implicit and explicit bias. One participant shared such a dynamic about the salary negotiation process. These dynamics appeared regionally based with the most explicit bias being in the US South, and more progressive areas were California and the US Northeast. The dynamics of the region often create cultural and social barriers that impede women presidents and chancellors. These institutional differences may influence their potential to achieve gender equity.

Change requires structural revision in addition to professional development advocating new leadership behaviors and models (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Many universities and colleges remain entrenched with male symbolism and power politics causing organizational cultures to personalize power for status and advancement (Showunmi et al., 2015; DeFrank-Cole et al., 2014; Ely et al., 2011). There was a universal theme that these leaders were often disadvantaged because of stakeholder bias and had to be creative to circumvent those effects.

The situation where there is bias in the search committee, the board, the community, the faculty, the students, or other stakeholders is an example of women presidents encountering traditional role congruity challenges (Hogue, 2016; Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, & Ristikari, 2011; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Ayman and Korabik (2010) found that the effects of
gender and culture have the potential to change the definition of what constitutes leadership and what is considered to be effective leaders. Thus, social role theory supports the participants’ perception that gender equity in human resources, structural, political, and symbolic frameworks within higher education organizations must be adapted to get more women to step into the role (Koenig & Eagly, 2014). The idea of needing to bolster specific skill sets that women have traditionally lacked if they desire to ascend to top the literature reinforces executive roles. The research suggests institutions establish highly tailored professional development approaches for women in higher education (DeFrank-Cole et al., 2014; de Vries & van den Brink, 2016; Ely et al., 2011; Enke, 2014; Preston-Cunningham, Elbert, & Dooley, 2017).

The literature also explains how institutions are as concerned about how the selection reflects on them in the way they communicate the selected candidate's transition into the role, and this is borne out by this study. This research did find that boards considered a non-traditional candidate like a woman when a crisis precipitated the need for the change (Bornstein, 2007). Haslam and Ryan (2008) called this the glass cliff phenomenon and described the dynamics surrounding women's appointment to precarious leadership positions. This study found women are eager to take these precarious jobs because of beliefs that these jobs suit the distinctive leadership abilities of women and that the lack of other opportunities would make women more eager to take on a dangerous appointment. Hill and Wheat (2017) also studied female paths to the presidency in higher education from a structural perspective. They hypothesized that women did not have enough support going through the organizational structures, which is sustained by these findings. Unlike Hill and Wheat’s (2017) data analysis, this study found the need for influential female peers and networks to be more critical than having mentors and role models.
Implications and Recommendations for Action

The findings of this study imply several useful suggestions for institutions of higher education who understand the value women leaders bring to universities and colleges. The first recommendation is the creation of more gender-balanced higher education boards and administration who are more aware of their personal biases. De Welde and Stepnick (2015) found that higher education was caught in a spiral where white men who dominated boards and executive positions continued hiring for “the old boys club” which were the jobs with authority and power (p. 12). This study found strong evidence of this disparity in the way the hiring boards applied criteria differently to male versus female candidates. One participant shared, “There is an assumption that men can take skills and laterally apply them, but women have to demonstrate competence in the specificity of their expertise.” The participants made compelling arguments that higher education leaders and their boards need to be more diverse as well as both reflective and sensitive to personal biases. Universities and colleges may consider using prescriptive means to attain representative demographics for board and trustee committees as well as in their administration executive ranks. The creation of diverse talent in areas where power is centralized has the potential to accelerate the creation of a leadership team willing to put more equitable policies in place for fairer hiring, promotion, and wages.

Another recommendation is to consider reframing the entire centralized search process. The current committee search practices use outside entities who construct advertisements that may not fully reflect the needs, values, and culture of the institution. The participants voiced knowledge that consultants have produced fairly generic universities and colleges job advertisements. The declarations about being equal opportunity employers tacked to the bottom of almost every job advertisement does little to reassure diversity candidates. The colleges and
universities should find meaningful ways to connect their public statements about president and chancellor job descriptions to the private actions of those participating in candidate selection. This stronger connection between recruiting and selection actions also has the potential to enhance the equitable treatment of women coming up the executive pipeline. This strengthening between parts of the centralized recruiting process is but one effort that could eliminate the chilling effect that structural and cultural bias creates during selection processes (Bilimoria & Lang, 2011). Institutions must do more than comply with affirmative action laws for suitable optics. It will take commitment at the very top of higher educations' leadership ranks to make structural changes that produce more diverse leadership teams that meet stakeholder expectations.

Finally, boards, selection committees, and higher education leaders should look at their hiring processes to determine if they inadvertently create exclusionary cultures that bias candidate selection. Each of participants shared at least one circumstance where the selection committee or a board membered behaved in a way that was either implicitly or explicitly biased. Exclusionary ideologies contribute the academic women’s attrition (De Welde & Stepnick, 2015). It is likely that exclusionary selection behavior also contributes to women’s attrition from presidential and chancellor selection processes. Organizations that take the time to reframe their structural frame may create solutions that begin to line up for both men and women in more equitable ways. Bolman & Deal (2013) suggested that this kind of reframing is an opportunity to “go beyond constricted, oversimplified views of leadership, and each of the frames offers a distinctive image of leadership” (p. 355). This reframing process may give universities and colleges new leadership symbology that is less gendered to more specific to gender neutral digital era skills, knowledge and capabilities.
**Recommendations for Further Study**

This research underscores the literature that describes why female university executives are at a disadvantage progressing through the ranks and reaching the president and chancellor levels in representative numbers (ACE, 2017; Selingo et al., 2017; Madsen, 2008; 2011). The findings validate that women experience more barriers than men as they move through human resource (HR) processes that attract, assess, develop, retain, and promote higher education leaders (Bichsel & McChesney, 2017, February; BlackChen, 2015; Ibarra, Ely, & Kolb, 2013). The analysis of data from five years of job advertisements, structured survey results, and semi-structured interviews provides fresh insight into the challenges of women executives face in higher education. It was during the conduct of this research that several topics came up and had to be set aside because they were outside the scope of this study.

There were six significant areas that the participants brought up as areas that might benefit from additional study. The first was exploring how things have changed for women over time and studying how much and why it may increase the collective understanding within the higher education community of interest. The subject of regional differences was the next topic that may shed light on how culture and geography impact achieving goals associated with greater diversity. A third area was to look at the differences between institutions founded by men versus those founded by women seeking new insights about how gendered origin may influence board and selection committee decisions. Another area of exploration suggested was to review the differences between secular and religious institutions and how they select leaders. A fifth area was to explore why women executives are particularly weak in the political frame. Finally, there may be a benefit at looking solely at women leaders and confidence. The participants are at the top of their profession but did not score themselves as such. Thirty-two percent of the
participants scored themselves below the top 20% as leaders, and an astonishing 52% below the
top 20% as managers. The data shows that attitudes are changing, and women are making
progress, but structural reframing may produce a stronger force for continued advancement.

**Conclusion**

Women have been presidents of in higher education since 1871 (Gangone & Lennon, 2014). However, it has taken more than a century to get numbers higher than token representation (Thelin, 2011; Madsen, 2011). The American Council on Education (ACE) College President (2017) continues to address the slow ascent of women and minorities in its reports on the state of the higher education presidency. Pew Research data (2019, January) showed that women are only 30.6% of university presidents despite women getting more degrees than men at every level from associate to doctorate for more than 20 years. The research findings summarized in this chapter explain the potential obstacles women encountered in the centralized selection process for the president and chancellor roles. The qualitative analysis of recruitment postings, structured survey data, and semi-structured interviews provides new insight as to how implicit and explicit bias may have created obstacles for women.

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to engage past and present women presidents or chancellors of public and private nonprofit colleges and universities to explore their experiences with gender-bias during centralized selection recruitment, selection, and transition to enactment processes. This study examined both women chancellors and presidents since the search process is very similar, but still distinct from how subordinate positions such as vice presidents, deans, and provosts are selected (Johnston & Ferrare, 2018; Thelin, 2011). The researcher sought to understand and summarize new barriers revealed by data from job advertisements, structured survey results, and interviews with participants about their journey as
a candidate for president or chancellor jobs. There were literature gaps with little more than anecdotal data explaining why and how to alleviate the gender bias that has prevented women from achieving top executive roles in representational numbers. This study contributes to the college, university, and the rest of the higher education community of practice by providing data about the president and chancellor centralized selection process. The findings showed areas that may impede women from progressing toward these top leadership positions. The insights from this study regarding barriers in the recruiting, selection, and enactment processes can contribute to future policies and program reform.

The conceptual framework guided the analysis and interpretation of data from the three data sources that allowed for enhanced validity through triangulation. The emergent categories and themes derived data interpretation provided valuable insights. The study findings demonstrate that although some women presidents and chancellors have been successful navigating processes despite possible implicit bias forming institutional barriers. Institutions of higher education must use the results of this study to examine and refine their current hiring processes. There were six areas of additional research suggested from this participant data that may continue to broaden the understanding of how implicit bias makes its way into organizational processes. The resultant examination may help to remove the obstacles and increase the number of women presidents and chancellors to representative numbers.
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Appendix A

Request Membership Contact for Study

Dear <Platform Engagement Contact>,

My name is Lori Sussman. I am a candidate at the University of New England Program Doctor of Education in Transformative Leadership. I request your support to reach out to your members to participate in a structured survey. The study will collect data from participants who meet the following criteria: 1) they are or have been a current university or college president or chancellor, 2) they are female, and 3) the university is a public or nonprofit institution that grants baccalaureate and/or higher degree(s). This qualitative phenomenological study will describe the perceptions of women presidents regarding their selection process to discover how gender-bias manifests during presidential searches. Given the underrepresentation of higher education women as presidents or chancellors, the information gained may serve to help future women scholars pursue college and university top executive leadership roles.

The methodology includes a survey data that takes 30 – 45 minutes to complete as well as a follow-up request to participants asking for an additional 45 minutes to an hour for a semi-structured interview. The purpose of this research is to listen to the experiences of this select group of women to discern gender-bias during presidential recruitment, selection, and transition enactment.

This study will maintain participants privacy and anonymity. I assure you and your members that I will exercise all due diligence to secure the material collected. I will identify participants only by number. Also, I will destroy all text and data files three years after the dissertation publication. Until that time, I will secure the material in encrypted files, and those files will be on a disconnected storage device maintained in a physical safe. I will not share participant data with anyone outside the dissertation process. Finally, I will make sure that the dissertation material will not show any association between a participant’s and their particular university. You can contact me at my email which is lsussman@une.edu or call (843)810-2977.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to support this research. It is only with support from committed professionals like you that studies such as this one can contribute to the higher education community of practice.

Sincerely,

Lori Sussman
Doctoral Candidate, University of New England
lsussman@une.edu
(843)810-2977
LinkedIn Profile: https://www.linkedin.com/in/lorisussman/
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Dear Potential Participants;

My name is Lori Sussman, and I am an Educational Leadership doctoral student with the University of New England in Portland, ME. I am conducting an IRB approved phenomenological research study that engages women who have or still serve as presidents or chancellors of public and private nonprofit colleges and universities to explore their experiences with gender-bias during their centralized recruitment, selection, and transition enactment processes. Given the underrepresentation of higher education women as presidents or chancellors, the information gained may serve to help future women scholars pursue college and university top executive leadership roles.

The methodology includes a survey data that takes 30 – 45 minutes to complete and there will be a follow-up request asking participants for an additional 45 minutes to an hour for a semi-structured interview. The purpose of this research is to listen to the experiences of this select group of women to discern gender-bias during presidential recruitment, selection, and transition enactment.

You are invited to participate in this IRB approved study if you are a woman who is a former or current higher education institution (public or private not-for-profit college or university) president or chancellor in the United States. The survey should not take more than 30-45 minutes to complete.

Your participation in this study is voluntary, and entirely anonymous. If you elect to participate in the follow-on interview for a more in-depth 45 minute to an hour conversation, your data will be kept as strictly confidential. You may withdraw your participation at any time.

If you would like to participate in this study, please click the following link to access the online survey tool via REDCap. The survey will be open for approximately two (2) weeks.

https://redcap.une.edu/redcap/surveys/?s=98RCDDAHPN

Also, I welcome you to share this study and survey link with your women president and chancellor colleagues and please encourage them to participate. Again, all responses are completely anonymous. At the end of the survey, you will be presented with a request for a follow up interview if you so choose. At that point, you will not be anonymous, but your identity will be kept strictly confidential. For more information about this study, you may contact Lori Sussman at lsussman@une.edu. You may also request a copy of your questionnaire and any study results by contacting the researcher.

If you would like to speak with me directly regarding any part of this study, you may reach me at (843)633-2650.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Lori Sussman
Doctoral Candidate, University of New England
lsussman@une.edu
(843)633-2650
LinkedIn Profile: https://www.linkedin.com/in/lorisussman/
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Dear <President’s Name>:

I am writing to request your participation in a structured survey of public and private nonprofit college and university women presidents and chancellors to explore barriers experienced by this population during their presidential recruitment, selection, and transition enactment. I will use qualitative analysis of the data to view how gender-bias manifests in human resource processes. The purpose of this research is to listen to the experiences of this select group of women to discern gender-bias during presidential recruitment, selection, and transition enactment. Given the small number of higher education women who have held the presidency, the information extracted from this study will serve to help future females pursue college and university top executive leadership roles.

The methodology includes an analysis of respondent survey data as well as follow on interviews of participants willing to contribute 45 minutes to an hour of their time for a semi-structured interview. This study will maintain participants privacy and anonymity. I assure you that I will exercise all due diligence to secure the material collected. For example, I will identify participants only by number. Also, I will destroy all text and data files three years after the dissertation publication. Until that time, I will secure the material in encrypted files, and those files will be on a disconnected storage device maintained in a physical safe. I will not share participant data with anyone outside the dissertation process. Finally, I will make sure that the dissertation material will not show any association between you and your university. You can contact me at my email which is lsussman@une.edu or call (843)810-2977.

If you agree to my request for a follow up interview, you will not be anonymous at that point, but your identity will be kept strictly confidential. For more information about this study, you may contact Lori Sussman at lsussman@une.edu. You may also request a copy of your questionnaire and any study results by contacting the researcher.

Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary and all of your responses are anonymous. None of the responses will be connected to identifying information.

The survey will take approximately 20 to 30 minutes to complete.

To participate, please click on the following link:

https://redcap.une.edu/redcap/surveys/?s=98RCDDAHPN

If you have any questions about this survey, or difficulty in accessing the site or completing the survey, please contact me at my email which is lsussman@une.edu or call (843)633-2650.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to participate in this research. It is only with support from committed top leaders like you that studies such as this one can contribute to the community of educational leaders.

Sincerely,
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Lori Sussman
Doctoral Candidate, University of New England
lsussman@une.edu
(843)633-2650
LinkedIn Profile: https://www.linkedin.com/in/lorisussman/
### Structured Survey - Consent, Demographics, and Leader Orientation

Please complete the survey below.

Thank you!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1: Consent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please provide your consent to participate in this study before completing this survey. The researcher will be using pseudonyms to ensure confidentiality and to protect your identity and the identity of your employer. Please note that you may request to be removed from this study at any point without penalty. All information that you provide will be safely kept electronically in a physical storage device disconnected from the internet and secured in a safe. You will remain anonymous. This researcher will safeguard your personal information and only use aggregated data. At the end of the survey, you will be presented with a request for a follow up interview if you so choose. At that point, you will not be anonymous, but your identity will be kept strictly confidential. For more information about this study, you may contact Lori Sussman at <a href="mailto:lsussman@june.edu">lsussman@june.edu</a>. You may also request a copy of your questionnaire and any study results by contacting the researcher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No (Must be &quot;yes&quot; to continue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you or are you currently a president or chancellor of a public or private nonprofit college or university?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No (Must be &quot;yes&quot; to continue)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your role?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current President</td>
<td>Former President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Chancellor</td>
<td>Former Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served as both President and Chancellor</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Must be &quot;yes&quot; to continue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of College</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What type of college or university did you or do you now lead?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral University</td>
<td>Master's College or University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate College</td>
<td>Baccalaureate/Associate's College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's College</td>
<td>Special Focus Institution (Health, Technical, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal College</td>
<td>(Must be &quot;yes&quot; to continue)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you identify as female?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which age range best describes you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years old</td>
<td>35-44 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 years old</td>
<td>65-64 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>(Must be &quot;yes&quot; to continue)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Which ethnicity best describes you?                                      | ○ White  
○ Hispanic or Latino  
○ Black or African American  
○ Native American, American Indigenous, or American Indian  
○ Asian or Pacific Islander  
○ Other  
○ Prefer Not to Answer |
| If ethnicity is "other," please specify                                 |  |
| What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?        | ○ Bachelor's degree (i.e., BA, BS)  
○ Master's degree (i.e., MA, MS, MEd)  
○ Doctorate (i.e., Ph.D., Ed.D.)  
○ Other (please specify) |
| If education is "other," please specify                                  |  |
| What other fields did you spend more than a year in the role besides education? (check all that apply) | ○ Healthcare  
○ Retail  
○ Information Technology  
○ Other Business  
○ Federal Government  
○ State Government  
○ Other? (please specify)  
○ None |
| If other fields are "other," please specify                              |  |
| How long have you served in your current college or university president role? | ○ Less than one year  
○ One year  
○ Two years  
○ Three years  
○ Four years  
○ Five years  
○ Over five years |
| Did you attend the college or university that you are now leading?       | ○ Yes  
○ No |
| Were you a faculty or staff member at the college or university that you are now leading? | ○ Yes  
○ No |
| Have you served as a college or university president or chancellor before assuming this position? | ○ Yes  
○ No |
| How many times have you served as a president?                          | ○ One Time  
○ Two Times  
○ Three Times  
○ Four Times  
○ Five Times  
○ Never |
| How many times have you served as a chancellor?                          | ○ One Time  
○ Two Times  
○ Three Times  
○ Four Times  
○ Five Times  
○ Never |
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How many total years did you serve as a president?
- Less than one year
- One year
- Two years
- Three years
- Four years
- Five years
- Over five years
- Never

How many total years did you serve as a chancellor?
- Less than one year
- One year
- Two years
- Three years
- Four years
- Five years
- Over five years
- Never

Were you actively recruited for the president or chancellor role?
- Yes
- No

If you were actively recruited, what was the gender of the individual who reached out to you?
- Female
- Male

If you were actively recruited, what is the affiliation of the individual who reached out to you?
- Consultant supporting search
- College or university board member
- College or university staff or faculty member
- Search committee member
- Other? Please specify

If you were actively recruited, what was your role at the time of contact?
- President
- Provost
- Dean
- Faculty
- Other? Please specify

If you were actively recruited, and your answer for the recruiter's affiliation was "other," please specify.

If you were actively recruited, and you listed the affiliation of the individual who reached out to you as "other," please specify.

How many screening calls were part of your initial interview experience?
- 1 - 2
- 3 - 4
- 5 - 6
- 7 or more

Including you, how many finalists were part of the final interviews?
- 1 - 2
- 3 - 4
- 5 - 6
- 7 or more

Do you know the genders of the final candidates? If so and including yourself,
- There were more women than men
- There were more men than women
- There were an equal number of men and women

What were the roles and gender of those performing screening interviews with you?
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What materials were requested as part of the application?

________________________________________________________

Did you perceive these requested materials as gender specific or neutral?

________________________________________________________

Thinking about the people who interviewed you, how many were on the committee and did you recall how many of the members were men, and how many were women?

________________________________________________________

Thinking about the people who interviewed you, how many were stakeholders, but not on the committee and did you recall how many of the members were men, and how many were women?

________________________________________________________

When you visited the campus, who did you meet with and what was their gender?

________________________________________________________

Did you perceive that your initial offer packet was the same or better pay and benefits that male peers received?

| ☐ Yes | ☐ No |
|_______|_______|

Were there issues that came up in the initial job offer? If so, did any related to gender or gender equity for pay?

________________________________________________________

Did you have contact with an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) officer of the institution? If so, what issues were discussed?

________________________________________________________

Did the organization have special considerations for your launch due to your gender?

| ☐ Yes | ☐ No |
|_______|_______|

If you answered "yes," to your perceptions that there were special considerations for your launch due to your gender, please explain.

________________________________________________________

Behaviors

Please indicate how often each of the items below is true of you.

1 (Never) 2 (Occasionally) 3 (Sometimes) 4 (Often) 5 (Always)

An example is that you would answer '1' for an item that is never true of you, '2' for one that is occasionally true, '3' for one that is sometimes true of you, and so on.

Be discriminating! Your results will be more helpful if you think about each item and distinguish the things that you actually do all the time from the things that you do seldom or never.

1. _____ Think very clearly and logically.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Show high levels of support and concern for others</td>
<td>5 (Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.</td>
<td>5 (Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inspire others to do their best.</td>
<td>5 (Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strongly emphasize careful planning and clear timelines.</td>
<td>5 (Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Build trust through open and collaborative relationships.</td>
<td>5 (Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Am a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.</td>
<td>5 (Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Am charismatic.</td>
<td>5 (Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Approach problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.</td>
<td>5 (Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Show high sensitivity and concern for others’ needs and feelings.</td>
<td>5 (Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Am unusually persuasive and influential.</td>
<td>5 (Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. _____ Am able to be an inspiration to others.</td>
<td>☐ 5 (Always)</td>
<td>0 (Never)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ 4 (Often)</td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. _____ Develop and implement clear, logical policies and procedures.</td>
<td>☐ 5 (Always)</td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. _____ Foster high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.</td>
<td>☐ 5 (Always)</td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. _____ Anticipate and deal adroitly with organizational conflict.</td>
<td>☐ 5 (Always)</td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. _____ Am highly imaginative and creative.</td>
<td>☐ 5 (Always)</td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. _____ Approach problems with facts and logic.</td>
<td>☐ 5 (Always)</td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. _____ Am consistently helpful and responsive to others.</td>
<td>☐ 5 (Always)</td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. _____ Am very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.</td>
<td>☐ 5 (Always)</td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. _____ Communicate a strong and challenging sense of vision and mission.</td>
<td>☐ 5 (Always)</td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. _____ Set specific, measurable goals and hold people accountable for results.</td>
<td>☐ 5 (Always)</td>
<td>4 (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Sometimes)</td>
<td>2 (Occasionally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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22. _____ Listen well and am unusually receptive to other people’s ideas and input.

   5 (Always)  4 (Often)  3 (Sometimes)  2 (Occasionally)  1 (Never)

23. _____ Am politically very sensitive and skillful.

   5 (Always)  4 (Often)  3 (Sometimes)  2 (Occasionally)  1 (Never)

24. _____ See beyond current realities to generate exciting new opportunities.

   5 (Always)  4 (Often)  3 (Sometimes)  2 (Occasionally)  1 (Never)

25. _____ Have extraordinary attention to detail.

   5 (Always)  4 (Often)  3 (Sometimes)  2 (Occasionally)  1 (Never)

26. _____ Give personal recognition for work well done.

   5 (Always)  4 (Often)  3 (Sometimes)  2 (Occasionally)  1 (Never)

27. _____ Develop alliances to build a strong base of support.

   5 (Always)  4 (Often)  3 (Sometimes)  2 (Occasionally)  1 (Never)

28. _____ Generate loyalty and enthusiasm.

   5 (Always)  4 (Often)  3 (Sometimes)  2 (Occasionally)  1 (Never)

29. _____ Strongly believe in clear structure and a chain of command.

   5 (Always)  4 (Often)  3 (Sometimes)  2 (Occasionally)  1 (Never)

30. _____ Am a highly participative manager.

   5 (Always)  4 (Often)  3 (Sometimes)  2 (Occasionally)  1 (Never)

31. _____ Succeed in the face of conflict and opposition.

   5 (Always)  4 (Often)  3 (Sometimes)  2 (Occasionally)  1 (Never)
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32. Serve as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.  
   - 5 (Always)  
   - 4 (Often)  
   - 3 (Sometimes)  
   - 2 (Occasionally)  
   - 1 (Never)

**Leadership Style - Strongest Skills**

This section asks you to describe your strongest leadership skills. For each item, give the number "4" to the phrase that best describes you, "3" to the next best skill, and on down to "1" for the item that is least like you.

You will be asked to rank your strongest of the following leadership skills:

- Analytic skills
- Interpersonal skills
- Political skills
- Ability to excite and motivate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style Matrix - Strongest Skills</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytic skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to excite and motivate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leadership Style - Best Description**

This section asks you to choose items that describe your leadership style best. For each item, give the number "4" to the phrase that best describes you, "3" to the next best skill, and on down to "1" for the item that is least like you.

You will be asked to rank the best way to describe you using the following descriptors:

- Technical expert
- Good listener
- Skilled negotiator
- Inspirational leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style - Best Description</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good listener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled negotiator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leadership Style - Success Skills**

This section asks you to choose items that describe your leadership success skills. For each item, give the number "4" to the phrase that best describes you, "3" to the next best skill, and on down to "1" for the item that is least like you.

You will be asked to rank skills that helped you the most to be successful:

- Make good decisions
- Coach and develop people
- Build strong alliances and a power base
- Energize and inspire others

---
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### Leadership Style - Success Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make good decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach and develop people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build strong alliances and a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energize and inspire others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leadership Style - People Notice**

This section asks you to rank attributes that people notice about your leadership style. For each item, give the number “4” to the phrase that best describes you, “3” to the next best skill, and on down to “1” for the item that is least like you.

You will be asked to rank what people are most likely to notice about you:

- Attention to detail
- Concern for people
- Ability to succeed, in the face of conflict and opposition
- Charisma

### What people are most likely to notice about me is my:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attention to detail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to succeed, in the face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of conflict and opposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leadership Style - Important Leader Trait**

This section asks you to rank your most crucial leader trait. For each item, give the number “4” to the phrase that best describes you, “3” to the next best skill, and on down to “1” for the item that is least like you.

You will be asked to rank the following as your most important leadership trait:

- Clear, logical thinking
- Caring and support for others
- Toughness and aggressiveness
- Imagination and creativity
### My most important leadership trait is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear, logical thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring and support for others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness and aggressiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagination and creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leadership Style - Best Description**

This section asks you to use given symbolism to rank one that best describes your leadership style. For each item, give the number "4" to the phrase that best describes you, "3" to the next best skill, and on down to "1" for the item that is least like you.

You will be asked to rank the following descriptors as most like you:

- An analyst
- A humanist
- A politician
- A visionary

### I am best described as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An analyst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A humanist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A politician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A visionary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall rating**

- 5 Top 20%
- 4
- 3 Middle 20%
- 2
- 1 Bottom 20%

**Compared to other individuals that you have known with comparable levels of experience and responsibility; how would you rate yourself on:**

1. **Overall effectiveness as a manager**

2. **Overall effectiveness as a leader.**
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Would you be interested in participating in a 30 - 45 minutes individual interview by video teleconference to discuss five questions that probe deeper into your president selection process? This researcher will ask about your recruiting, selection, and transition to role enactment processes. The researcher seeks to understand and summarize any barriers that you sensed while undergoing the journey from candidate through transitioning into the role. Your participation in this interview is entirely voluntary, and all of your responses are anonymous. None of the responses will be connected to identifying information. If the survey data are collected in a manner that offers anonymity, the consent materials should state the survey is anonymous unless the participant wishes to be available for an interview. The consent materials should tell participants who are willing to be interviewed that their data will be kept confidential, and that their identity will not be disclosed. At the end of the survey, there should be a box to click to participate in an interview. Clicking the yes box will take you to a page to enter your contact information. Please understand your answers are no longer anonymous at this point, but will be kept confidential.

If you agree to participate in an in-depth interview, please provide your name. Your data will be kept confidential, and that your identity will not be disclosed. When you provide contact information, please understand your answers are no longer anonymous, but will be kept confidential.

If you agree to participate in an in-depth interview, please provide your email. Your data will be kept confidential, and that your identity will not be disclosed. When you provide contact information, please understand your answers are no longer anonymous, but will be kept confidential.

If you agree to participate in an in-depth interview, please provide your phone contact information. Your data will be kept confidential, and that your identity will not be disclosed. When you provide contact information, please understand your answers are no longer anonymous, but will be kept confidential.

If you agree to participate in an in-depth interview, please provide your assistant's name and contact information so the researcher can coordinate and schedule with him or her. Your data will be kept confidential, and that your identity will not be disclosed. When you provide contact information, please understand your answers are no longer anonymous, but will be kept confidential.
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UNIVERSITY OF NEW ENGLAND

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH

**Project Title:** Exploring Barriers Experienced by Women Presidents and Chancellors of Public Higher Education Institutions

**Principal Investigator:** Lori Sussman, Doctoral Candidate, University of New England, lsussman@une.edu (email) and (843)633-2650 (work) and (843)810-2977 (mobile phone)

**Introduction:**

- Please read this form. You may also request that the form is read to you. The purpose of this form is to give you information about this research study, and if you choose to participate, document that choice.

- You are encouraged to ask any questions that you may have about this study, now, during or after the project is complete. You can take as much time as you need to decide whether or not you want to participate. Your participation is voluntary.

**Why is this research study being done?** The purpose of this phenomenological study is to engage women who presently serve as presidents or chancellors of public higher education (HE) institutions to explore their experiences with gender-bias during centralized recruitment, selection, and transition enactment.

**Who will be in this study?**

- The participants in this study women who are public and private nonprofit college and university presidents
- You must be 18 years old or older to participate
- Three to ten presidents will be interviewed for this study

**What will I be asked to do?** The researcher is a doctoral candidate at the University of New England conducting an IRB approved study. The participants will be asked to participate in a one-on-one semi-structured interview using Zoom video teleconferencing technology to record the session. The interview will take approximately 45 minutes to one hour. The interview instrument will be emailed before the meeting. The researcher will have a copy of the questions posted in "share mode" during the session. The researcher will serve as the facilitator and read the questions. The president who is being interviewed will verbally answer the semi-structured interview questions. The researcher will record these responses and take notes as a backup. The participant can ask to stop the recording at any time. The responses will be stored in a secure setting and transcribed using NVIVO transcription and REDCap. The researcher will email the transcript to each participant to check if they would like to add any clarifying information or delete any portion of the recording.
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What are the possible risks of taking part in this study? There are no reasonably foreseeable risks associated with participation in this study.

What are the possible benefits of taking part in this study? There is no payment or other benefits to you participating in this study. However, the data collected can add to the greater knowledge of the community of practice and offer insights to the field of educational leadership.

What will it cost me? Participants will not incur any costs by participating in this study.

How will my privacy be protected? Semi-structured interviews will be conducted in a private meeting space, phone call or through a secure web conference center. In order to protect the participant’s privacy, every participant will be assigned a pseudonym.

How will my data be kept confidential?
- Your participation in this research is confidential. The data will be stored and secured on a home office computer that is password protected. Interview voice and video files created as part of the interview process will be destroyed once the transcription is completed and verified. The researcher will use the participant’s pseudonym during data coding.
- Research findings will be available to participants upon request in writing or via email.
- This principle investigator will maintain a copy of your signed consent form for at least three years after the project is complete. After this time elapses, the document will be destroyed. The consent forms will be securely stored by the lead researcher. It will not be bundled with any other artifacts from the research project.
- Please note the Institutional Review Board may review the final report. The report data will only display the pseudonyms given to the participants.

What are my rights as a research participant?
- Your participation is voluntary. Your decision to participate will have no impact on your current or future relations with the University of New England.
- Your decision to participate will not affect your relationship with the lead researcher.
- You may skip or refuse to answer any question for any reason.
- If you choose not to participate there is no penalty to you and you will not lose any benefits that you are otherwise entitled to receive.
- You are free to withdraw from this research study at any time, for any reason.
- If you choose to withdraw from the research, there will be no penalty to you, and you will not lose any benefits that you are otherwise entitled to receive.
- You will be informed of any significant findings developed during the course of the research that may affect your willingness to participate in the research.
- If you sustain an injury while participating in this study, your participation may be ended.

What other options do I have?
- You may choose not to participate.
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Whom may I contact with questions?

- The researcher conducting this study is Lori Sussman, Graduate Student, University of New England. Her contact information is lsussman@une.edu (email) and (843)810-2977 (mobile phone)
- For more information regarding this study, please contact the researcher’s faculty advisor, Dr. Bryan Corbin using the following contact information: (346)800-2106, or bcorbin@une.edu.
- If you choose to participate in this research study and believe you may have suffered a research-related injury, please contact Dr. Bryan Corbin at (346)800-2106 or bcorbin@une.edu.
- If you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, you may call Mary Bachman DeSilva, Sc.D., Chair of the UNE Institutional Review Board at (207) 221-4567 or irb@une.edu.

Will I receive a copy of this consent form?

- You will be given a copy of this consent form.

________________________________________________________________

Participant’s Statement

I understand the above description of this research and the risks and benefits associated with my participation as a research subject. I agree to take part in the research and do so voluntarily.

Participant’s signature or Date
Legally authorized representative

______________________________

Printed name

Researcher’s Statement

The participant named above had sufficient time to consider the information, had an opportunity to ask questions, and voluntarily agreed to be in this study.

______________________________

Researcher’s signature Date

Lori L. Sussman
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Sussman Interview Protocol

Interview Protocol to Identify Themes Exploring Female Underrepresentation as President of a State Public University

Interview of <Name>, <Title> on <Date> in <Location>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Data</th>
<th>Participant Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Time:</td>
<td>Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Location:</td>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Time:</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting follow up needed:</td>
<td>URLs: <a href="https://www.linkedin.com/in/todd-lant-75a5923">https://www.linkedin.com/in/todd-lant-75a5923</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Biography:
## Introduction

**Welcome Script:** <Name>, thank you so much for agreeing to this interview about female underrepresentation as president/chancellor of a public or nonprivate private university. You are such an accomplished leader, and I genuinely appreciate your time today. As mentioned in the structured survey, I hope to understand better how your experience was going through the presidential/chancellor search process and discover instances of gender-bias. I will use this information for dissertation publication, and this means that I will upload the document into the University of New England (UNE) research repository. A numerical label will replace all references to you and your university. Any questions before we get started? Great, then let's get started.

## Questions: Setting the Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1: Were there specific materials for the president/chancellor role that you had to prepare for your candidacy that highlighted gender? I am particularly interested in applications, responding to search and recruitment postings, responding to templates or guidance to evaluate applicants, models or advice for applicant interviews, hiring board/search committee guidance memorandums/policies that you reviewed, hiring board/search committee selection criteria you considered, and items from public website information used for communication with stakeholders about the search. Did these items seem gender-balanced, gender-neutral, or gender-biased?</th>
<th>Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-up question:</strong> Was the preparation of materials for this role different from previous experiences, peer experiences, or from what you expected?</td>
<td>Response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Interview Protocol**

Script: You have a unique set of experiences going through the selection process for this pivotal president/chancellor role. The next questions are about this journey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2: Were you part an inclusive pool or a single diversity candidate?</th>
<th>Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-up questions:</strong> Did you perceive that your position screening was the same or different from other participants due to gender? How does gender-bias appear during the recruitment of women candidates for a higher education institution president or chancellor role?</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Script: The next questions are about your organization's recruiting, selection, and transition processes for your president/chancellor search.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3: Did you perceive that your interview process had variances from male counterparts due to your gender?</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-up question:</strong> How does gender-bias visibly manifest during a higher education institution selection process for president/chancellor?</td>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Interview Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Script: Continuing to consider your recruiting, selection, and transition planning, I will ask a similar question, but using a different lens.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4:</strong> What were your perceptions of your organization’s launch actions and did you perceive differences because you were a woman appointee?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-up question:</strong> How does a woman president/chancellor experience gender-bias during transition events that communicate her selection as the higher education institution president?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Script: Here is the final question.

Q5: Is there anything else that you would like to share about your experience with gender-bias during presidential/chancellor recruitment, selection, and transition enactment?

Response:

Follow-up question: Is there anything that you would care to share concerning barriers that exist in higher education president/chancellor hiring processes and do you have recommendations to help institutions achieve more gender equity at the top?

Response:

Reflection:

Conclusion

**Concluding Script:** Thank you so much for your time today. I will be transcribing this session and will email you a copy in 2 - 3 business days. I would be very grateful if you would kindly check to make sure I correctly transcribed your thoughts and email me back with your acceptance of this transcript. This exchange will also provide you with an opportunity to add additional thoughts. I will also be happy to go over it by video teleconference using Zoom or by the phone if you have any questions or further comments that you would like me to capture.
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---Original Message-----
From: Lori Sussman <lsussman@une.edu>
Sent: Saturday, February 02, 2019 4:45 PM
To: lee@lexbolman.com
Cc: Bolman, Lee G. <BolmanL@umkc.edu>
Subject: Permission to use your Frames Quick Self-Rating Scale for my dissertation

Hello Dr. Bolman,

My name is Lori Sussman and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of New England. I am well into the process and composing my first three chapter draft for proposal approval.

I am using your four frame theory as part of my conceptual model for my dissertation on the underrepresentation of women as university presidents at a state level public university system in the US.

May I get your permission to use your Frames Quick Self-Rating Scale for my survey instrument for data collection and to use the results in my dissertation? I plan to interview seven state level university presidents and use the results of your questionnaire for quantitative analysis.

Kind regards, Lori Sussman

This e-mail may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If you suspect that you were not the intended recipient, please delete it and notify the sender as soon as possible.

---

Lori Sussman <lsussman@une.edu>

Re: Permission to use your Frames Quick Self-Rating Scale for my dissertation

To: Bolman, Lee G. <BolmanL@umkc.edu>