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ABSTRACT

GENDER DISTINCTIONS IN THE MORAL AND COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT OF ADULTS: THE INTERACTION OF WAYS OF KNOWING, DECISION MAKING, COMMUNICATION, AND LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS IN HIGHER EDUCATION
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In general, most women have different ways of knowing, communicating, and acting from most men. Women’s characteristic modes of thought, expression, and action are complementary to, not in conflict with, those modes that are more characteristic of men.

The particular qualities that women demonstrate can and do have value in the governance of modern institutions. Institutions that include women along with men in their governance, and also allow expression of their particular women’s gifts, benefit from this inclusion. Centuries-old prejudice and fear prevent modern institutions from enjoying women’s strengths as well as men’s strengths in their administration.

Organizations in our society which have historically not included women have recently opened to the participation of women in administrative roles. This change in organizations is laudable; however, researchers
in the last two decades have shown that merely the presence of women is not enough.

At the same time that organizations have been opening to women in administrative roles, researchers have shown that women are different from men in how they work in organizations and in how the organizations respond to women. Because of the work of scholars such as Miller (1976); Gilligan (1984); Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986); and Tannen (1990), it is now known that women are different from men in their moral and cognitive development and in communication; therefore, women are likely to be different from men as administrators in organizations such as higher education institutions.

How do these factors -- that organizations are including women in administrative roles, that women are different from men, and that women’s differences affect their work in organizations -- contribute to the impact that women have on organizations and vice versa?

This research study provides insights into and analyses of the above questions based on in-depth interviews of five women administrators in higher education in the New England area. In this thesis, I draw on the research of others to demonstrate women’s different, characteristic ways of knowing, communicating, and behaving. Then I show through others’ research and my own with women administrators in higher education how women’s
ways are both expressed and thwarted in the governance of the institutions these women serve.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Introduction

In The Education of Harriet Hatfield, May Sarton’s 60-year-old character, Harriet, sat in reflection. Her companion of 30 years had recently died. The night before, Harriet had dreamed of opening a bookstore, an adventure for which she had no direct experience:

I had to laugh at myself for thinking I could embark on such a venture with no business experience whatever, but it felt like an instinct as powerful as a cow’s instinct to eat grass. (p. 10)

Sarton’s character shaped her future using a process rarely studied in academic literature. This process, common to my own experience personally and professionally, is one of making meaning using what Harriet calls instinct. Harriet did not use thinking as the process of making meaning. Instead, she acted from a different kind of knowing, a feeling "as powerful as a cow’s instinct to eat grass."

Much like Sarton’s character, I have watched myself and other women administrators in higher education use different ways of knowing to make decisions, to communicate, to solve moral dilemmas, and to serve as leaders. Women administrators are, like Harriet Hatfield, more likely than men administrators to use instinct and the way they feel about issues in making meaning and making
decisions. Although making decisions and behaving from instinct and feelings can be quite effective, sometimes it is so subconscious for women that they do not easily reflect upon it, and, therefore, cannot easily defend it.

Research and my own observation have shown that men, on the other hand, tend to think, rather than to feel, their way to meaning and decisions. Men tend to use a rational, logical, and analytical thought process that is easily identified and defensible. Because society has been dominated by the male perspective, analytical thinking is highly valued.

It seems probable that women and men both use various ways to know and to make decisions in their lives; thinking is not the exclusive domain of men, nor is feeling the exclusive domain of women. The difference between the two genders and the way their consciousness functions lies in the fact that each gender seems more prone to choose one mode over the other -- women more commonly use feeling, instinct, intuition; men more commonly use logical reasoning. As Montaigne mused, "There is as much difference between us and ourselves as there is between us and others."

This study explores the interplay of processes for meaning-making and decision-making used by women, including thinking. In the history of epistemology, thinking has been considered the only way that people can make meaning of life (In his famous dictum, Descartes said, "I think;
therefore, I am."). In recent years some observers of human consciousness, many of them women, have begun to question this assumption. Instinct and intuition are other, equally valid ways of knowing, and no doubt there are many other ways through which women and men make meaning in their personal and professional lives.

Through five interviews, I explored how women make meaning in their lives: how they value thinking, instinct, intuition, acting on a hunch, listening to a "gut" feeling, listening to "a voice," "sleeping on it," "giving it time on the back burner," and in general moving beyond the rational mind. I also discovered that there are other ways that women use to know.

Not the definitive study on gender differences in knowing, this study is part of a more complex project on gender. Nevertheless, it may help to fill in with discernible features some blank places of our understanding about how people know and make meaning. I focus on how one population, women administrators in higher education, make meaning in their lives; how their ways of knowing affect their organizations, and how their organizations affect their ways of knowing; how women administrators behave from their knowing, and how organizational norms affect their behavior.
B. Statement of the Problem

In general, most women have different ways of knowing, communicating, and acting from most men. Women's characteristic modes of thought, expression, and action are complementary to, not in conflict with, those modes that are more characteristic of men.

The particular qualities that women demonstrate can and do have value in the governance of modern institutions. Institutions that include women along with men in their governance, and also allow expression of their particular women's gifts, benefit from this inclusion. Only centuries-old prejudice and fear prevent modern institutions from enjoying women's strengths as well as men's strengths in their administration.

Organizations in our society which have historically not included women have recently opened to the participation of women in administrative roles. This change in organizations is laudable; however, researchers in the last two decades have shown that merely the presence of women is not enough.

At the same time that organizations have been hiring women for administrative positions, researchers have shown that women are different from men in ways that impact how they work in organizations and how the organizations respond to women. Because of the work of scholars such as Miller (1976); Gilligan (1984); Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (BCGT) (1986); and Tannen (1990), it
is now known that women have different ways of knowing from men in moral and cognitive development and in communication; therefore, women are different from men as administrators in organizations such as higher education.

How do these two factors -- that organizations are including women in administrative roles, and that women are different from men, which affects their work in organizations -- contribute to the impact that women have on organizations and vice versa?

Kanter (1977) asserts that the social composition of people in the organization has a significant impact on their performance. This is most notable when the proportion of one social group (i.e., women) is much smaller than the proportion of another, the dominant social group (i.e., men). Kanter argues that when women are few in number, they will:

find it harder to gain "credibility," particularly in high uncertainty position such as . . . management jobs, . . . face misperceptions of their identity . . . in the organization, [and women will also be] more likely to be excluded from informal peer networks, and hence, limited in the source of power through alliances . . . (pp. 248-249)

Considering the present issue, as women are beginning to be accepted into higher education administration, how do their relatively few numbers affect their positions within those organizations? Further, how are the women affected by their status as people in the organization who have different ways of making meaning from the dominant (men) people in the organization?
Administrators who tend to be interactive and collaborative, who tend to include relevant people in decisions, who tend to ask new questions and develop new solutions, who tend to be flexible, who tend to lack ambition for the sake of status alone, and who tend to desire to empower everyone would benefit any institution they serve. Women tend to administer in this way. Once an institution acknowledges the value of traits like these, it is likely to encourage them rather than to require people who embody them to submerge them in deference to a set of other characteristics which challenge them. Seeking the full expression of women's ways of knowing such as those listed above can only be in the institution's best interests.

In this study I explored how women administrators in higher education perceive themselves to be affected at any organizational stage and regardless of the social composition of people in the organization. I was also interested in how women in higher education perceive that their organizations are affected when they bring women's ways of knowing to administration. How do these women make meaning in their lives? How do they communicate with others? How do they make and implement decisions? And how do they provide leadership? More than determining learning styles and the process of thinking, this study examines the relationship between women administrators' perception of
their cognitive and moral development and organizational leadership.

C. Areas of Research

In order to explore the impact of women administrators on institutions of higher education which were created by and for men and the impact of these institutions on women administrators, this study examined four major areas. The first area of investigation describes the issues and influences which affect women administrators in higher education. Among the issues affecting women administrators are women’s moral and cognitive development, their ways of knowing.

The second area of investigation describes how women bring their different ways of knowing into administrative positions in higher education. According to Haring-Hidore, et al. (1990), these women self-identify as constructed knowers. In *Women's Ways of Knowing*, Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986) (BCGT) defined constructed knowing as an inclusive way of knowing associated with women and different from the male-related, objective mode. Constructed knowers are comfortable "creating" meaning in a subjective way, rather than "uncovering" Truth, as an objective knower would do.

Extrapolating from BCGT's research, Bond (1992) predicted that women administrators, as constructed knowers, would manifest this externally by being "highly
interactive and collaborative" (See Appendix D). Women administrators who are constructed knowers would tend to invite those concerned in a given situation to be a part of the decision-making process.

For the third area of investigation, I wanted to identify women administrators who are constructed knowers. I extrapolated from Bond’s Hypothesized Table (Appendix D) and Bond’s source, BCGT, to design a questionnaire (Appendix G) which I sent to 40 women administrators in the New England area.

The women who received the initial questionnaire were asked to respond to it and to mail it back with a copy of their current resume. From the potential interviewees who responded as constructed knowers according to Bond’s hypotheses, I selected five women administrators for more extensive questioning.

The fourth area of investigation involved interviewing the five women selected from the initial questionnaire for approximately two hours each. I constructed interview questions based on Haring-Hidore’s adaptation of the BCGT interview questions. Open-ended questions asked women to tell stories that expressed their understanding about their ways of making meaning, communicating, making decisions, and acting in their professional capacities.
D. Purpose of the Study

There are several purposes of this study. The first purpose is to test two hypotheses. In the first hypothesis, Haring-Hidore, et al. (1990), hypothesized that women administrators in higher education who use women's ways of knowing are constructed knowers. The subjects in the Haring-Hidore study were selected through convenience, and I wanted to find if the randomly selected women administrators in my study identified as constructed knowers, used constructed knowing as a strategy, or in relation to other ways of knowing.

In the second hypothesis, Bond (1992) theorized that there are relationships between how one knows and how one behaves based on information from BCGT's categories. My initial questionnaire was based on Bond's projected relationships (see Appendix D) and additional information about separate and connected procedural knowers from BCGT, Bond's source. The responses indicated the correlation between Bond's table and how the interviewees associate with it.

In addition to testing BCGT's findings and Haring-Hidore's and Bond's hypotheses, I integrated information from a review of existing literature with my own in-depth interviews. From that synthesis I formed conclusions and added to the emerging body of knowledge about the cognitive and moral development of women and how that cognitive and moral meaning-making is manifest through leadership and
administration. The study provided further insight into the relationship between who women are and how they behave.

E. Significance of the Study

First, this study contributes to the emerging body of literature which focuses on the way women know and behave in organizations. This knowledge was acquired through exploring the moral and cognitive development and communication styles of women administrators in higher education.

A second contribution involves the role that women have in bringing about change. To contrast the traditional "shape of life" in organizations to the changes women are part of, Zuboff (1988) described traditional organizations and predicted:

We remain, in the final years of the twentieth century, prisoners of a vocabulary in which managers require employees; superiors have subordinates; jobs are defined to be specific, detailed, narrow, and task-related; and organizations have levels that in turn make possible chains of command and spans of control. The guiding metaphors are military, relationships are thought of as contractual and often adversarial. (p. 394)

Zuboff describes traditional organizations and leadership, a paradigm which she notes as problematic. The second contribution of this study shows how women-related ways of knowing are helping to define a new paradigm which is inclusive, connected, and empowering to all: descriptions of the type of manager Zuboff claims are necessary for the leadership of the future.
The new women-related paradigm is beginning to be seen as propitious to both women administrators and the colleges and universities they serve. The new paradigm helps higher education understand the differences between women's decision-making processes, providing the opportunity to accept these differences, and, finally, encouraging conscious adaptation to these differences in ways that benefit both the institutions and the people, both women and men, who serve in them. The women-related paradigm also benefits the young women and men who look to administrative leaders as role models.

An emphasis on a men-related standard of individual achievement and hierarchical status has dominated higher education and other organizations until this time. Our society is now in a time of transformation as it begins to incorporate women-related standards of relationships and connections. Assimilating women's ways of knowing into the organizational structure will not only sanction women's characteristics, it will also make it possible for men to observe, appreciate, and collaborate with these characteristics.

F. Design of the Study

This research study is organized into six chapters. This first chapter briefly introduces the study and describes each of the chapters. The second chapter reviews and critiques the work of Jean Baker Miller, Carol
Gilligan, Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (BCGT), Lynne Bond, Haring-Hidore, et al., and Deborah Tannen, regarding the cognitive and moral development of women. The work of the above-listed authors is contrasted with the findings of William Perry (1970) and Lawrence Kohlberg (1981, 1984).

The second chapter develops a comparison between the literature of connection and collaboration (the first group of authors) with that of competition and hierarchy (Perry & Kohlberg). The chapter examines women’s concern for relationships versus men’s concern for separation, and women’s concern for empowerment versus men’s use of power.

The third chapter examines research which describes the status of women in higher education and the issues which influence them. Of special note concerning the status of women in higher education is that recent research has shown that, although there are six million more women than men in the United States (Dolnick, 1991), women are simply outnumbered in the administration of higher education: the dominant culture in higher education administration is male.

Shavlik and Touchton (1986) identify an important issue that keeps women from administrative positions in higher education: the male, dominant culture’s fear that administrative positions on college campuses will be feminized. According to these researchers, for those who fear having administrative posts seen as a woman’s job,
one woman in a top administrative position is enough. In a male-dominated job situation, one woman administrator becomes very visible, and people feel that other women administrators are not needed (Sandler & Hall, 1986; Gillespie, 1988).

Numerous other researchers explore issues which influence the status of women administrators in higher education. Bayes and Newton (1978) noted early that males in power believe that the rewards they enjoy would no longer be available to them if these rewards had to be shared equally with women. Gillespie (1988), Sandler and Hall (1986), and Rossi (1980) found that the older the institution of higher learning, the more traditional (white male) its administrative staff. Sandler and Hall (1986) and Moore, (1984) found that women in higher education secure and are appointed to jobs in the lower ranks and in non-tenure faculty appointments. Touchton and Davis (1991) reported,

The return on a college education differs greatly from women and men. In 1987, the median salary for men with 4 years of high school ($25,394) was higher than the median salary earned by women with 4 years of college ($23,854) (p. 10).

There are numerous issues which influence the status of women in higher education administration.

The fourth chapter describes the research methodology and the theoretical assumptions of the qualitative methodological techniques chosen for this study. The
description of the research methodology is divided into the following sections:

1. the philosophical assumptions and rationale for the qualitative approach;
2. the technique of the open-ended interview;
3. the selection of the participants;
4. the pilot study;
5. the method of data collection; and
6. the method of data analysis.

Chapter V presents and analyzes the data acquired through the questionnaires and interviews of five women administrators in higher education. The data was analyzed on three levels. First, patterns and themes within the interview material were identified. Second, the data was evaluated against the BCGT protocol. Third, themes and patterns were compared with the way the data fits the BCGT protocol as hypothesized by Bond. Analysis was conducted within each interview and across all interviews.

Chapter VI consists of the conclusions and implications of the study. I examine the implications of gender-related or gender-specific characteristics, show relationships where they exist, speculate on perspectives which are incongruent with the literature, and offer suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER II

WOMEN'S WAYS OF KNOWING

A. Moral Development

1. Lawrence Kohlberg

The study of women’s ways of knowing begins, ironically enough, with a man who derived his theories from research conducted exclusively with men. Lawrence Kohlberg (1981, 1984) was a noted social science scholar who conceptualized a theory of moral development. Beginning with his doctoral dissertation in 1958, Kohlberg spent 30 years studying moral education. During that time, he wrote three volumes on moral development which cover moral, political, and educational philosophy, and moral psychology applied to education.

From his research Kohlberg and his associates created a model of moral development in which people pass through six progressive stages. Briefly, Kohlberg breaks the six stages into three levels: the first two stages are the preconventional level; the middle two stages are the conventional level; and the last two stages are the postconventional level.

Children at the preconventional level begin with a simple concern for reward or punishment ("obedience or punishment"). They then develop to the point where they learn that by doing something for someone else they can sometimes benefit themselves ("instrumentalist
relativist"). As children advance into the middle level, conventional, stages, they learn about pleasing others ("good boy/nice girl"), and then become interested in established rules of conduct ("law and order"). According to Kohlberg, many people never develop beyond these conventional stages of moral understanding.

Those who do go beyond, into postconventional stages, learn to base their actions on principles agreed upon by consensus, or on personal rights and belief systems ("social contract, legalistic"). The ultimate stage of human moral growth, according to Kohlberg, is expressed by people who determine justice according to moral standards "based on logical comprehensiveness, universality and consistency."

The precise delineation of Kohlberg's model of human moral development is of less concern to this study than the fact that he derived it by studying males and then generalized this male-derived model to describe human moral development: what is true for men must be true for all. He assumed that women's moral development should be identical to men's. When women's development did not fit Kohlberg's male-derived model, women were described as less highly developed than men, and Kohlberg did not include the results of his women participants in his study.
2. Jean Baker Miller

Kohlberg's conclusions about women's moral inferiority were widely accepted until the work of researchers such as psychologist Jean Baker Miller began to appear. Miller was working as a psychological researcher, and her specific area was not moral development. However, her conclusions about gender differences were to have influence across many disciplines, including influencing the work of Carol Gilligan (1982) in the field of moral development.

In 1976, Miller was one of the first academic authors to claim that, while women have often been considered deficient in comparison to men, women are not deficient. She asserted that women are simply different from men, not inferior to them.

Miller distinguishes women from men in one important way by describing women's tendency to focus on relationships as they make meaning in their lives. Miller believes that relationship is fundamental to women's lives:

One central feature is that women stay with, build on, and develop in a context of attachment and affiliation with others. Indeed, women's sense of self becomes very much organized around being able to make and then to maintain affiliations and relationships. (p. 83)

According to Miller, the focus on relationship, as well as other roles women hold as important, has been taken for granted. In the process, women's contributions have been devalued. The assumption is that because women do not individuate and separate as men do, there must be something
wrong with their process, something wrong with holding relationships as important.

In addition to establishing a continuum from relationship to separation and showing how each gender relates to it, Miller suggested that there are other human characteristics that "exist in each sex but in different proportions" (p. 43). Figure 1 notes Miller’s conception of characteristics that exist in each gender in different proportions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. focus on relationships</td>
<td>1. focus on individuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. are able to admit weakness or vulnerability</td>
<td>2. are not comfortable with feeling weak or vulnerable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. focus on emotions and reactions of others</td>
<td>3. focus on expressing own emotions and reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. believe women will do the &quot;lesser task&quot; of helping others develop</td>
<td>4. believe men will do the important work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. feel more comfortable with cooperation</td>
<td>5. feel more comfortable with competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. have no sense of advantage over others</td>
<td>6. have acquired a sense that men are members of a superior group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. want to share with others</td>
<td>7. see sharing as losing something</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1  Miller’s Human Characteristics That Exist in Each Gender in Different Proportions
Miller’s important work, proposing gender differences instead of women’s deficiencies, encouraged other researchers to look at gender differences in new ways.

3. Carol Gilligan

Psychologist Carol Gilligan began her research career as a collaborator with Lawrence Kohlberg, and her own work owes much to Kohlberg as a pioneering precursor. But Kohlberg’s conclusions that women are morally deficient and inferior prompted Gilligan to pursue her own groundbreaking discoveries about gender differences in human moral development. Her work in women’s moral development complements Miller’s findings in women’s psychology.

a. Observational Bias

Gilligan saw, through her work with Kohlberg, that research investigating human development had been focusing on men and then universalizing conclusions to apply to both women and men. Besides Gilligan and Miller, other researchers came to the same conclusions about a glaring observational bias in a supposedly "scientific" process: that adult development has long been defined by research conducted exclusively on the development of men.

One group that identified this problem clearly is Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, and Rosenkrantz (1972). Here is how they summarized the conclusions of the male-biased model of development:
a. There are qualities that are acknowledged as important for adulthood;
b. among the qualities necessary for adulthood are the ability for independent thinking, lucid decision-making, and competent performance; and
c. each of these qualities deemed important for adulthood is connected to masculinity and appears less frequently in women.

Gilligan realized that if this model describes how adulthood is conceived, using men as the archetype, then women could not be considered adults. Instead of accepting this conclusion, she challenged the yardstick used by researchers who concluded that women do not measure up to men. Questioning the criteria, she wrote:

Yet looked at from a different perspective, these stereotypes reflect a conception of adulthood that is itself out of balance, favoring the separateness of the individual self over connection to others, and leaning more toward an autonomous life of work than toward the interdependence of love and care. (1986, p. 17)

Gilligan asserted that to continue favoring the male model of development (independence) is to deny that there is a female model of development (interdependence). This denial of a female model, in the context of a presumably universal male-oriented model, perpetuates an observational bias that fosters an incomplete model -- and, more important, an incomplete understanding -- of human development.

The disparity between women's experience and the representation of human development, noted
throughout the psychological literature, has generally been seen to signify a problem in women’s development. Instead, the failure of women to fit existing models of human growth may point to a problem in the representation, a limitation in the conception of human condition, an omission of certain truths about life. (p. 4)

By thus truncating our understanding of the human condition, we also deny the voice of more than half of the population.

Gilligan did not propose to discredit men’s moral development in order to have women’s voices heard. Rather, her objective was simply to make knowledge more complete by including women’s differences, rather than dismissing them:

... when one begins with the study of women and derives developmental constructs from their lives, the outline of a moral conception different from that described by Freud, Piaget, or Kohlberg begins to emerge and informs a different description of development. (pp. 16-17)

Gilligan claimed that neither women nor men are deficient or deviant; they just develop differently:

... the contrasts between male and female voices... highlight a distinction between two modes of thought and... focus a problem of interpretation rather than... represent a generalization about either sex. (p. 4)

Gilligan’s intention was to identify and describe some of the differences, because by accounting for these differences, a more accurate model of what is truly human may be obtained.

Thus, although Gilligan distinguished differences in female and male development, her encompassing vision of human development was inclusive, rather than exclusive.
Her own observational bias, if it can be called that, was different from the biases of previous researchers because she did not dismiss any perspective; rather, she wove together all points of view. She expanded the realm of considerations.

At the foundation of Gilligan’s model of human development lies what she called her "central assumption":

... that the way people talk about their lives is of significance, that the language they use and the connections they make reveal the world that they see and in which they act. (p. 2)

In other words, both women and men are involved with connection . . . they just make different connections.

By debunking the biases underlying what had been considered the objective neutrality of the scientific method of inquiry, Gilligan took a radical step that went beyond mere gender differences in human development. She challenged that sacred icon, the scientific model itself, which was invented by males and perpetuated by them. And she posited a relational model in its place, something more congruent with women’s ways of knowing, an inclusive understanding that humans construct knowledge out of subjective experience:

Theories formerly considered to be sexually neutral in their scientific objectivity are found instead to reflect a consistent observational and evaluative bias. Then the presumed neutrality of science, like that of language itself, gives way to the recognition that the categories of knowledge are human constructions. (p. 6)
b. Gilligan’s Model of Human Moral Development

Thus, Carol Gilligan (1982) stepped out of the traditional male-oriented research mode. She compared her fundamental premise that women’s morality is based on responsibility, care, and connective relationship with Kohlberg’s findings that human (actually, men’s) morality is based on competition, rights, and separation.

Gilligan found women to be different from men in their degree of concern for others:

Sensitivity to the needs of others and the assumption of responsibility for care-taking lead women to attend to voices other than their own and to include in their judgment other points of view. (p. 16)

By extension, women find it easier than men to hear and understand others. It is this tendency to include that attracts those who want their voices to be heard.

According to Gilligan, this tendency to be inclusive, rather than exclusive, puts women at some disadvantage compared to men in those specific situations where they are obliged to judge and to make decisions that would exclude others:

The reluctance to judge may itself be indicative of the care and concern for others that infuse the psychology of women’s development and are responsible for what is generally seen as problematic in its nature. (p. 17)

Conversely, however, women may find different, but equally valid, ways to make decisions which in the male world view would require exclusion. Given their preference to include, Gilligan claims, women would seek ways of
decision-making that align with caring for others and maintaining connection.

c. Connection Between Moral Development and the Development of Identity

Along with moral development, Gilligan (1982) studied the development of identity. She found that women develop identity based on personal experience and relationships, compared to men who develop identity based on separation and autonomy.

Gilligan showed how the orientation of valuing responsibility is more common to people whose self-concept is rooted in connection and relationship (mostly women) and how those oriented in terms of rights describe themselves through separation and independence (mostly men). Figure 2 shows the connection between moral development and the development of identity in women and men.

For women, "...identity is defined in a context of relationship and judged by a standard of responsibility and care" (Gilligan, p. 160). Gilligan found that a woman's self-image revolves around cooperation and relating to those around them: "When women construct the adult domain, the world of relationships emerges and becomes the focus of attention and concern" (p. 167).

By contrast, in the world according to men, identity is equivalent to status and is determined by what one does and whom one knows. Status is defined by achievement:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MORAL DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT OF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOSTLY WOMEN</td>
<td>MOSTLY MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility and care = Relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(dialogue and exchange of views) (connection to others)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights = Separation and autonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(abstract laws and universal principles) (split from others)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 Moral Development and Development of Identity

"Instead of attachment, individual achievement rivets the male imagination, and great ideas or distinctive activity defines [sic] the standard of self-assessment and success" (p. 163). In other words, men relate to others by qualifying for identity, whereby one has to prove he is qualified in order to be part of and connected with a group.

Gender-based identity development is important for understanding relationships between the genders. Men seek a sense of self and worthiness through their work by being powerful, a process that often separates them from others, including women colleagues who, according to Gilligan, are working to connect:

Thus the sequential ordering of identity and intimacy in the transition from adolescence to adulthood better fits the development of men than it does the development of women. Power and separation secure the man in an identity achieved through work, but they leave him at a distance
from others, who seem in some sense out of his sight. (p. 163)

Because women conceive their self-image and power by staying connected with others, they tend to define success as a situation in which everyone wins, putting them at odds with a male system that is based on a win-lose paradigm. Obviously, this contrast has implications for the interaction of women and men in the workplace which are addressed in Chapter VI.

d. Summary of Gilligan's Contributions

Gilligan's research spans a variety of human characteristics which she perceived to be different for women and men based on what is important by gender. Her findings are summarized in Figure 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEMALE MODEL OF PRIORITIES</th>
<th>MALE MODEL OF PRIORITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. interdependence</td>
<td>1. independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. responsibility</td>
<td>2. rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. care and relationship</td>
<td>3. competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. inclusive</td>
<td>4. exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. win-win</td>
<td>5. win-lose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. connection</td>
<td>6. balancing claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. attachment</td>
<td>7. individual achievement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Gilligan's Model of Moral Development -- Gender Differences Determine Priorities
B. Cognitive Development

1. William Perry

Just as Lawrence Kohlberg, a man who studied men, served as an important precursor for the study of women’s moral development, so William Perry, another man who studied men, laid the groundwork for the study of women’s cognitive development. In 1970, Perry published his famous study of the cognitive development of students at Harvard University. He based his research "on the principle that if you want to study how people think, you must first get them to think" (Robert W. White, 1970, p. vi, foreword to Perry’s book).

For the purposes of this study, Perry’s work made three important contributions: the innovative methodology he devised as he conducted the research that resulted in his developmental schema; the shift in perspective that occurs as a person passes through these stages of intellectual development; and the discovery that thinking is a developmental process rather than an unchanging function of personality.

a. Methodology

Perry’s methods have had far-reaching influence. His most important innovation may be that he used a qualitative mode of inquiry. Perry wanted to study the process of thinking, not the products of thinking, so he created an
atmosphere conducive to thinking. Since standardized testing such as intelligence tests, questionnaires, and psychological tests did not satisfy his research standards, Perry took a different approach. He invited "the students to think, taking their own time, doing it in their own way, choosing their own topics" (p. vi).

In addition to this change in method, Perry also listened to his subjects' thought processes as other researchers had not. He listened during the interview and, after it was over, he listened to the tape recording of the interview. In describing the reaction of the subjects to Perry's innovative methodology, White (1970) writes:

The student subjects in this research felt that their thoughts about themselves and their world were of absorbing interest to the listener, that he became deeply involved in following them, that he would listen forever as they fumbled and backtracked and slowly discovered what they wanted to say, that he took them seriously and viewed them with respect. (p. vi, in Perry)

In this environment students were encouraged to consider, to contemplate, to take themselves seriously, and to think at their best. Perry observed thinking as, "not a laboratory model, not a disjointed set of elicited responses, but an involved, serious attempt to formulate and convey one's personal reflections" (White, p. vi, in Perry).

b. Shift from Personal Styles to Developmental Stages

Perry initially designed his study to explore personal styles of thinking. His goal was simply to look at how
students react to intellectual and moral relativism. Perry wanted to compare students with a "strong preference for dualistic, right-wrong thinking and those...[who think in a more] qualified, relativistic and contingent way" (p. 7).

At the onset, Perry "considered such differences as a manifestation of differences in personality in keeping with much psychological thinking of the time" (p. 7). Because the qualities of thinking seemed set in personality, Perry believed that they were static, unchangeable. But in 1969 he discovered, through the work of a graduate student, that people can change their stage of cognitive development through moral education. Teaching a class on moral education, the graduate student observed some of his students moving from the beginning levels of Perry's conception of cognitive development at the start of the class to more advanced stages toward the end of the semester.

With further study, Perry and his colleagues came to see that the quality of knowing expressed by their subjects was not a reflection of personal style. Rather, the quality of knowing was "characteristic of stages in the developmental process itself" (p. 8). Recognizing that what he had discovered did not fit with his original purpose, Perry redirected his study based on his new understanding.

Perry then asked a new question to direct the study: "Could it be that in a changing, pluralistic culture in
which man's [sic] very knowledge and values are seen to be relative, the sequential challenges of this journey are essential steps in a person's maturation?" (p. ix, preface).

It was here that Perry's perspective shifted. He began to look at context as well as content. He looked at development in terms of the fundamental paradigms through which a person views life:

. . . forms in which a person perceives his world rather than in the particulars or "content" of his attitudes and concerns . . . [because] forms of seeing, knowing, and caring lies [sic] precisely in their transcendence over content . . . the general pattern of personal development at the level of forms may be more enduring, manifesting itself through many generations of particulars. (p. ix, preface)

Eventually, Perry recognized that the "forms," or perspectives, through which people view the world served as their framework for "seeing, knowing, and caring." He realized that these perspectives give shape to a person's knowing and remain constant even as the particulars change. Through this work, Perry established a new model for inquiry into thinking and knowing.

c. Perry's Model of Cognitive Development

Through his research, Perry (1977) produced a "Chart of Development," proposing that cognitive development is represented in nine hierarchical and progressive stages. (See Appendix A for a full description of these stages.) It is, he wrote, the
sequence of these forms . . . [that] appears to
us to manifest a logical order -- an order in
which one form leads to another through
differentiations and reorganizations required for
the meaningful interpretation of increasingly
complex experience . . . (p. 3)

Perry called his hierarchical sequence of
epistemological perspectives "positions" or "stages." The
stages of this "logical order" are not sharply delineated;
they overlap and have flexible boundaries. According to
Perry’s schema, people begin in a state of "embeddedness,"
assuming that "reality" is static. Slowly, conflicting
realities emerge, and they recognize that each individual
has a unique and shifting "reality."

Ways of thinking, according to Perry, begin at the
most simplistic level. The student subjects in the first
four stages believe that all knowledge is based on and
related to contrasting absolutes of a right-wrong, either-
or duality. At the fifth stage there is a radical change:
beliefs are no longer assimilated into dualistic
understanding. Rather, by the fifth stage Perry’s subjects
discard duality and embrace a relativistic position,
whereby they distinguish everything in its context, in
relation to its surroundings. From that stage on, the
individual commits to his own beliefs, moving from an
external focus on others’ beliefs to questioning and
creating his own. The individual begins to have faith in
his own knowing.

The progression ends with complex affirmations of
personal commitments in a world of conditional knowledge
and relative values. The forms and transitions leading up to this climax outline the major steps through which the person "... appears to extend his answer to make meaning in successive confrontations with diversity" (Perry, p. 3).

In other words, Perry found that his subjects progressed in their ability to consider possibilities that contrasted to their previous way of thinking. Perry's subjects matured by developing the skill to incorporate formerly contradictory concepts into their scheme of understanding, instead of dismissing them as wrong or impossible. Perry describes how through these stages or positions his subjects became conscious of the source and character of knowledge, how this knowing developed, and how their perception of themselves as knowers transformed throughout their lives.

2. Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule

a. Influence of Perry and Gilligan

Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986) (BCGT) were greatly influenced by both Perry and Gilligan. They coupled Perry's qualitative research tool in cognitive development with Gilligan's findings about women in moral development.

In the preface to his book, Perry acknowledged that his study needed to be repeated in diverse settings. Following his direction, BCGT attempted to replicate
Perry's methodology in a study of women's cognitive development, what BCGT called "ways of knowing."

A comparison of Perry's research with men and BCGT's study with women reveals a similarity and several differences. The similarity involves their research methodology: the authors of *Women's Ways of Knowing* used Perry's qualitative, open-ended interview format.

Two notable differences between Perry's and BCGT's studies involve the selection of subjects. Although Perry interviewed some women, his model was formed using only interviews with his male subjects because his female subjects did not fit his male-derived model. BCGT's subjects were all women.

A second difference concerns the backgrounds of Perry and BCGT's respective subjects. Perry had a homogeneous subject population, students enrolled in Harvard University; while BCGT's subjects were from varied backgrounds and various organizations. Consequently, BCGT found that when the population being studied is allowed to vary, the results are more subtle and more ambiguous:

> When the context is allowed to vary, as it did in our study, because we included women of widely different ages, life circumstances, and backgrounds, universal developmental pathways are far less obvious. (p. 15)

A third difference between Perry's and BCGT's research studies concerns intention. Perry looked at what women might have in common with men, and then dismissed women when they did not fit this male-derived model. BCGT looked
to "uncover those themes that might be more prominent among women" (BCGT, p. 9). Perry universalized what he found in his study of men's experience to human experience. In contrast, BCGT simply wrote about women's ways of knowing without generalizing women's experience to human experience.

In the beginning of their study, BCGT tried to place their subjects' responses into Perry's model of developmental stages. BCGT found differences:

When we began our analysis by classifying the women's data using Perry's scheme, we found that the women's thinking did not fit so neatly into his categories. There were digressions of thought . . . twists and turns in perspectives, themes . . . and elaborations of points of view that we simply had not anticipated. (p. 14)

Finding traditional research models useless, BCGT followed Gilligan's example and questioned the classification system itself. They contended that by narrowly limiting the subjects of his study, male students at Harvard, Perry controlled the research so narrowly that the findings were predictable. Narrowing the source of data determined the model:

What we believe Perry heard in his interviews with men and captured so well in his developmental scheme is the way in which a relatively homogeneous group of people are socialized into and make sense of a system of values, standards, and objectives. The linear sequence in development stands out clearly when the context in which development occurs is held constant. (BCGT, p. 15)

By studying women from varied backgrounds and various organizations, BCGT's developmental model was not as
controlled and predictable as Perry's. And their results were quite different.

BCGT, like Gilligan, questioned the standard classification system, and they were influenced by Gilligan's work in a couple of important ways. First, Gilligan's conclusions about gender differences in moral development form an important foundation for BCGT's work in cognitive development. Second, like Gilligan, BCGT could not fit the data from their women subjects into existing models which had been based on the data collected primarily from men subjects.

b. Results of BCGT's Work

In *Women's Ways of Knowing*, BCGT describe five distinct categories and four additional subcategories through which, they conclude, women make meaning in their lives. (See Appendices B and C for detailed descriptions of the characteristics.) The epistemological perspectives developed by BCGT provide a framework for understanding how women know.

The first way of knowing, *silence*, depicts women who feel they have no voice, who "do not cultivate their capacities for representational thought" (BCGT, p. 25). In the second way of knowing, *received*, women passively acquire what they perceive to be concrete knowledge from listening to others.
The source of the third way of knowing, subjective knowing, is the self. For these women there are two characteristics of knowing: a women trusts her inner voice, personal experience, and intuition; and the quest for self involves women who are "actively and obsessively preoccupied with a choice between self and other" (p. 77).

In the fourth way of knowing, knowledge is communicated through procedures. BCGT divided this category into two parts. In the "separate mode," the aim is to construct truth; and, in the "connected mode," the aim is to construct meaning. Either way, women who use procedural knowing are intentional in their use of methods to convey information.

In the fifth way of knowing, constructed knowing, women combine the separate and connected modes of understanding. The aim is to understand through exploring the context in which information is shared.

i. Men and Women as Knowers: Male Authorities versus Female Outsiders. BCGT’s work owes a lot to Perry’s pioneering methods. But BCGT’s different emphasis, on women’s cognitive development rather than on men’s, led them to important discoveries of their own. Among their contributions is the conclusion that women have more difficulty than men in four areas:

1. asserting their authority or considering themselves as authorities;

2. expressing themselves in public so that others will listen;
3. gaining respect of others for their minds and their ideas;

4. fully utilizing their capabilities and training in the world of work. (BCGT, p. 5)

BCGT did not stop with these conclusions, however; their studies also indicated why women have difficulty in these areas. For example, they found that women tend to perceive men as the authorities in this world. One reason for this attitude is the fact that "leadership in public life still rests predominantly on male shoulders" (BCGT, p. 44). As public leaders, men are seen as the source of "right answers" and "truth."

BCGT also found that women "aligned more with outsiders than with authorities" (p. 44). Perhaps this alignment is caused by the fact that women constantly hear authority figures making claims that women do not accept. For example, BCGT’s subjects spoke about "science professors who communicated their beliefs that women were incapable of making science" (p. 44). Other BCGT subjects spoke about authorities "who wielded their power to extract sexual favors" (p. 44). When inaccurate comments and misuse of power represent authority, it is little wonder that women are alienated enough to choose, consciously or unconsciously, NOT to align or identify with power and authority.

BCGT’s research also revealed new information concerning women in education. Women reported that their schools "were very likely to have ignored the works and
achievements of women in developing the curriculum" (p. 44). When women's voices are silenced in deciding who teaches what, and how it is to be taught, and when women are also seldom the subjects of study in education, female learners are given a clear message that women do not count for much.

That message results in two things. First, because women are discounted in education, women rarely "find authorities of their own sex as models" (p. 44) in education, any more than they do in public life. And, second, women found that their male classmates "were more likely to have taken and held the floor for presenting their views" (p. 44). Because women are held in low esteem, their voices are literally silenced, excluded. Worse, these demeaning social attitudes lead women, through low self-esteem, to exclude themselves, both relegating themselves and being relegated to the role of passive participants in an active, male-centered arena.

ii. Men and Women as Knowers: Connected versus Separate Procedural Knowers. In addition to missing models of authority of their own gender, women in education do not have a model of knowing to which they relate, because the academic world is still dominated and controlled by men’s ways of knowing, by men’s ways of creating meaning.

BCGT found, quite in agreement with the conclusions of Gilligan and others, that women who use procedural knowing tend to be more comfortable with a model of connection, a
personal knowing that is based on firsthand experience. Women tend to create meaning both by understanding and experiencing another’s perspective, another’s reality, and by being understood by another. This way of knowing and making meaning, so characteristic of women, is process-oriented and subjective; it personalizes the process by including feelings and stressing the interconnection of self and other.

Connected procedural knowing requires that the self be allowed to participate in an intimate way, a process comfortable to women. As noted through discussion of Gilligan’s work, women tend to define self through interdependence. Women express this definition of self as procedural connected knowers by creating their reality through systematically accommodating personal observation and analysis. Connected knowers, by integrating thought and feeling, move in and out of procedural knowing easily.

This emphasis on connection and interdependence in women’s cognitive process influences their approach to communication and decision-making. BCGT found that women tend to believe that "dialogue and exchange of views allow each individual to be understood in his or her own terms" (p. 8). Dialogue, talking things through, allows those involved to feel included in the process. Although consensus may not be reached and all needs may not be met, people tend to feel more ownership of, and therefore more support for, a decision. In short, people feel that they
have been heard, an important factor for both men and women.

BCGT stated that "men may find connected knowing more difficult than women do" (p. 113), and that men, based on Perry's findings, favor separate procedural knowing. The focus of separate knowing is to evaluate and judge. Separate knowing is goal-oriented and impersonal. Based on thought more than on feeling, it separates the self from the situation. The goal of separate knowing is to discover Truth; it presumes that Truth, objectively discovered, is universally true, in all situations.

Because women are less comfortable with a separate style of knowing or making meaning, "few women found argument -- reasoned critical discourse -- a comfortable form of communication . . . fearing that someone may get hurt" (p. 105). Yet, much teaching is grounded in argument, and many learning situations expect students to write about or verbally demonstrate an understanding of contrast and separateness, rather than similarity and connectedness.

Clearly, women's difference in cognitive development puts them at a disadvantage in most schools and other learning situations, which are still dominated by male modes of cognition. As long as schools tilt toward male learners by stressing debate, logical analysis, and abstract concepts, women are forced to adapt to a mode that is comparatively more alien for them than for men.
BCGT qualified their findings by making it clear that "separate and connected knowing are not gender-specific . . . but may be gender-related: it is possible that more women than men tip toward connected knowing and more men than women toward separate knowing" (p. 103). Furthermore, BCGT were careful to state, these differences are simply differences, not value judgments: neither way of knowing is inherently superior or inferior.

Writing ten years before BCGT, Janet Lever (1976), a researcher of girls' and boys' ways of knowing, foreshadowed BCGT's findings. Her research showed that girls value what BCGT later termed "connected knowing," and that girls are more inclined to be connected knowers than boys. BCGT found that Lever's fifth-grade girls constructed their conversations in ways similar to the ways in which college women constructed conversations. BCGT also found that Lever's fifth-grade boys' conversations paralleled those of college men. Lever's girls engaged in conversations to share in an intimate way, in contrast to boys' conversations, in which there is debating and judging in an impersonal manner. While Lever's boys and BCGT's separate knowers (men) come from an abstract code of rules, the females in both studies have loosely-defined personal conversations. Figure 4 shows the relation of BCGT's women and Lever's girls compared to BCGT's men and Lever's boys:
BCGT's College Women and Lever's Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCGT’s College Women and Lever’s Girls</th>
<th>BCGT’s College Men and Lever’s Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. intimate</td>
<td>1. impersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. relatively informal and unstructured</td>
<td>2. bound by more or less explicit formal rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 Comparison of Conversations Comparison of BCGT’s Women and Men to Lever’s Girls and Boys

(Information quoted from BCGT, p. 114)

iii. Thinking and Other Ways of Knowing. BCGT also explored the ability to make meaning in life using ways of knowing other than thinking. They took us to the edge of a new paradigm that is not limited to thinking as the only, or even the best, way to make meaning.

For example, BCGT observed that their subjects knew by using intuition: "Truth, for subjective knowers, is an intuitive reaction -- something experienced, not thought out, something felt rather than actively pursued or constructed" (BCGT, p. 69). The authors also described their own process using intuition: "... we realized that this fresh knowledge was not new but had been, for us, underground, unarticulated, intuited, or ignored" (BCGT, p. 19-20).

The interviewees also knew by feeling: "Occasionally women distinguish between truth as feelings that come from within and ideas that come from without" (BCGT, p. 69). These women described a way of knowing that comes from
within and is NOT relegated to the realm of thought. This internal knowing is their trusted authority.

For other women in the BCGT study, truth had a sensory base. One woman said that "If I read something, and if it agrees with my senses, then I believe it, I know it" (BCGT, p. 75). For such women, the world of the senses seemed to be a viable alternative to thinking as a way of knowing.

c. Summary of BCGT’s Contributions

In summary, BCGT used Perry’s paradigm as a springboard, integrating his thesis that thinking is an important way of knowing. Then they took a new step, opening a new paradigm containing the following elements:

a. the process of making meaning of life is important;

b. thinking is part of the process of knowing;

c. making meaning includes knowing through several ways other than thinking.

Although BCGT compared women and men to some extent, their main concern was to explore women’s ways of knowing and to establish women’s cognitive development as different from, but just as valid as, men’s. Figure 5 shows BCGT’s description of how women make meaning in their lives compared to how Perry described how men make meaning.
WOMEN

1. resolve conflicts in context and relationship
2. align with outsiders
3. feel comfortable with connected and constructed knowing
4. find separate knowing difficult
5. do not favor argument as a form of communication
6. value truth that is personal and felt
7. tend to know through intuition and subjective ways of knowing

MEN

1. resolve conflicts by deciding who is right
2. align with authorities
3. feel connected and constructed knowing is difficult
4. favor separate knowing
5. favor argument as a form of communication
6. value truth that is abstract
7. tend to know through thinking and objective ways of knowing

Figure 5  BCGT’s Description of How Women Function Compared to Perry’s Description of How Men Function

C. Manifestations of Moral and Cognitive Development

Moral and cognitive development are expressed through communication and behavior. As researchers have shown, there are gender distinctions in the manifestation of communication and behavior.

1. Communication

In her study of moral development, Gilligan discovered that women not only develop somewhat different values from men, they also express their values and their consciousness in ways different from men. BCGT found the same kinds of
differences when they investigated women's cognitive development: just as women learn and know differently, they also communicate differently.

a. Deborah Tannen

Much, therefore, had begun to be questioned about women's ways of communicating, and the differences between these ways and men's ways, before linguist Deborah Tannen published her best seller, *You Just Don't Understand* (1990). Tannen's contribution has been to focus particular attention on the all-important ways women and men talk to each other. Her findings have been fully congruent with those of the human development scholars already treated in this paper, and they show that moral and cognitive gender differences may be reflected through communication.

i. **Gender Distinctions in Communication.** Tannen examined the purposes and styles of women's and men's communication and concluded that there is a gender hierarchy in communication, much as Miller, Gilligan, and BCGT acknowledged gender hierarchy in their respective fields. Tannen asserted that "if women's and men's [communication] styles are shown to be different, it is usually women who are told to change" (Tannen, p. 15). Thus, men's communication styles become the standard.

Tannen challenged this hierarchical perspective by emphasizing that men and women have different "but equally valid styles" (p. 15) of communicating, neither being
better than the other. As men observe women, according to Tannen, they see subjective talkers, while men see their own ways of talking as objective. Because the way women speak is different from, not inferior to, the way men speak, Tannen concluded that it is important to give equal respect to women’s ways of talking.

When women enter a male-dominated system, communication is one of the most important aspects of the organization to negotiate. According to Tannen, many men engage the world as an individual in a hierarchical order in which he was either one-up or one-down. In this world, conversations are negotiations in which people try to achieve and maintain the upper hand if they can, and protect themselves from others’ attempts to put them down and push them around. Life, then, is a contest, a struggle to preserve independence and avoid failure. (p. 24-25)

Women, on the other hand, communicate in a very different way. While men often communicate to determine status, women communicate to establish connection. For women, conversations are negotiations for closeness in which people try to seek and give confirmation and support, and to reach consensus. They try to protect themselves from others’ attempts to push them away. Life, then, is a community, a struggle to preserve intimacy and avoid isolation. Though there are hierarchies in this world too, they are hierarchies more of friendship than of power and accomplishment. (Tannen, p. 25)

Tannen asserted that gender difference can be clearly observed in patterns of communication. Women are inclined to consult others and to include them. Men see
consultation as controlling, limiting, and as an obstacle to leadership. Women include others as a way of showing care. For women, failure to include another in a decision may indicate a lack of closeness in a relationship:

Women expect decisions to be discussed first and made by consensus. They appreciate the discussion itself as evidence of involvement and communication. But many men feel oppressed by lengthy discussions about what they see as minor decisions, and they feel hemmed in if they can't just act without talking first. (p. 27)

Thus, men's and women's different patterns of communication manifest in decision-making. Women want to process; men want to act. Women want involvement; men see drawn-out discussions as a challenge to their status. Consensus for women reaffirms the principles that are valuable to them, such as intimacy and interpersonal relations. Consensus is viewed by men as unnecessary, lengthy, and restrictive.

Like Gilligan and BCGT before her, Tannen concluded that women are not all one way and men all another:

Though all humans need both intimacy and independence, women tend to focus on the first and men on the second. It is as if their life-blood ran in different directions. (p. 26)

Figure 6 summarizes the way Tannen saw the focus of communication determined by gender. Tannen sees both men and women involved in the same activities. The intention of the activities, however, differs by gender.
**Women as Communicators**

1. Are subjective talkers
2. Converse to
   a. Negotiate for closeness
   b. Reach consensus
3. See consulting with others as
   a. Including others
   b. Showing care
   c. Important to show closeness
4. See discussion as evidence of involvement
5. Enjoy process-oriented decision-making because
   a. They want to process
   b. Involving others is desirable
6. Like consensus because it reaffirms intimacy and interpersonal relations

**Men as Communicators**

1. Are objective talkers
2. Converse to
   a. Negotiate for status
   b. Preserve independence
   c. Avoid failure
3. See consulting with others as
   a. Controlling
   b. Limiting
   c. An obstacle to becoming a leader
4. See discussion as oppressive and hemming them in
5. Dislike process-oriented decision-making because
   a. They want to act
   b. Involving others is challenge to status
6. Dislike consensus because it is unnecessary and restrictive

---

Figure 6 Tannen’s Focus of Communication Determined by Gender

2. Behavior

a. Lynne Bond

Psychologist Lynne A. Bond (1992) synthesized much of the recent work focused on women’s ways of knowing. She built a predictive model, using the perspectives that BCGT
revealed, and hypothesized about women’s views of self, others, education, and the workplace (see Appendix D).

Bond hypothesized that knowers behave in predictable ways based on how they know. She used BCGT’s concept of women’s ways of knowing and described how knowers in the BCGT categories would respond in given situations. According to Bond, one of the characteristics of constructed knowers is that women do not "merely uncover information, [they construct knowledge] through dialogue with self and others" (p. 3). Women construct knowledge in the context of their life experience and in the context of the lives of the people with whom they are working.

Bond predicted that constructed knowers in teaching or working positions, such as higher education administration, would be "highly interactive and collaborative" (Appendix D). Women administrators who are constructed knowers would tend to invite all those concerned in a given situation to be a part of the decision-making process. Women who are constructed knowers consider all input and include all who are involved before coming to a decision. While these women consider all sides in deliberation, their intention is not to please everyone as much as it is to use all resources to arrive at the best solution.

Still another proposed characteristic of women administrators as constructed knowers, according to Bond, is "sharing and evaluating views and reframing new questions" (Bond, p. 3). In situations where questioning
has previously been seen by men as challenging the status quo, constructed knowers would look at all options without being possessive of the status quo. They would elicit and ask new questions as well as develop new solutions.

   i. Gender Distinctions in Behavior. Bond predicts that most women, unlike most men, would not be attracted to administrative positions for the inherent power. Rather, women would use administrative positions to relate to others and express themselves. Women are often more flexible in their roles, focus, and process than men. Because of this tendency towards flexibility and a desire for everyone to be empowered, women would have a different intention from men as they enter administration.

   Bond is an important researcher who is looking at the new inquiry on women’s ways of knowing. Although she is in the formative stages of developing her thesis, Bond is one of few analysts who are considering the implications of the new information as it relates to women administrators in higher education.

   Grounded in the research of Miller, Gilligan, BCGT, and Tannen, Bond is a researcher who made the hypotheses that behavior comes from the way one knows. Bond’s prediction of the relationship between the way one knows and the way one behaves is one prediction that will be examined in this dissertation.
CHAPTER III

WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS IN HIGHER EDUCATION: THEIR STATUS AND ISSUES THAT INFLUENCE THEIR STATUS

A. Introduction

Based on the new information about women's ways of knowing, Bond's hypotheses that women administrators who are constructed knowers will behave in ways which are predictable makes sense. However, the women administrators are not always behaving in an environment that supports how they want to behave.

To examine Bond's hypotheses, it is important to first look at the environment of women administrators in higher education. It is important to ask the questions: How are women administrators accommodating the traditionally male-centered institutions?, and How are the institutions accommodating the women?

According to Martin (1985), Moore (1987), and many other researchers, higher education was created by and for men. A group of researchers that has written about this issue is BCGT (1986, p. 190):

Most of the institutions of higher education in this country were designed by men, and most continue to be run by men. In recent years, feminist teachers and scholars have begun to question the structure, the curriculum, and the pedagogical practices of these institutions.

As Moore (1987) points out, "since the beginning of the twentieth century, women have generally experienced increasing access to higher education, but closer
examination reveals that such access has frequently been channelled into specific types of institutions and fields of study" (p. 24). Men are still the gatekeepers in education, whether the gate is at the level of undergraduate admission or higher education administration.

In higher education administration, the environment is one issue which influences the status of women in administrative roles. According to the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, "Female . . . administrators in academe face a hostile work environment" (Blum, 1991, p. A1). Although some issues are changing for the better (see Chapter II), the article by Blum illustrates how the environment has changed very little in the past 20 years because of "persistent and widespread gender discrimination and sexual harassment," (Blum, 1991, p. A1). Furthermore, in the same article, President of Education Consultant Services, Marcia Boyle, claimed: "There is slightly more institutional lip service paid to women's issues now but little in the way of concrete action is being undertaken" (Blum, 1991, p. A20).

Earlier, Gordan and Ball (1977) identified issues which influence the status of women administrators in higher education. They suggested the following as a partial list of problems for women who are or who wish to be administrators:

1. socialization and stereotyping,
2. limited access to education and employment opportunities,
3. the lack of affirmative action by educational institutions, and
4. the dearth of female role models for women setting their career goals (p. 46). These issues, which influence the status of women in higher education administration, listed by Gordan and Ball in the 1970s remain valid into the 1990s.

Sandler and Hall (1986) support the contention by Gordan and Ball that the small number of women role models in higher education administration causes problems. They claim that "the chilly climate for women cannot be separated from the problem of numbers . . . women face many of the same problems any minority group faces" (p. 3). Clearly, the scarcity of women administrators in higher education is a major issue.

1. Number of Women Administrators in Higher Education

Although research on women administrators in higher education has increased since the 1970s (Moore, 1984), there is not a great amount of research. This lack is possibly caused by the marked scarcity of women administrators in higher education (Moore, 1987; Moore & Wollitzer, 1979). According to Patricia B. Kilpatrick, Vice-President and University Marshal at Case Western Reserve, "There aren't enough women in the higher professorial ranks or the upper administrative levels" (Blum, 1991, p. A20). Stecklein and Lorenz (1986) and Gillespie (1988) predict that equity in numbers will not be reached during this century.
The Carnegie Commission (1973) reported that women are practically nonexistent in academic administration. Moore (1987) updated the 1973 report by stating that the number did not increase significantly in the ensuing fifteen years.

Moore (1984) surveyed 4,000 administrators at approximately 1,600 institutions of higher education and reported on the number of women in administration. The largest numbers of women administrator respondents were the following: director of financial aid, 35%; head librarian, 34%; and registrar, 28%. In comparison, the top three positions held by men were president or chancellor (90%), chief business officer, and registrar (71.7%). Academic department chairs who responded were 13.8% women, and over half of these women were in nursing, home economics, arts and sciences, and continuing education. Finally, there were no female respondents who were deans of business, engineering, law, medicine, or physical education. Of the women respondents, 60% were employed in liberal arts colleges.

Other studies support Moore (1984). Reisser and Zurfluh (1987) found that, on the average, 1.1 woman senior administrators were employed per institution. Tinsley (1985) reported that, from 1975 to 1983, most women administrators in higher education were located in student affairs. Additionally, Allen (1984) reported that less than 5% of chief academic officers in higher education were
women. The Fact Book on Higher Education (1991) reported that there has been a large increase in the number of women gaining degrees, but not a parallel increase in the number of women gaining positions in higher education administration.

Writing in the British journal, Comparative Education, Moore claimed that women administrators in U.S. higher education "are found largely in support positions rather than executive positions" (1987, p. 31). She also claimed that women administrators are found in traditional female positions such as "counsellors, aides, and as administrators of teacher education, nursing, and social work programmes" (p. 31).

The research results concerning women college presidents are consistent in comparison to other positions: there are few women presidents, and the number of women college presidents has not changed significantly. According to Reisser and Zurfluh (1987), in 1970, 11% of U.S. college presidents were women and more than 90% of them were presidents of Catholic women’s colleges.

In support of Reisser and Zurfluh (1987), Mooney (1988) reported on a survey by the American Council on Education. The survey found that, of the 2,000 presidents surveyed, only 10% were women; and, of those, 40% were presidents of women’s colleges. Blum (1988) reported that most women who are presidents of colleges are at two-year public institutions and four-year private institutions.
The director of the Office of Women in Higher Education at the American Council on Education, Donna Shavlik, reported that 12 percent of college presidents are women, "a total of 360" (Blum, 1991, p. A20). As the comparison of these studies clearly shows, the number of woman college presidents has not grown significantly since 1970.

Watkins (1985) quoted Judy Touchton, Associate Director of the American Council on Education: "The numbers [of women college presidents] are growing so slowly. At the current rate, assuming no increase in the number of institutions, there will not be an equal number of women and men presidents in the U.S. colleges and universities until 2070" (p. A1).

2. Status of Pipelines for Women Administrators

One may argue that there are fewer women administrators in colleges and universities because there are fewer women than men who are qualified. The number of women in the pipelines for filling administrative positions suggests that there are more qualified women than men in the pipeline until the doctoral degree. At that point, men outnumber women.

Research shows that the pipelines and career paths normally used to reach administrative positions in higher education follow a pattern (Caplow & McGee, 1965; Cohen & March, 1986; Moore, 1984). Because men have held the
administrative positions, the career paths researched have been those taken by men. According to Moore and Sagaria,

After completing a terminal degree and gaining professional experience in a discipline, they achieve tenure and senior status in a department, then move on to be chairman, dean, or provost.

(1981, p. 21)

Because "this particular career ladder has salience both as a model and as perceived reality and because it is the model against which women's careers in academe can and are being measured" (Moore & Sagaria, 1980, p. 21), it is important to look at the pipelines and career paths through which women are expected to go to follow men administrators in higher education. A survey by the American Council on Education (Mooney, 1988) showed that women presidents came from similar pipelines as their male counterparts.

a. Undergraduate Degree Pipeline

At the beginning of the pipeline is the undergraduate student. According to Touchton and Davis (1991), women are financing their own education more often than men. Even when financial aid is granted, their award packages contain less. Once in, according to the Almanac of the Chronicle of Higher Education (August 28, 1991), at the undergraduate level there are more women graduates than men: 3,299,312 women compared to 3,163,754 men. The demographics of undergraduates entering colleges show that women began
entering colleges at a higher rate than men in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Bernard, 1981; Hodgkinson, 1983). Possibly this increase was created by the daughters, as re-entry students, and granddaughters, as traditional age students, of the women who explored the working world during World War II. For whatever reason, women now receive 56% of all associates degrees and 51% of all bachelor's degrees (Touchton & Davis, 1991).

Getting a higher education has been important to an increasing number of women since 1960, and this effort "has focused on breaking formal barriers to entry into higher education, and particularly into traditionally male professions, by challenging the discriminatory policies and practices of educational and training institutions" (Moore, 1987, p. 23). Moore (1987) continues by saying that the additional education has resulted in "a dramatic increase in the number of women entering medicine, law, business, and academic" as professions (p. 23). The impact of this increase is just beginning to be felt.

b. Re-entry Student Pipeline

Re-entry students comprise a specialized undergraduate population which could be a more life-experienced pool to advance through the administrative pipeline. Based on statistics which track this undergraduate population, re-entry women comprise the fastest growing group to enter college.
Bernard (1981) reported that, in the early 1970s, the number of women re-entering college between 30-34 years of age increased by 85 percent (Bernard, 1985). In addition, women returning to college "perform most creditably" (Bernard, 1981, p. 267). As this population continues through the academic ranks, it could have an impact on the number of eligible women available for administrative positions.

c. Masters Degree Pipeline

According to the Almanac of the Chronicle of Higher Education (August 28, 1991), during the 1988-1989 academic year, there were more women than men receiving masters degrees: 148,982 men and 160,780 women. Women now receive slightly more than 50% of all masters degrees (Touchton & Davis, 1991). This is an important statistic which affects the subsequent number of qualified women credentially eligible for administrative positions in higher education.

d. Doctoral Degree Pipeline

Even at the doctoral level, women are entering in greater numbers. In 1974, 5,273 doctorates were granted to women. Ten years later this number had doubled to more than 10,000 (Weis, 1985). Following that trend through the 1980s, the Almanac of the Chronicle of Higher Education (August 28, 1991) reported another rise in the number of women earning doctorates, but the number is still not equal
to the number earned by men. Women earn 35% of all doctoral degrees, "but are not yet fully represented throughout the range of possible fields" (Touchton & Davis, 1991, p. xi).

The *Almanac of the Chronicle of Higher Education* (August 28, 1991, No. 1) reported the total number of doctorates earned for the 1988-1989 time period: 22,705 men compared to 13,054 women (p. 28). There are clearly more men with doctorates, often a criterion for earning administrative positions in higher education. Although traditionally the number of men with doctorates exceeds the number of women, I question whether the difference can account for the fact that only 12 percent of college presidents are women.

Pearson, Shavlik, and Touchton (1989) observed that women are the majority of undergraduate students, earn over half the bachelor's and master's degrees each year, earn less than one-third of the professional degrees (27.5%), and earn slightly less than one-third (32%) of the doctoral degrees. Since the doctorate is generally a qualification for higher education administrative positions, the argument can be made that there are not as many qualified women as men. However, the question posited earlier about presidents also applies here: the disparity between the percentage of men and women administrators is explained by the statistics of men and women earning doctorates.
e. Teaching Faculty Pipeline

One of the pipelines for administrators in higher education is the teaching faculty position. In the century that women have served as teaching faculty, the percentage of women faculty has doubled from its starting position of 12 percent (Pearson, Shavlik, & Touchton, 1989). Sagaria (1985) cited Moore, Salimbene, Marlier, and Bragg (1983) who gave the percentage of administrators in higher education who come from faculty positions with no distinction between research and teaching faculty. According to the survey, 34% of the deans came from faculty positions. The percentages of the studies are not as high as many would like: women do currently comprise approximately one-fourth of the teaching faculty positions in the U.S.

Although women hold one fourth of the faculty positions, they are "clustered in small numbers in fields stereotyped as female: English, nursing, foreign languages, home economics, fine arts, and library science" (Etaugh, 1984). Further, according to Etaugh, the largest increase in women faculty was in two-year colleges.

Salary difference is a reason that some women stay out of teaching faculty positions in higher education. According to Etaugh (1984), there was a great difference in salary depending on gender: male faculty salaries were 17.9% greater than female faculty salaries, with the greatest discrepancy in business schools. The Chronicle of
Higher Education (July 15, 1989) reported that, in 1987, "women faculty earn[ed] 88 cents for every dollar earned by their male colleagues..." (p. A20).

f. Research Faculty Pipeline

The research faculty pipeline is another avenue to administrative positions in higher education. Moore (1987) put the research position pipeline for women into historical perspective:

When Elena Cornara Piscopia became the first woman ever to receive a university degree, the year was 1670 and universities had been in business for nearly 400 years. Her graduation is reported to have drawn such a crowd that they had to move the ceremony from the University of Padua to the cathedral. Now, over 300 years since that event, women are still lagging behind men in their access to university study, especially to advanced study, and to positions as faculty members and researchers. (p. 28)

Thus, in this pipeline there is restricted access for women. According to Moore (1987):

Some of the advantages men may enjoy disproportionately include admission to the best graduate programmes, receipt of better financial arrangements, selection as proteges of prominent and productive scholars, and introduction and participation in collegial networks where resources, advice, and inside information are dispensed. (p. 29)

One woman scientist who has been accepted in the male-dominated research faculty community is Ruth Hubbard, professor of Biology at Harvard University. She is also an observer of the research faculty pipeline.

In her essay, "Some Thoughts about the Masculinity of the Natural Sciences," which appears in Feminist Thought
and the Structure of Knowledge, Hubbard questioned the authoritarian and hierarchical nature of "the criteria and mechanisms of selection" (1988, p. 1) used in distinguishing fact from fiction. She cited the process used for accrediting "fact makers," research faculty:

Making science is such an enterprise. As scientists, we must follow certain rules of membership and go about our task of fact making in professionally sanctioned ways....If we follow proper procedure, we become accredited fact makers. In that case, our facts come to be accepted on faith and large numbers of people believe them even though they are in no position to say why what we put out are facts rather than fiction. (p. 2)

If Hubbard’s description of the enterprise of fact making is accurate, then what is the system used to determine who can be permitted to make facts, a major role of higher education? She argues that there is no such system and that fact makers are socialized to be gender biased:

They have a particular kind of education that includes college, graduate, and postgraduate training. That means that, in addition to whatever subject matter they learn, they have been socialized to think in particular ways and have familiarized themselves with a narrow slice of human history and culture that deals primarily with the experiences of western European and North American upper-class men during the past century or two. They also have learned to obey certain rules of individual and social behavior and to talk and think in ways that let them earn the academic degrees required of a scientist. (p. 2)

If one of the tickets to being allowed to be a fact maker is education, who is permitted to have an education? Hubbard argues that, "Until the last decade or so,
predominantly upper middle- and upper-class youngsters, most of them male and white" have had access to education (p. 2).

If there now is a slightly larger number of women students in the education pipeline for becoming fact makers, then what stops them from becoming fact makers? Hubbard continues,

In the ivory, that is, white and male, towers in which science gets made, people from working-class and lower-middle-class backgrounds are . . . the technicians, secretaries, clean-up personnel. Decisions about who gains the status of fact maker are made by professors, deans, and university presidents who call on scientists from other similar institutions to vouch-safe the quality of a particular candidate and to guarantee that he or she conforms to the standards prescribed by the university and the scientific profession. (p. 3)

Thus, Hubbard argues, the research faculty positions on campuses which are used by some to gain access to administrative positions, are available to people by class and by gender. In other words, class and gender discrimination is a built-in part of the system.

If a different-minded student does manage to wiggle through the educational pipeline, once she gets out, there is yet another blockade. Hubbard contends that decisions made by the government and private funding systematically sustain the hegemonic view because of peer review:

What that means is that like-minded people from similar personal and academic backgrounds get together to decide whether a particular fact-making proposal has enough merit to be financed. It is a club in which people mutually sit on each other's decision-making panels. The criteria for access are supposed to be objective and
meritocratic, but, in practice, orthodoxy and conformity count for a lot. Someone whose ideas or personality are out of line is less likely to succeed than "one of the boys" - and these days some of us girls are allowed to be one of the boys, particularly if we have learned the rules by which the game is played. (p. 3)

The key words and phrases used by Hubbard are interesting: "like-minded, similar personal" and "academic backgrounds," "club," "mutually sit on each other's decision-making panels," "orthodoxy and conformity count." The words alone conjure the inside of an exclusive club which is predominately gender-segregated. Hubbard then refers to a shift in "the club," the prestigious research faculty. The "boys" are allowing a few women in . . . but only if the women "play" the way the boys in the exclusive club want them to.

Hubbard's personal experiences support other researchers' contentions. Hers is a heartfelt account of one who has played the game according to the pre-determined rules and, having gained admittance to the club, refuses to reconstruct the glass ceiling for other women.

Hubbard summarizes gender bias in making knowledge:

Thus, science is made, by and large, by a self-perpetuating, self-reflexive group: by the chosen for the chosen. The assumption is that if the science is "good" it will somehow, in the long run, "serve the people." But no one, no group, is responsible for seeing that it does. Public accountability is not built into the system. (p. 3)

In deciding who does and who does not have access to making knowledge, Hubbard determined that, "An entire range of discriminatory practices is justified by the claim that
they follow from the limits that biology places on women’s capacity to work" (3). The few women whose research is funded are sometimes those who have learned to research and publish what that self-perpetuating system approves.

Hubbard’s essay makes it clear that the gatekeepers to research are male and that it is a nepotistic-type system. There are few women who gain access to administrative positions in higher education through the research faculty pipeline; and, according to Hubbard, these women would be women in gender only. These women would have to behave like the men in order to gain admittance and to stay.

B. Issues Which Influence the Status of Women Administrators in Higher Education

Although there are 6 million more women than men in the United States (Dolnick, 1991), women are simply outnumbered in higher education administration. As the research shows, the dominant culture in all aspects of higher administration is male.

Women, however, have recently begun to be in the majority in higher education. There are more women than men as undergraduates and graduates of master’s programs; and, the number of women with doctorates is slowly increasing. Therefore, the pipelines for administrative positions have recently begun to produce a more equitable balance of gender for selection to higher education administration.
1. Response of the Dominant Culture

The response of the dominant male culture in higher education administration to the demand for more women is to slowly allow more in. There are, however, numerous roadblocks to this invitation.

a. Fear of the Feminization of Administration

Shavlik and Touchton (1986) identify an important issue that keeps women from administrative positions: the fear of feminizing administrative positions on college campuses. According to these researchers, for those who fear having administrative posts seen as a women’s jobs, one woman in a top administrative position is enough. In a male-dominated job situation, one woman administrator becomes very visible, and the feeling that occurs is that other women administrators are not needed (Sandler & Hall, 1986; Gillespie, 1988).

In an argument against the fear of the feminization of administration at colleges and universities, Hyer (1985) reports that, on the average, colleges and universities employ only 1.1 women in dean and higher positions per institution (Hyer, 1985). Hyer found that the number of women in administrative positions at doctorate-granting institutions actually decreased from 1975 to 1985. However, because the total number of employees also decreased, the percentage of women administrators did
increase slightly and made it appear that there were more women.

b. Fear of Losing Rewards

As noted, gender inequality in higher education administration supports the white male-dominated system. The middle-class and upper-middle-class white male benefits from higher salaries, job opportunities, social status, professional recognition, and power. Bayes and Newton (1978) found that the males in power believe that the rewards they enjoy would not be possible for them if they had to share the rewards equally with women. In acknowledging the concern for the loss of rewards, the authors noted the "economic competition for precious resources" (p. 8) as a reason for inequity in management work settings.

c. Protection of Male Bastions: Prestigious Institutions

Another obstacle to more women in higher education administration is that the men in higher education administration seek to protect their territory. Bayes and Newton (1978) noted this reason for inequality of the genders when they wrote about the "monopolization of privilege by white males" (p. 8) on management levels. Gillespie (1988), Sandler and Hall (1986), and Rossi (1980) found that the older the institution of higher learning,
the more traditional its administrative staff; and the more traditional administrative staff is white male.

One example of an older, and traditional university is Yale University: "Yale epitomizes the male world of higher education," (Schwartz & Lever, 1973, p. 57). Of 43 women on the faculty of 839 in the early 1970s, only two had tenure (Schwartz & Lever, 1973). Twenty years later, the Yale faculty is still dominated by men. With faculty positions as the most common pipeline for administrative positions, Yale, a prestigious institution, is prohibiting women from entering administrative positions by way of the faculty pipeline. They simply hire few women for tenure track faculty positions.

Another example of an older and traditional university is the University of Maryland (Gillespie, 1988). In the late 1980s, there were two female department chairs, one of whom was the head of the Home Economics Department, traditionally a woman's position. According to one of the two female department chairs, the University of Maryland "has no women deans, vice presidents, provosts, or chancellors" (Gillespie, 1988, p. 237).

2. **Discrimination**

a. **Gender Discrimination**

Researchers have found that women in higher education are discriminated against on the basis of gender: they
secure and are appointed to jobs in the lower ranks and in non-tenure faculty appointments (Sandler & Hall, 1986; Moore, 1984). Women in higher education, according to Sandler and Hall (1986), are either head librarians, registrars, the directors of financial aid, heads of schools of nursing, or heads of home economics.

Other positions where women are found are in the caretaker roles in student affairs, affirmative action, or academic support roles such as Director of Admissions. Women in higher education in general are in traditional female jobs on the lowest rung of career ladders, and women administrators in higher education are no exception (Moore, 1987).

Shakeshaft wrote about women administrators in public school, and her findings are also true for women administrators in higher education. "There is overwhelming evidence in the research literature that women do not become school administrators because of sex discrimination that devalues women. The primary reason that women are not hired or promoted into administrative positions is solely the fact that they are female" (Shakeshaft, 1986, p. 502).

In *Women in Educational Administration* (1989), Shakeshaft wrote at length about women in public school administration not being hired or promoted because of gender: "...the major barrier to women has been a culture characterized by male dominance because all of the specific barriers can be traced back to a society that supports and
enforces a male-dominant system" (p. 79); and further, "...the cause of all barriers to women in school administration that have been identified in the social science literature can be traced to male hegemony" (p. 83). Shakeshaft clearly shows why there are barriers for women administrators in public schools. The same barriers exist for women administrators in higher education, and the barriers exist for the same reasons in higher education as they do in public schools.

Some people who have tracked the status of women administrators in higher education have identified the ways in which the work environment in higher education is different for women than for men. Patricia B. Kilpatrick, Vice-President and University Marshal at Case Western Reserve, was quoted by Blum (1991), "There are still pay issues and family issues to be addressed, and we are still working against a powerful old-boys network" (p. A20). Kilpatrick cited three issues which make the work environment in higher education different for women than for men.

b. Pay Issues

Addressing the pay issue raised by Kilpatrick, Touchton and Davis (1991) reported,

The return on a college education differs greatly for women and men. In 1987, the median salary for men with 4 years of high school ($25,394) was higher than the median salary earned by women with 4 years of college ($23,854). (p. 10)
Women administrators in higher education earn less than men administrators (Sandler & Hall, 1986; Stecklein & Lorenz, 1986; Gillespie, 1988). According to Touchton and Davis (1991), "Overall, in most major positions in administration, women have lower median salaries than men in the same position" (p. 106). Public colleges seem to be closing the gap while there remains a greater disparity in private colleges. For example, in 1987, for the presidency of a four-year public college, there was a 6% differential compared to a four-year private college, where there was a 16% differential. For a two-year public college, there was a 2% differential, compared to a 22% differential for a private college (Touchton & Davis, 1991, p. 106).

Faculty salary differences by gender favor men. However, there is only a four-point difference in the increase from 1976 to 1986. For women faculty, the average salary went from $15,000 to $27,576, an increase of 83%. For men faculty, the average salary went from $18,378 to $34,294, an increase of 87% (Touchton & Davis, 1991, p. 15). In private colleges and universities, the average salary for women ($31,174) was 74% of the average salary for men ($41,929), according to Touchton and Davis (1991, p. 15).

Another gain in salaries for women faculty can be seen in comparing 1976-77 to 1985-86. Earlier, combining all ranks, women faculty salaries averaged 80% of the men
faculty compared to 82% a decade later (Touchton & Davis, 1991). The gain is small, but there is a gain.

c. Subtle Discrimination

Sandler and Hall (1986) reported on a chilly climate, the subtle ways in which women are discriminated against in higher education. They reported that women are singled out, overlooked, and ignored simply because of such unchangeable characteristics as their gender. Specific examples of subtle discriminations were cited, such as ignoring women's contributions in meetings, interrupting women speakers, using exclusionary or sexist language, and referring to women professionals as "charming" or "pretty." The result of these "micro-inequities" is to "waste women's resources...undermine self-esteem, and damage professional morale" (Sandler & Hall, 1986, p. 3). The point of subtle barriers is made more emphatic in the words of the women faculty and administrators. Sandler and Hall (1986) cited several examples:

... one faculty member said she had recently been on a search committee where the two women candidates were treated "differently" from the four male candidates; the women were asked many factual questions about the university and were often interrupted during their responses. Male candidates, on the other hand, were allowed to ramble, to talk about non-academic issues (sports, cars, real estate), to digress. They were encouraged to ask - rather than answer - questions and were rarely, if ever, interrupted. Because women are more likely to be grilled, they are more likely to make mistakes, to become tense or worn down earlier in the day, and to be perceived as not being "collegial"... because there is minimal informal interaction. (A male,
by the way, was hired.) (Benokraitis & Feagin, *Modern Sexism*, p. 76)

As Sandler and Hall clearly show, micro-inequities, subtle ways in which women are disregarded or neglected based on gender, are issues which influence the status of women administrators in higher education. Though previously accepted as normal behavior, the subtle discrimination that occurs in the hiring and promotion of women in business and higher education is being recognized by women and acknowledged by researchers.

d. Sexual Harassment

A prominent problem for women on college campuses is sexual harassment. According to Dziech and Weiner (1984), sexual harassment is so common that it is often ignored. According to Graham (1978), "... the proportion of women graduate students who encounter professors whose interest in them transcends the academic is high" (p. 771).

While statistics on sexual harassment involving women administrators in higher education are hard to find, faculty women, a major pipeline for administrative women, have begun to speak out. One study at Harvard University (Hoffman, 1986) reported that 3% of tenured women faculty members had experienced sexual harassment. In comparison, 49% of non-tenured women faculty members reported having experienced sexual harassment. The study leaves unanswered the question of why the difference in the incidence of harassment reported by women in these two faculty
categories. There may be power issues which account for the discrepancy between tenured and non-tenured women faculty reporting sexual harassment. Another possible reason for the discrepancy may be the age difference between tenured and non-tenured women faculty. If there is an age difference between tenured and non-tenured women faculty, a third possible reason for the difference in reporting could be that older women are more tolerant of sexual harassment or are less able to name it than younger, non-tenured women.

Because of pay issues, subtle discrimination, and sexual harassment, a substantial majority of women in leadership roles in higher education consider resigning (Reisser, 1988). Many women reported that they have a high level of stress and burnout and that they are required to sacrifice family and professional growth for professional advancement.

3. Organizational Response

a. Institutionalized Discrimination

As noted, historically, education administration has been a male domain. "Most [schools] offer white males more options in an environment that is hospitable to their needs" (Shakeshaft, 1987, p. 500). Though this statement is made about public schools, it also applies to colleges and universities. Tradionally, universities were
established by men to educate men (Veysey, 1965), and this tradition has been slow to change. Women have only been allowed into coed institutions of higher learning since the turn of the century and have entered colleges in relatively large numbers only since the 1960s.

Colleges and universities reflect the values of society in what they teach, in the ways in which they are organized, and in their basic requirements of students. As products of this system, women in higher education have not overcome the discrimination in the way that courses and programs of study are scheduled, the competitive nature of exams, non-student-centered learning, time requirements for degree completion, hiring and promotion practices, and the importance of research over quality teaching. As Shavlik and Touchton (1988) observed,

> We have a long way to go before institutions show fundamental change in their encouragement, recognition, acceptance, and support of women. Women must still deal with the ways in which institutions discriminate against them both overtly and covertly. As long as this is true, women will have special needs and concerns. Perceptions about what women need will change only when institutional practices, not the women themselves, are viewed as the problem. (pp. 105-106)

b. Socialized Discrimination

Gender socialization is a barrier to women administrators. Bayes and Newton (1978) wrote that:

> Men and women are socialized in a culture which both explicitly and implicitly defines sex roles as total roles and which trains individuals in
these roles. A total role is one which defines a sense of self and a set of appropriate behavior, including the level and kind of authoritative-ness; it permeates all aspects of life, and takes precedence over other, more situation-specific, work or social roles if they are incompatible. Dominance and independence are linked with the masculine role, while submissiveness, passivity, and nurturance are linked with the feminine (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel 1970). These sex-linked role conceptions are learned through socialization, primarily within the nuclear family. (p. 8)

Academic careers are socially more difficult to enter for women than for men. Moore (1987) stated that "as the woman student matures and moves to making choices pertaining to an academic occupation, social and family pressures reportedly intensify" (p. 29). Moore goes on to say that this decision is usually occurring at the same time that decisions about marriage and family are also being presented.

In comparison, men, for whom the same decisions are being presented, commonly "expect that the wife will support the occupational decision of the man and that her interests will be subordinated to his" (Moore, 1987, p. 29). They expect that women cannot be counted on professionally because their first duty is to their family. Expectation is often the decision-maker of organizations such as higher education institutions.

Moore's (1984) research supported the expectation that "there were clear differences in marital status by sex. Twice as many male as female administrators were married and living with their spouses" (p. 9). In her "Leaders in
Transition" study, "approximately 90% of the male respondents were married, more than half to homemakers" (Moore, 1984, p. 12). This study clearly indicates that women are not supported when making decisions about their careers. For many women, it has been a decision whether to marry or whether to have a career in higher education administration.

The existence and perpetuation of cultural stereotypes is a major barrier to women’s advancement to senior-level, decision-making positions in organizations such as higher education. Citing Roby (1971), Astin and Bayer (1972) pointed out that sex discrimination does not begin when women enter the higher education system. Rather, discrimination is socialized from the beginning of life and extends into higher education:

Sex discrimination in academe does not begin when a woman accepts an appointment at a college or university. Rather, its roots reach far back to the cumulative effects of earlier sex differentiation processes and discrimination: early childhood socialization for "appropriate" sex role, different treatment and expectations accorded to boys and girls by their parents, teachers, and peers throughout adolescence and early adulthood, differential opportunities for access and admission to undergraduate and graduate school, and so forth. (p. 101)

Kanter’s (1977a) research in the administration of corporations spoke to discrimination against women as managers:

Women have been assumed not to have the dedication of men to their work. . . . One woman asked her manager for a promotion, to which he replied, ‘You’re probably going to get pregnant.’ She pointed out to him that he told her that
eight years ago, and she hadn't. . . . One working mother who had heard that "married women are absent more," had to prove that she had taken only one day off in eleven years . . . (p. 67)

Kanter's research showed that "people with discrepant social characteristics" (p. 68), those who cannot be trusted to have total dedication to the organization, are left out of the management of corporations. Stereotypes against women, the result of socialized discrimination, affect decisions of male managers when hiring and promoting.

According to Kanter, when a woman administrator in higher education is the only woman in a group of men administrators, the men often respond to her in stereotypical ways, placing the women in roles such as mother, sister, sex object, or iron maiden, instead of colleague, friend, collaborator. Kanter (1977a) stated that these conservative notions keep women from developing their potential.

It might be interesting to research the types of families in which men who categorize women in this way grew up. Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986) speculate that, if these men grew up in families where "the men were supposed to be the ones with the voice of the family . . . [where the] man feels he is superior to women," (p. 165), one would expect the male gatekeepers to apply the family-of-origin relationship pattern to women in their work "family." Kanter's (1977) charge that men place women business associates into roles which are based on the
roles in which they placed women as they grew up (mother, sister, sex object, iron maid) could also be used.

Other researchers support Kanter's research on dominant and subordinate discriminatory behavior in organizations. Miller (1986) reported that dominant groups [men] determine acceptable roles for subordinate groups [women], and that subordinates are usually unable to perform in the acceptable roles. Astin and Bayer (1972) reported that

... women generally hold lower ranks and make lower salaries, however comparable their backgrounds, work activities, achievements, and institutional work settings to those of their male colleagues. Considering the many variables in these analyses, one can only conclude that sex discrimination is rampant in academe. (p. 115)

One role which is not accepted for the subordinate population in administration in higher education by the dominant population is the leadership role. Leadership is seen as masculine, and women are kept from leadership positions by a glass ceiling which is a barrier "to women as a group who are kept from advancing higher because they are women" (Morrison, White, & Van Velsor, 1987, p. 13).

c. Influence of Structure on Self Concept

Differences in the socialization of men and women is an issue that influences women administrators in higher education. A contrasting theory has been studied by Kanter (1981). She proposes that "what we perceive as 'sex difference' in work behavior may be more a result of
structural factors in an organization than differences in male and female socialization" (p. 75). The total gender issue that influences administrators, according to Kanter, may be a combination of gender socialization and the impact of structure of the organization as it forces each man and woman into roles and creates self-concept.

Kanter writes:

Whenever there is a large administrative apparatus that is hierarchically organized, the potential exists for individuals' behavior to be shaped by their positions within that organization. This is as true for the university or television network as it is for the government bureaucracy or the private corporation. Each position within the organization shapes the person by confronting him or her with characteristic dilemmas (choices or decisions about appropriate behavior) and constricting the range of possible responses. (Kanter, 1981, in Forisha & Goldman, pp. 75-76)

There are, based on Kanter's work, three aspects of organizational structure which shape the lives of men and women who are part of them. These are:

1. opportunity - the "path to progress," however it may be defined;
2. power - the ability to mobilize resources;
3. numerical distribution - the relative number of people of one kind in an organization made up predominantly of people of a different kind.

Independently and jointly, these facets of organizational arrangement affect the behavior and the feelings of men and women. (p. 76)

Concerning opportunity, Kanter proposed that, whether people are set in high or low tracks, they develop a belief system that propels them along that track. This applies to both men and women. But because women are initially placed
in the lower tracks, women usually stay in the lower tracks of an organization and create a belief system that keeps them there.

Concerning power, Kanter writes that, "Power begets power" and, likewise, those without power beget powerlessness. According to Kanter, "what looks like sex differences may really be power differences. Women, when they do achieve managerial or leadership positions, are clustered in the low-power situations. It should not be surprising if they adopt the behavior of the powerless" (pp. 78-79).

Concerning numerical distribution, Kanter found that, "Performance pressures on people in token positions generate a set of attitudes and behaviors that appear sex-linked" (p. 80). However, according to Kanter, these attitudes and behaviors would be true of anyone in the situation. "Tokens" are usually stereotyped quickly, and the pressure of this stereotyping "often forces tokens into playing limited and caricatured roles...[a situation that is] useful for dominant group members" (pp. 80-81). Like the other issues, stereotypes of tokens can be self-perpetuating.

d. Visibility and Access

Moore (1987, Access and Opportunity) writes of two barriers to access for women from the beginning of an academic career. The barriers are of the "lack of a
personal, one-to-one relationship with a senior professional [and this is] . . . compounded by the fact that most senior academics in most fields are male" (p. 29). She further stated that "professionally centered, but cross-sex relationships" (p. 30) are difficult.

Another barrier, according to Taylor and Shavlik (1977), is that women do not have access to those in the selection process. Taylor and Shavlik (1977) also support Moore:

women having requisite professional credentials, academic and administrative experience, and personal characteristics necessary for high-level positions in higher education do exist - but they face barriers of visibility, stereotyping, and discrimination unknown to male colleagues. (p. 95)

Taylor and Shavlik (1977) supported the idea of lack of visibility and access. They confronted the myth that women are not administrators because they were not qualified nor interested:

The inequitable representation of women in higher education administration is no longer in doubt. The question is: Why are there so few women administrators? One commonly held notion is that few women are prepared for and interested in such positions, particularly at the highest administrative levels. Experience in the Office of Women in Higher Education at the American Council on Education, however, suggests the opposite view: Many women in higher education are qualified and ready to move into more influential positions but have not done so because they lack visibility and access to those persons most involved in the selection process. (p. 91)

One reason that women are not visible and do not have access to decision makers in higher education is that
administrators are selected through informal networks of men (Taylor & Shavlik, 1977):

It is widely recognized that most jobs in higher education are filled by means of informal networks of faculty, administrators, or other educational leaders who, by initiation or response, recommend promising candidates for positions. Because educational institutions are largely male-dominated, so are the networks that spring from them. Even those persons who earnestly seek to advance women find themselves knowing few women to suggest for candidacy. (p. 91)

As well as not being part of the decision-making networks, women do not have access to decision-making situations. Taylor and Shavlik (1977) quoted Martha Peterson, President of Beloit College and a speaker at a 1976 meeting of women college presidents at Wingspread in Wisconsin. Peterson was quoted as saying:

It is particularly important for women college presidents to recognize that we often are not present where vital decisions are made - the squash court, the luncheon club, etc. We need to be very aware of where the power base in our community is . . . (Taylor & Shavlik, 1977, p. 95)

C. Issues That Are Changing

I have cited numerous barriers to women who want to be administrators in higher education. There are, however, several issues in higher education and in our society as a whole, which are changing to support equality for women administrators.
1. **Legislation**

Legislation to advance the cause of equality of women in higher education was passed in the 1960s and 1970s. Some contend that this legislation has not been completely put into practice; and that the hiring and promotion of women in higher education has not changed appreciably (Gillespie, 1988; Jones, 1988; Shavlik & Touchton, 1988). Gordan and Ball (1977) recognize the advances made in legislation and address the next issue of rights: "Although considerable progress has been made in changing laws, women have not obtained all their legal rights," (p. 47).

Change to include women has come in that the legal means to combat discrimination is in place. The National Association for Women in Education (1991), Shavlik and Touchton (1988), and Gordan and Ball (1977) listed numerous laws, regulations, and executive orders which have been enacted since 1964 (p. 99). Among the laws referred to are the following:

- **Executive Order 11245** (as amended by Executive Order 11375), mandating the use of affirmative action;

- **Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964**; as amended, prohibiting discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin;

- **Title IX of the Elementary/Secondary Education Act of 1972**, the first prohibiting discrimination against students on the basis of sex, and also including some aspects of employment;

- **Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964** (minority women included in 1964), prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin;
Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of handicap;

Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age;

The Equal Pay Act of 1963, as amended, prohibiting differential pay rates for women and men doing the same work; and

Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978, amending Title VII and providing that pregnant women will be treated the same for all employment-related purposes as other persons not so affected but similar in their ability or inability to work. (Touchton & Davis 1991, p. 3)

Civil Rights Act of 1991, allows compensatory and punitive damages under the Title VII of 1964 Civil Rights Act and also "covers disabled workers and employees of local, state, and federal governmental entities." ("About Women on Campus," V. 1, #2, Spring 1992, p. 1)

Collectively, the effect of these acts has been,

to open access to women students, faculty, and administrators, to assess the climate for all women, to undertake studies to remedy inequities, and to examine other impediments to the full and equitable participation of women in the academy. (Shavlik & Touchton, 1988, p. 100)

The legislation has also affected the process and paperwork for accepting women as leaders in higher education. More specifically,

The results have included more open searches, elimination of quotas on admissions, establishment of special recruiting programs for disciplines not usually chosen by women, salary equity studies and remedies, affirmative action procedures, more resources for women’s programs, especially athletics and recognition of special problems, such as sexual harassment. (Shavlik & Touchton, 1988, p. 100)

Shavlik and Touchton (1988) caution that, although the legislation does create a more inclusive climate, it does not change everything for women:
All these changes do not necessarily affect the promotion of women leaders directly. . . . [nor] fundamentally change the prevailing perception -- that women who wished to be leaders needed to be EXTREMELY WELL QUALIFIED, have proven records of accomplishment, and be overprepared for their positions. (1988, pp. 100-101)

Furthermore, Shavlik and Touchton warned:

. . . persons seeking leaders often cling to old stereotypes of leaders, demanding that women behave just like their male counterparts rather than enhancing their roles with the new and varied talents and fresh perspectives they might bring. (p. 101)

Supporting the status quo, the judicial system has been reluctant to address academic discrimination which has left it up to the women who have not been hired to bring charges, an expensive and time-consuming process (Gray, 1985). Some researchers, such as Hodgkinson (1983), believe that colleges must and will create parity out of self-interest.

Based on the increased number of women in the pipelines, we are in the process of a shift to include more women in higher education administration. Twenty years of legislation has brought about some change; but, for further change to occur, there must be enforcement of the relatively new legislation and change in the attitudes which have created the current situation.

a. Leadership Development Programs

A significant impact on women administrators in higher education has been made by leadership development programs (Shavlik & Touchton, 1988). Some new programs were begun
in the early 1970s to increase the number of qualified women leaders and develop their leadership skills.

Among the more recently established programs which have encouraged women administrators are the Institute for Administrative Advancement at the University of Michigan; the Higher Education Resource Service, which began in New England and is now nationwide; National Institute for Leadership Development, formerly the Leaders for the '80s Project; and the American Council on Educational National Identification Program (Shavlik & Touchton, 1988).

There are also previously established programs for men which have begun to include and to increase the number of women. Among the previously established programs are the American Council on Education Fellows Program. Originally established to mentor men, it began to include women in the 1970s. The Institute for Educational Management, which included women from the beginning, has increased the number of women participants (Shavlik & Touchton, 1988).

In addition to programs, there are organizations whose goal is to support women in higher education. The Office of Women in Higher Education of the American Council on Education was established in 1973 "with a mandate to increase the number of women in higher education administration, especially at the presidential level" (Touchton & Davis, 1991, p. xi).
b. Position Changes and Mobility

Sagaria (1988) researched another argument for why there are few women administrators in higher education. The argument is that, because women are unwilling to move, they cannot properly follow an administrative career.

Sagaria addressed the mobility argument when she researched position changes as the primary means for mobility of women administrators in higher education. According to Sagaria (1988), "Since the beginning of the 1970s, position changes have become the principal means for advancing women into leadership positions as well as for increasing their numbers in administrative positions" (p. 305). The study investigated how position changes for both women and men within an institution and within institutions affected professional mobility.

Sagaria (1988) reported that, in contrast to expectations, women administrators in colleges and universities are willing to and expect to move. Citing Moore (1983), Sagaria (1988) reported that "43.7 percent of the women administrators are married, whereas 87.8 percent of the men administrators are married. Therefore, marriage is not a limit on mobility for the majority of women administrators." Nevertheless, Sagaria found that "men are selected for administrative positions more often than women . . . [and] more women than men seek administrative position changes" (p. 307). Her conclusion was that "organizational hiring and promotion practices more so than
personal aspirations or decisions of candidates influence the structuring of careers by gender" (p. 307).

c. Working for a Woman Boss

One issue which has kept women from being administrators in higher education in the past is the belief that neither women nor men will work effectively for a woman boss (Gordan & Ball, 1977; Colwell, 1982). Follow-up research refutes this argument (Fernandez, 1981) and observes that attitudes have not been accurately reflected.

Fernandez wrote that "Many negative myths about women as bosses have been adopted by society because of sexist attitudes imposed by the white-male-dominated institutions" (p. 167). His study showed that, "female bosses are usually evaluated the same as male bosses but that they are rated better than male bosses in a number of critical areas" (p. 167).

One area in which women bosses were given higher ratings was the ability to supervise various groups. Supervising white men, 82% of the women bosses were given good to excellent ratings by their subordinates, compared to 69% for the male bosses. Supervising females, 78% of the women bosses were given good to excellent ratings by their subordinates compared to 59% for the male bosses.

A second area in which women bosses were given higher ratings than their male counterparts was career development:
Regardless of the age or race of the bosses, managers at every level, of every race, and of both sexes are more likely to give positive assessments in the areas of career development and performance evaluation to female bosses than to male bosses. (Fernandez, 1981, pp. 167-168)

In this study, 74% of male managers with female bosses compared to 59% of male managers with male bosses felt their bosses were supportive of their career development.

Regarding usefulness of performance appraisals, both men and women managers gave women bosses slightly higher ratings than male bosses. The subordinates of both genders felt that female bosses are "more specific, useful, and clear as to what improvements are needed and how they might be effected" (Fernandez, p. 168). Fernandez concluded that, "if sexist attitudes can be excluded from corporate thought, female managers will be much preferred to male managers" (p. 168).

2. Signs of Progress

With all the issues and roadblocks that have been holding women out of administrative positions in higher education, there are signs of progress:

1. more women than men are earning associate degrees;
2. more women than men are earning undergraduate degrees;
3. more women than men are earning masters degrees.
In addition, there is:

1. an increase in the number of women earning doctoral degrees;
2. an increase in the number of women teaching faculty;
3. an increase in the number of women research faculty;
4. an increase in the number of women administrators at all levels of higher education; and
5. an increase in the number of women college presidents.

Touchton and Davis (1991) cite further signs of progress:

1. an increase in the number of women as state higher education officers (10% in 1988);
2. an increase in the number of women heading higher education consortia (20% in 1988); and
3. an increase in the number of women in executive positions in higher education associations.

Women are an important resource to colleges and universities, and higher education is an important resource to women. Discriminatory practices are depriving women from taking full advantage of and fully contributing to colleges and universities. Intelligence is a characteristic of both genders, and higher education is using less than half of the available intelligence
resources when white, middle- and upper middle-class men dominate campuses.

Unfortunately, as Schuster and Van Dyne (1985) point out, at the very time that women are wanting to transform institutional structures to integrate the insights of feminist scholarship and pedagogy, the climate for progressive change is questionable. "Budget cuts, retrenchment, a steady-state faculty, shrinking pools of applicants, the changing expectations of students...aging faculties...and rapid disciplinary changes" (p. 90) have created an atmosphere of structural provincialism and, of course, the recession that began in the late '80s has further undermined efforts at change by providing economic excuses. And reduced budgets continue to dominate higher education in the 1990's.

Women who are not promoted, who are denied tenure, given the least interesting assignments, and discouraged from pursuing research soon look elsewhere for career opportunities. Burn-out and stress waste their energies as women deal with the discriminatory practices of their male colleagues.

Women represent a large and growing segment of the labor market. Women administrators provide diversity and have different perspectives based on different life experiences. They ask different questions which have not been asked by the traditional male administrators. Higher
education would be well served to include more women in the decision-making boardrooms for these reasons.

The new research about women administrators indicates that the integration of the female administrative perspective with the male administrative perspective creates a healthier environment. Shakeshaft (1986) stated:

*Studies indicate that - when female values and behaviors are allowed to dominate in schools - teachers, administrators, and students benefit. In schools and districts with female administrators, research tells us that achievement in reading and math is higher, that there is less violence, and that student and staff morale are higher. Studies of men and women administrators have found differences in the ways they approach the job and in the climate they create.* (Shakeshaft, 1986, p. 503)

Although Shakeshaft was referring to public schools, which have a greater number of women administrators than higher education, the same conclusions may reasonably be drawn in reference to the reality of higher education administration.

Touchton and Davis (1991) point out that women's studies have "formed the intellectual and conceptual basis for much change" (p. xii), and identify the gains made in these programs. There are approximately 30,000 courses offered in women's studies, with 54 schools granting undergraduate degrees and six granting master's degrees.

More than 100 colleges are in the process of curriculum reforms that "focus essentially on how we can reshape the way we think about knowledge" (p. xii). This is evidence that higher education is changing to include
women's history and to include the ways in which women think.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the qualitative research process that I used while looking at women administrators in higher education. The stories told by the participants and the methods and research process I used are representative of ethnographic studies and were guided by the work of Weissler (1989) and Heath (1983).

To begin, I discuss my relationship to the topic of women administrators in higher education, the research and interview questions selected for the interview, the research setting of higher education, the participants who were chosen, and the issues of which I am aware which influenced data analysis. My relationship to the study is an important issue in qualitative research because the researcher is acknowledged as the agent who determines what information constitutes data, what interpretations are made, and what hypothetical frameworks are constructed. In addition I will address the process of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) that I used.

This study combined the qualitative, open-ended, in-depth interview method with the coding protocol originally developed by BCGT. The method is agreeable with Patton (1990) because the "open-ended responses permit one to understand the world as seen by the respondents" (p. 28).
The approach is also supported by sociologist John Lofland (1971): "In order to capture participants 'in their own terms' one must learn THEIR categories for rendering explicable and coherent the flux of raw reality. That, indeed, is the first principle of qualitative analysis" (p. 7).

The open-ended, in-depth interview method enabled the women administrators to reveal their points of view without this researcher determining the points of view ahead of time through "prior selection of questionnaire categories" (Patton, p. 28). The interview method provided the opportunity for the women interviewees to uncover truths in their own words. Patton (1990) further acknowledges that the interviewees' own words reveal "...depth of emotion, the ways they have organized their world, their thoughts about what is happening, their experiences, and their basic perceptions" (p. 24).

A. Review of Initial Questionnaire and Interview Questions

The initial questionnaire and the interview questions were reviewed by several individuals. Deanna Nekove, a member of the Research Consulting Services of the School of Education, UMass-Amherst, offered suggestions about coding for confidentiality, reviewed the initial questionnaire and interview questions, and recommended timeline guidelines.

The second reviewer of the instruments was Dr. Gretchen Rossman, professor of qualitative research methods
at the School of Education, UMass-Amherst. Her recommendations were discussed with the dissertation committee and incorporated in appropriate situations.

The third and fourth reviewers of the initial questionnaire and interview questions were peer reviewers Pat Meny and Sally Ember, graduate students at UMass Amherst. The former, with professional experience in organizational behavior, has conducted major research projects; and the latter has published academic articles using qualitative research methods.

1. Initial Questionnaire

Following an introductory letter for potential participants (see Appendix E), I eventually made two mailings of the initial questionnaire with an informed consent form (see Appendices F and G). Each mailing went to twenty possible participants. (For selection criterion, see "Selection of Subjects."

The return rate of the first mailing of the initial questionnaire was 60%. Of the 20 sent out, there were 12 responses. A month and a half after the deadline, one additional response was received. There were no responses from 7 who were sent the initial questionnaire. Of the 13 responses there were 3 who stated that they did not have the time to continue in the study. Of the 10 who agreed to continue, 2 had returned questionnaires that were unscorable. Of the 8 remaining, there were 2 who scored in
the range indicating that they were not constructed, connected, or subjective knowers. Of the 6 remaining, there were 2 who scored clearly as constructed, connected, and subjective knowers. While 60+% is an acceptable return, I wanted a larger sample than 4 from which to choose the 2 remaining interviews.

In addition to wanting a larger pool from which to select women to be interviewed, I decided to gather more information about the initial questionnaire as a tool. In short, I wanted to send the initial questionnaire to other women administrators.

To enlarge the pool, I explored several options to secure additional women administrators within a 2 1/2 hour driving distance from the Amherst area. One option I considered was to extend the travel distance and include other members of NAWE and the women listed in the Black Issues in Higher Education CEO list. For financial and time considerations, I decided against this option.

Second, I looked into re-issuing the initial questionnaires to the original women administrators who had not responded. I decided against this option for a couple of reasons. First, a week after the deadline for the initial questionnaire, I had called each women who had not responded. This eventually resulted in only one response. Second, two of the original seven recipients who did not respond had resigned their positions after the initial questionnaire was mailed.
I chose a third option of determining to whom to mail the second set of 20 initial questionnaires. The second group of women administrators was chosen from telephone directories of area colleges and from recommendations from colleagues. I sent 20 more initial questionnaires to women administrators in the Northeast within a 2 1/2 hour driving distance of Amherst, MA.

2. **Pre-Pilot Studies**

Before conducting formal pilot studies, I informally asked two women administrators in higher education the questions that Haring-Hidore, et al. had used. Based on their responses, I reworded and rearranged some questions, deleted others, and added some of my own.

In addition to the two informal dress-rehearsals, I discussed the questions with Gary Bernhard, a dissertation committee member, on several occasions. The results of those discussions prompted further revisions of and additions to the questions and alteration of their order.

Therefore, this was the path I took to developing the pilot study:

1. I began with BCGT’s interview questions;
2. I quickly moved to Haring-Hidore’s interview questions, which were very similar to BCGT’s;
3. Based on Haring-Hidore’s, et. al’s, concerns around their interviewees’ inability to be reflective, I looked at different ways to get the
The last item, concerning participant reflection, indicated my desire to encourage interviewees in my study to respond as much as possible from their own context rather than mine. To respond to the criticism by Haring-Hidore that the participants needed to learn to be more reflective, I reconfigured the questions in the form of asking the interviewees to tell personal stories about situations instead of answering direct questions.

3. **Pilot Study**

After the pre-pilot study informal interviews, two pilot study interviews were conducted before the formal interviews. The audiotapes of the pilot study interviews were reviewed both by the members of the dissertation committee and by this interviewer. The purposes of the pilot study interviews were to hear the flow of the interview questions, to determine the level at which the interviewees engaged in the questions, to calibrate the timing, and to refine the interview questions.

There were several areas of interest that came from the pilot studies. What particularly stood out were the observations of responses to interview questions which solicited the telling of stories. The pilot interviews also enabled this interviewer to have access to ideas and procedures that only a "dress rehearsal" could provide.
Also, from the pilot study interviews I found new information about the interview questions. The first issue concerned the "warm-up section" of the interview questions. The pilot study interviewees were visibly more comfortable with the questions in the second half of the interview which asked for their response to anectodal comments made by others about specific ways of knowing. This reaction reenforced my commitment to word my questions in ways to encourage participants to tell their own stories.

A second change I made in the interviews based on the pilot study involved the developmental perspective. Question 9 of the pilot study asked the interviewees to respond to written questions about their ways of knowing during each decade of their lives. Instead of giving these written questions to the interviewee during the interview, I listed their development/shifts based on their interview.

A third change brought about by the pilot study involved tightening the questions. I began by wanting to ask each interviewee similar questions in order to get responses that could be compared. However, based on the interviewees' responses, different questions fell naturally at different times in the interview, and the same question needed to be asked using different words based on the context that each interviewee constructed. So, I gave up the personal desire to have responses to identical questions which could be cleanly contrasted.
A fourth change involved a critical look at how the questions are asked. All three people I worked informally with had common responses:

a. they seemed more comfortable with responding to statements rather than to questions; and 

b. they asked for anchors and contexts for the questions instead of being asked to respond to abstract questions.

A fifth change in the interview structure which was provided by the pilot study involved the initial questionnaire. The pilot study interviewees articulated what the pre-pilot study participants had said: the questionnaire was not written in their language. Statements were made such as, "The choices did not compute"; "The choices forced [me] to claim things that [I] was uncomfortable with"; "I could not 'settle in' with the questions"; the questions were "too far away from me and who I am."

The forced choiced inventory format of the initial quesitionnaire did have consequences. One interviewee followed her comments about the initial questionnaire with the statement that "It was just like the Myers-Briggs. I struggled with the Myers-Briggs."

I changed my introductory remarks to include a statement that "Some of these statements may not feel they are right for you. Just remember that this is an artificial construct and do the best you can with the
question or statement." This seemed to be helpful to the women in the pilot study.

Among the surprises from the pilot study were the following:

1. In the first pilot study interview, I was surprised with the knowledge that the interviewee had about the material I was using. She was familiar with Gilligan and BCGT's work and used some of the vocabulary they do. One example of this was that she referred to using her own "voice."

2. The interview questions quickly got the interviewee to talk about her major "shifts" of cognitive development. The interviewee's shift involved moving from mostly logical, linear, objective, scientific-method ways of thinking to also including relational, inclusive, contextual ways.

3. The interviewee laughed early on. This was an indication to me not of her nervousness, but rather of her feeling relaxed.

4. In the second interview, after the interview questions had been asked, the interviewee volunteered that she had felt intimidated by the questions.

5. After the interview questions had been asked, the second interviewee volunteered feedback about the
interview style. She stated that she had felt "affirmed and supported" by the interviewer.

6. The second interviewee said that she had been made to "feel safe" by the interviewer's manner. She said that she "never felt I didn't give right answers or [was] not on track. That part was very positive."

4. Selection of Subjects

A total of forty introductory letters and questionnaires were mailed to women administrators in higher education. Initially, twenty letters and questionnaires were mailed with the pool of participants coming from members listed in the 1993 National Association of Women in Education (NAWE).

Some NAWE participants were contacted by using the "snow-balling" technique (Taylor and Bogdan, 1984). This technique utilizes mutually known professional colleagues through networking in professional organizations to identify potential interviewees. Having a mutual professional acquaintance can both create interest in participants for taking part in the research study and put the interviewee at ease through the initial common connection.

Based on the response to the initial questionnaire, two women administrators were selected for interview based on their self-identification as constructed knowers.
Although the return rate of the first mailing was acceptable at 66%, I wanted a greater pool from which to select those to be interviewed.

After discussion with committee members, I mailed a second set of twenty questionnaires to women administrators using the same selection criteria, except that these women did not have to be listed in the previously cited publications. Based on the response to the initial questionnaire returned from the second mailing, I selected three additional potential participants.

The selected respondents were then contacted by telephone to follow-up on their written desire to participate and to set an appropriate date and time for the two-hour interview. Also, the telephone contact gave them an opportunity to ask any initial questions about the study.

The constructed knowers chosen were in their mid-thirties to early fifties. Each had at least three years' supervisory experience in the administration of higher education. In that amount of time, these women administrators had had the opportunity to experience numerous supervisory issues.

The interviewees represented a range of backgrounds, ages, and positions. Factors such as race, size, sexual orientation, and ethnic background were not considered in the selection process. Some of these factors emerged as
significant during the course of the interviews, however, and were considered in the analysis of the data.

5. Data Collection and Recording: The Interview

The interviews lasted for approximately two hours and were audio tape recorded. The questions (Appendix H) were open-ended, in order to encourage interviewees to tell their own stories. They focused on concerns and issues about how women make meaning. In accordance with Taylor and Bogdan's theories of qualitative research (1984), the interviewees were asked to tell about important experiences that helped them make meaning, experiences that are important to their cognitive and moral development, experiences that indicate how they communicate, and experiences that show how they are leaders.

This method of open-ended, in-depth interviewing also agrees with Bogdan and Biklen's (1982) perspective on qualitative research in which outcomes and products are not as important as process and meaning. The objective is to reveal "how people negotiate meaning...and how through interaction the individual constructs meaning" (p. 28, 33). Psatas (1973) states that the in-depth interview has the potential to expose a rich understanding of "what [the interviewees] are experiencing, how they interpret their experiences, and how they themselves structure the social world in which they live" (p. 13).
Confidentiality in the study was most important. The names of potential interviewees were kept confidential, using numbers and coded first names.

The stories the interviewees told in open-ended interviews were disclosing and enriching in contrast to responses to objective, specific questions. This form of qualitative inquiry depended on the researcher’s ability to listen and observe in a nonjudgmental way and to create a trusting space for telling revealing stories (Taylor and Bogdan, 1984).

The primary focus of this study was on internal processes — feelings, knowings, thoughts, strategies, and meaning-making — and how they influenced external expression in communication, decision-making, and leadership. The in-depth interview format provided participants with the opportunity to view their worlds from their own perspectives, to use their own words, to name their emotions, and to make meaning of the process.

Patton (1990) as well as Bogdan and Biklin (1982) and Geertz (1973) recommend that the phenomenological approach be used to explore the internal process. Phenomenological research emphasizes the meaning and social context of human behavior based on subjective experience. This approach, according to Geertz, will support this researcher’s "attempt to understand the meaning of events and interactions to ordinary people in particular situations...
to attempt to gain entry into the conceptual world of their subjects" (p. 31, Bogdan and Biklen, 1982).

The guided in-depth interviews provided the freedom for the interviewee to select what was talked about within the framework of the interview questions. The questions were used to complement the interviewee's conversation, to clarify her comments, and to explore the internal processes of meaning-making.

The interviews were conducted in a location selected by each interviewee. Any disadvantages of this arrangement of variable environments for this researcher were counteracted by advantages for the interviewee. The site selected by the interviewee meant familiar surroundings, convenience, and less travel for the interviewee. The familiar surroundings seemed to encourage the participant to be more at ease during the interview and therefore more willing to disclose.

I began each interview by stating the purpose and procedures of the study. As well, I answered questions about myself as the researcher and about the interview process. I emphasized the confidentiality and anonymity with which each interview was conducted, explaining that each interviewee would be assigned a code name.

I had the first, rough draft transcription of the tape recording of each interview completed by a bonded court reporter. I then listened to the tape, compared it to the disk copy of the completed transcription for accuracy, and
made corrections. The second and third time through the audio tape, I listened for sentence and paragraph breaks and arranged the hard copy to reflect what I heard.

After the interview was transcribed, each participant was given a copy of the transcription of her interview. Additional comments were then accepted. These comments were accepted in writing or in person, depending on the convenience of the interviewee.

The participants in this study were volunteers. There was no financial reimbursement for their involvement. However, the interviewees were invited to request information from this project that they might find useful.

There were two parts of analyzing the interviews. The strict qualitative research was the first: I looked to see if there were patterns or themes in each of the participant's interviews. Then, I compared each of the interviews to determine themes common to all.

The process I used to analyze the raw data, the interviews, was a combination of linear/logical and circumvolution/procrastination. During the proposal for the study, I had mapped out the outline of the presentation of the findings and stuck to the basic outline.

Getting to the basic outline, I went on a convoluted path. While reviewing the interviews, I procrastinated for months by reorganizing the beginning chapters of the dissertation, fretting over wishing I had asked each participant for follow-up to more statements, and wanting
more verifying information. I finally ran out of justifications for delaying and began to look at patterns and themes.

6. Patterns and Themes

Looking for patterns and themes happened by reading and re-reading each interview many times. Even though I had worked with the interview material in the transcription process, each time I read the interviews, I found new information.

Patterns and themes first emerged as I initially titled paragraphs in the interviews. This process produced the greatest insights for me. I compared the titles of the paragraphs within each interview and collapsed related titles several times. I then pulled quotes that documented each concept. Later, I compared the titles from the interviews to discover what participants had in common.

7. Ways of Knowing

Using BCGT’s protocol and categories, I compared BCGT’s ways of knowing to the information in each participants’ interview. Next, I compared these findings to the interviews of each of the other participants.

8. Research Record

A research record was kept. This is in keeping with the recommendations made by Rossman (1990), Taylor and
Bogdan (1984), and Miles and Huberman (1984). Contained in the journal were the following:

1. my comments about the interviewees' body language,
2. my attitude toward the interviewees,
3. the tone of the words,
4. the nature and quality of the bonding between the interviewees and myself,
5. my personal responses during the course of the interview and after,
6. the problems encountered, and
7. understandings that may have developed during the course of the interview and after.

B. Analytical Process

Combining two analytical methods permitted me to analyze the interview data inductively and deductively. The first process let the patterns and themes emerge naturally from both the individual interview and the interviews collectively.

The grounded theory approach was used to evaluate the transcribed interviews. Basing my analysis on Patton (1990) and Taylor and Bogdan (1984), I read the hard copy and relistened to the tapes several times to uncover the large patterns and themes that emerged from the interviews. During this analytical process, I tried not to make the
information fit any pre-existing model. As Patton (1980) advises:

The cardinal principle of qualitative analysis is that causal relationships and theoretical statements be clearly emergent from and grounded in the phenomena studied. The theory emerges from the data; it is not imposed on the data. (p. 278)

Each interview provided insights relevant to each interviewee, and comparing each interviewee with the others revealed patterns and themes for the whole group.

Following the first analytical process, I then used the coding protocol first developed by BCGT, adapted by Haring-Hidore, et al., and revised by me to determine if the responses of the interviewees in this study corresponded with BCGT's categories (see Appendix I). Exploring the relationship between the interview data and the framework of the ways of knowing as outlined by BCGT, I analyzed the data both from individual interviews and from all the interviews as a group. Using the BCGT coding protocol, I tried to determine how and when the interviewees choose different ways of knowing as strategies and how the interviewees self-define as knowers.

The third phase of analysis was to compare the patterns and themes discovered in the first analysis with the BCGT coding information. This was done for individual interviews as well as across all the interviews.

In summary the analytical steps included the following:
1. I determined themes and patterns that emerged within each interview;
2. I identified those themes and patterns that extended across most or all interviews;
3. I next passed through the interviews using the BCGT coding protocol and noted BCGT categories;
4. I then compared the BCGT categories that extended across most or all the interviews;
5. I recorded relationships and contrasts between the broad themes and patterns and the BCGT categories; and
6. I compared Bond’s predictions of behavior to the behavior of the participants in the study.

The data analysis was supported by data management software specifically designed for use with qualitative interviews. "The Ethnograph," a program for the computer assisted analysis of text based data developed by Qualis Research Associates, was partially used to code and analyze the interviews.

C. Limitations of the Study

This was a phenomenological study of what women administrators in higher education who self-identified as constructed knowers or who use constructed knowing think, feel, and know about their interactions within hierarchical and objectivist institutions of higher education. The study has been limited by the following factors:
1. The number of participants was five. It is important to keep the number of interviewees small because of the enormous amount of data generated. As Glaser and Strauss (1967) note, the number of interviewees is not important in the development of substantive theory: "A single case can indicate a general conceptual character or property; a few more cases can confirm the indication" (p. 30).

2. The study was limited to women administrators in higher education. Research about women's ways of knowing in the administration of higher education has been limited to date. Researchers have not yet had the opportunity to pursue the subject with sufficient breadth or depth. Even though research in this field is still a work-in-progress, a pattern of findings does seem to be emerging. I wanted to explore the emerging pattern around constructed knowers.

3. The study was limited to women administrators who self-identified as constructed knowers or who used constructed knowing as a strategy. Following up on the work conducted by Haring-Hidore, et al., who suggest that women administrators in higher education tend to identify themselves as constructed knowers, I have added to the information in this area.

4. The selection of participants for this study does not take into account race, ethnic origin, sexual identity, class, or other social groups other than age
and gender. It is assumed that these factors influence an interviewee’s experience, and I reported how the participants construed these characteristics of themselves in the interviews.

5. In their study, Haring-Hidore, et al., perceived their interviewees as not reflective because the interviewees had difficulty responding to questions about how they know and make meaning. They concluded that their research outcomes were limited as a result of what they perceived to be the limitations of their subject group. Given Haring-Hidore, et al.’s, assessment of their research and its outcomes, and in order to avoid the same difficulties they encountered, I revised the question set on the assumption that the question structure itself has an impact on research outcomes and focused on the telling of stories. Participants in my study were not selected based on the degree of their ability to reflect, their degree of self-knowledge, or on their willingness to share personal experiences.

6. Participants were selected because of their willingness to participate.

7. The limitations of the study included the inconsistency between what people say and what they do. Taylor and Bogden (1984) observe that, "Interviews are subject to the same fabrications, deceptions, exaggerations, and distortions that
characterize talk between any persons" (p. 81). In addition to saying and doing different things, people say and do different things in different situations.

8. The study is limited to how it can be shown that ways of knowing relate to behavior.

9. The study is limited to the extent to which there are characteristic ways of knowing common to many women. The theories in Women's Ways of Knowing were conceptualized using research with white, mostly middle and upper-middle class women. A limitation of this study is that I did not consciously break that tradition.

Spelman (1988) challenges the generalization of women's experiences from one race to another. I respect that challenge. This study did not address the issues of racial differences and relationships of ways of knowing among women. This is not to say that there will not be greater differences between women and women that are greater than differences between women and men.

10. The participants for this study were limited to colleges and universities in the New England area. For this study, the New England area states included Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, and Rhode Island.

11. Women administrators from public and private two and four year colleges and universities were included in
this study. Women administrators from secular institutions were also included. This broad representation could be seen as a limitation.

D. Role of the Researcher

As a woman administrator in higher education who identifies as a constructed knower, my personal experiences affect my perceptions. My experiential familiarity could have biased the data collection and analysis. To minimize the bias, I structured the questions to encourage the interviewees to ground their responses in their own experiences. Additionally, I believe that knowing the college and administrative cultures was beneficial to me in all facets of the study.

Qualitative researchers Taylor and Bogdan (1984) observed that, in addition to the advantage of increased awareness of the issues, there may be an advantage to the researcher having a personal interest in the study: "... the researchers empathize and identify with the people they study ... in order to understand how they see things" (p. 6). Because I, as the researcher, closely identify with the subjects of the study, the study has been enriched.
The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the five participants in the interviews, to present the data collected in the interviews, examine the responses to the interview questions, to review and analyze the data, and to present the perspectives of the participants and myself as the researcher. Presenting perspectives is in keeping with Bogdan and Taylor (1984) who instructed, "What the qualitative researcher is interested in is not truth per se, but rather perspectives" (p. 98).

A. Introduction of Participants

To understand the perspectives presented in this chapter, it is important to place the participants into context. First, I will introduce the participants individually by sharing what they consider the most important things that have happened in their lives in recent years; then, I will introduce the participants as a group.

1. Introduction of Individuals

Each interview began by my asking each participant to think back over the last few years and to describe what stands out for her. Although the responses varied, there were some common threads.
a. Diane

Diane is the director of residence life and dining services at the same small public college where Cecelia works. She was acquainted with the authors and research used in this study.

For Diane, turning 40 was a personal turning point in her life with overtones that affect who she is in all aspects of her life. She said

when I turned 40, not anything necessarily new happened; but it made me step into a category that has many pieces named...wisdom, being kind of more fully yourself, and more confident, worrying less about others . . . so that’s something I’m still trying to pull on and straighten and adjust to.

A second aspect of her life that stands out for Diane has to do with changing jobs.

... going from a very, very demanding position in a large institution where I felt oftentimes overwhelmed, not only by the work load, but probably more so by the emphasis on multiculturalism. ... In going to my first experience in a small institution, I’m trying to understand what dynamics might be associated with a small institution. ... I miss some of the complexity [of the large institution] ... and I
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The changes in her professional role are important experiences in Diane’s life. Some of the importance of the changes in jobs has to do with what Diane misses. She said that she misses

some of the complexity [of a large institution].

... and I am used to having a lot on my hands ...

... that I don’t understand ... it’s nice to be in a place that feels a little more predictable to me, a little more understandable ...

The last experience that Diane noted which stood out for her was that she and her partner celebrated our tenth year anniversary ... The number ten seems sizeable; so, it’s just another facet of my life I look at that has a lot of stability ... and I think, "Gees, I have been doing something for ten years".

Maintaining a close relationship between her personal and professional lives is important to Diane. She described her personal and professional lives as "inseparable" in part because "I learned the initial learnings I had with this work in the context of that [live-in] setting." Diane began her career by literally
living where she worked. Because Diane’s personal and professional lives were so closely integrated, she had to learn to separate them. As you will see later, other participants are learning to blend their personal and professional lives; and, Diane has come from the opposite end of the spectrum by learning to separate these two facets of her life.

b. Cecelia

Cecelia is the dean of sciences at the same small public college where Diane works in residential life. Diane, too, had read some of the literature on which this study is based.

For Cecelia, two aspects of her life stand out. The first aspect has to do with personal relationships.

... on a personal level, making the commitment to another person, living together, a whole personal partnership development that has been incredibly rewarding ... Also, my mother died last August, and her illness and death have had profound influence on me, one that in many ways I’m only beginning to feel and appreciate.

So, for Cecelia, the commitment to a personal partnership and the loss of a personal relationship have been important experiences in her life.
On a professional level, much has also happened. . . . the whole opening up of administration for me is a stage, not necessarily the end point, but a stage in my career."

It was not only the change from faculty to administration; Cecelia found different aspects of the new position in higher education to be very interesting.

And that has been very interesting to discover what kinds of abilities and talents I had in that area, to find out where I need to do more of the learning experience of learning from my own mistakes, learning about a whole bunch of other disciplines because I had to learn all of the . . . hard sciences vocabulary and working patterns . . . that some of the things I was perhaps fearful of, such as whether I could manage budget, that I know now I have a real talent for...whether I could have a tough enough skin to go through the kind of personal attacks that occurred...when I did some of the unpopular things.

c. Linda

Linda is an assistant dean in the student development division of a prestigious private university. She is the youngest participant in this study and is knowledgeable about the concepts and researchers used in this study.

In the interview, Linda’s responses concentrated on her development as a knower and related the questions in
the interview to a developmental process. Linda’s stories about her development as a "knower" suggested that she had reflected on Gilligan’s and BCGTs’ theories and had related the researchers’ concepts to her own experience.

Like Diane and Cecelia, Linda also divided her response to the initial interview question between her personal and professional life. Her opening statement began, "Well, I think it’s very easy to compartmentalize your life into work and nonwork; or, at least I feel I’ve done that." She expanded first into the area of work.

I would say that in the work realm, what has stood out for me is really doing a lot of thinking about what I want my future to be and making some steps towards kind of creating that.

For Linda, creating her future took several paths. It meant

getting much more involved in professional associations and taking some leadership roles . . . realizing that I’m not as much interested in being like a director of a very large organization as opposed to someone who can influence policy and important decisions . . . at more of a dean’s level, and to have more contact with faculty.
With these goals in mind, Linda recently assumed a senior administration position at a university where there are very few women in the administration.

On the "nonwork side of life what stands out for me is surviving probably the most difficult year of my . . . personal . . . life." Dealing with illness and loss defined Linda’s personal life. The deaths of her father and a staff associate coupled with having two friends be diagnosed with cancer

helped me reclarify how important people are for me, how important my family is to me . . . and helped me realize how important my friends are as a support system . . . you know, how to reach out to people . . . and I finished my doctorate two years ago.

Loss and accomplishment defined Linda’s personal life. And, completing her doctorate crossed both the personal and professional parts of her life.

d. Carolyn

Carolyn is the president of a small public college where Susan also works. She was knowledgeable about the research around which this study was based.

After clarification of whether I wanted her to speak to her professional or the personal life, Carolyn began to think out loud.
I guess one thing that stands out is that I’m still here . . . I’ve been nominated and encouraged to do other things . . . when I took this position, being a president was something I’d wanted to do for some time . . . but when I began it, I was not sure I was gonna do it for the rest of my life . . . when I look back over the last few years . . . I’m glad I am where I am. And, it’s as interesting as I thought . . . and is crazy.

To sum up why being a president of a college stands out for Carolyn, she said that "what stands out is the richness of the experiences that I’ve had . . . the fact that I’m finishing five years, that I’m in _____ [the name of the state], and I’ve seen a lot of changes." She was constantly changing, constantly getting into new arenas and new circles . . . being on national commissions . . . and doing things at kind of a higher and higher level of exposure, of responsibility.

Each of these changes is important to Carolyn.

Along with the professional aspect, "the other thing that stands out is trying to maintain another life while you’re doing this . . . and that requires constant
vigilance." To Carolyn, balancing two aspects of life does not mean a 50/50 split.

It means some sort of equilibrium . . . it’s an internal feeling more than anything else . . . I am one who likes to play, and I play at work.

Carolyn does not sense a separation of her personal and professional life. Instead, "I believe my life is real integrated . . . but I would not characterize myself as a workaholic, so that’s an interesting distinction."

e. Susan

Susan is the assistant dean of academic affairs at the same small public college where Carolyn is president. She knew about the research around which this study was based and had a good sense of how she fit the models proposed by the researchers used in this study.

Susan responded to the initial question by choosing to look back over eight to ten years.

in terms of my work, I’m more and more clear that I make critical decisions from a spiritual perspective and that that’s part of my work life.

And, she continued, the second thing that stands out is "just how critical it is that I be happy with my own life for . . . everything else that’s going on to be good."

Susan defined that further by saying that
as much as my life is really devoted to others, if I am not in a good place myself, then my judgment gets impaired and my ability to take risks gets compromised . . . so I’m learning that . . . for me the importance as part of that is having fun, of supporting fun, and having fun.

Feeling balanced and having fun were important to Susan, followed by feeling good about having gotten to a place where taking risks is more comfortable. On the personal side, Susan shared about just the pleasure and complications of having a family and work life. How much I love my family, and yet find myself in a set of demanding jobs, and I find demanding, complicated jobs the most interesting.

It was the question about balancing time between her demanding job and personal priorities that prodded Susan and her husband, also an academic, to make a major change, a decision that stands out for Susan. So, we made this move up to [the state] because I felt my life was very much out of whack, as did my husband; and, there was no real way we thought there was to get it back into whack; and we thought we were going to have to make a pretty dramatic change, which we did. I mean, we took
it financially on the chin to move, and we uprooted our children, and moved away from our older children and grandchildren . . . it was a serious decision . . . but it was really for the quality of time with the younger children and for [my husband] and I to finally have some time together which was just virtually nil by the time we left.

The move, one of the most important changes in Susan’s life over the past few years, has helped her see "my own family patterns . . . personality style . . . and leadership style . . . that play out." And seeing how these play out has helped Susan "get a grip on that. So, it’s easier for me to keep a balance . . . but it’s sort of the case of vigilance still." Sometimes torn between work and family, Susan has made a conscious decision to find ways to balance them.

2. Introduction as a Group

The same information presented in different ways sometimes begets different meanings. In the previous section, information about each participant was presented on an individual basis. Figure 7 briefly compares some of the information about the participants. The participant profile shows the varied positions held by each
Table 7 Participant Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Public/Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Director Residential Life</td>
<td>public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Asst Dean Student Develop</td>
<td>private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Asst Dean Academic Affairs</td>
<td>public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecelia</td>
<td>Dean of Sciences</td>
<td>public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7 Participant Profile

participant. It was important to me to interview women administrators in various positions in higher education to have an indication of how position in the organization affects each participant’s ways of knowing.

a. Academic Degrees and Leadership Training

Just as diverse as the positions of the participants are their formal education and leadership training. The information in the following figure shows the academic degrees and leadership training that helped prepare the women for their current positions.

In Chapter III, I provided information from researchers who discussed how science and math are seen as influential fields in academics and that women in higher education are generally not in those fields. Of interest
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Degrees and Leadership Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>MS, Community Services&lt;br&gt;BS, Psychology&lt;br&gt;management institute for women&lt;br&gt;three years doctoral level coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Ed.D, Administration, Planning, and Social Policy&lt;br&gt;M.Ed., Higher Education&lt;br&gt;Administration, and Planning&lt;br&gt;BA, Psychology&lt;br&gt;American Council of Education/National Identification Program (ACE/NIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecelia</td>
<td>Ph.D in Sociology&lt;br&gt;MA, Sociology&lt;br&gt;AB, Sociology&lt;br&gt;ACE Fellow in Academic Administration&lt;br&gt;Mellon Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Ph.D., Psychology: Learning and Organizational Development in Higher Education&lt;br&gt;MA, Experimental Psychology&lt;br&gt;BA, Psychology and Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Ed.D, Administration, Training, and Policy&lt;br&gt;M.Ed, Educational Policy, Research, Administration&lt;br&gt;BA, History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8 Participant Degrees and Leadership Training

to me is the fact that although none of the participants in this study held degrees in math or the natural sciences, some of them spoke of excelling in these fields before turning to social sciences or administrative areas.

Two participants actually started out in the objective arenas of quantitative research and natural sciences, then
shifted away from them; and, this pattern raises a series of interesting questions. Did this shift have to do with the participants' cognitive shifts toward being constructed knowers? Did the women find a wall which prevented them from going further in the fields of math or natural sciences? Are women who have achieved in math and the sciences more likely to be attracted to administrative positions? All are interesting questions, and all of the questions need another study for their answers. However, this study does provide some interesting insights.

For the participants in this study, the shifts from math or science to social science were made through experiences in undergraduate and graduate studies. Susan felt that math and science gave her only one way of thinking; social sciences gave her a more inclusive way of thinking.

As the observer, I heard the excitement in the tone of voice when Susan began to talk about her shift to social sciences. Although she enjoyed some of the logic of the math, math and science did not allow parts of her to live and grow. For example, Susan found that the paradigm of her scientific-method training as a clinical psychologist was "deceitful." She acknowledged a wrestling inside her because of the objectivity required:

always having this sort of reason [versus]
feeling dialogue going on . . . a lot of it came
when I started working at research labs, which
was the epitome of objectivity: working with computers and randomization and supposedly everything that could take away a human influence.

It was through the quantitative research labs where Susan’s job was to "take away a human influence" that she found just the opposite. Susan discovered that quantitative research was influenced by humans and the context it came from:

the notion that any of science or any reasoning is really objective - i.e., devoid of human feeling, of individual interpretation, of individual perspective, or the context of the time and the moment and the people involved - to me is contextual, it’s all imbedded in something else.

She began to acknowledge that the objectivity of math and science was made up:

I think it [working in a research lab using supposed objective methods] was when I got to be more radical about it [the supposed objectivity of science and math] probably. . . . And, I got just kind of rock-bottom-sure that there was, that objectivity was really just mythical . . . the notion that there’s anything that isn’t
tampered by human eyes, hands, and minds - the notion that anything is neutral - anything scientific that I read ... I know how they framed it.

Susan began to acknowledge the importance of context:

I guess I don’t believe a great deal in objectivity. I think objectivity is just careful subjectivity where we are aware of our own perspective and the perspective of others.

She continued:

everything is richer with context, more easily understood, more thoroughly understood when you know the context and something about the people from whence it came.

As she worked in the labs, Susan began to fervently believe there was a more inclusive way of researching than her quantitatively-oriented clinical psychology training allowed, a way that would allow for the context of the research, a way that would allow for human subjectivity.

A second participant who shifted from a scientific field to social sciences, an objective field to a more subjective one, was Carolyn.

I started out in science and switched to psychology. ... I started out in math and
chemistry and physics and took intro to psych . . .
. and psych really caught my eye. And I switched by my sophomore year, kinda without a great deal of agonizing or debate . . .

Perhaps there was not a great deal of agonizing over the switch because she "took all my electives in math, science, and languages." Carolyn supported her love for and talent in diverse fields of study which others did not consider compatible. She described having two exam conflicts while I was there, and that means two exams were scheduled at the same time because they didn’t think anyone would take the two courses.

It was this ability to see the relationships of diverse fields that illustrate Carolyn’s interests. Instead of being pushed to objectify, Carolyn’s experience allowed her to see the relationships.

I could deal with going right into that class in molecular bonding . . . and go into social psychology and try to understand racism. And I didn’t see those at odds, necessarily. Maybe they’re two different aptitudes that I have . . . but I knew they were peculiar.
She "particularly was interested in social psychology . . .
and excelled in statistics." Although she saw the
relationship in the fields of study, Carolyn "knew they
were peculiar. I mean, I had no one in school with me who
was taking that combination of things."

Blending the pure science and the social science,
blending the objective and the subjective, Carolyn sees it
as a strength in her professional position:
maybe being the chief executive of an
organization is the perfect position for someone
who has those two interests. So, I guess I never
saw them at odds.

Although none of the participants in this study are
directly involved with the math and natural sciences in
their current jobs, three of them are administratively
responsible for these areas. One participant in this study
is the dean of both social and natural sciences, one
participant is the assistant academic dean who oversees the
component of a college which grants degrees in math and
science, and one participant presides over that same
college as president.

b. Length of Professional Career

The length of the professional careers of the five
participants in the study ranged from 10 years to 30 years,
and at the beginning of my analysis, I wished that there
were a smaller span. I wished for a smaller span because I erroneously assumed that the participant with the most experience would behave most consistently as a constructed knower because she would have had more time to develop and more opportunities to practice being a constructed knower. Further, she would have greater opportunities to blend who she perceives herself to be with how she behaves. The greater the number of opportunities, I assumed, the more consistent the behavior.

Once involved in the analysis of this study, however, I saw that the twenty year range of length of experience provided an important insight: the number of years in a professional career in higher education did not determine the consistency with which a woman administrator behaved as a constructed knower (see below).

The following is a list showing the length of the careers of the participants in the study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Years in Career</th>
<th>Length of Career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>1984-1994</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>1981-1994</td>
<td>13 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>1974-1994</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>1968-1994</td>
<td>26 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecelia</td>
<td>1964-1994</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9 Length of Careers
c. Current Positions and Career Ladders

Other interesting factors to look at are the career ladders and current positions of the participants. Figure 10 shows the current position held by each participant. The career ladder for each participant appears below each current position.

Although each career ladder seems somewhat predictable within each participant’s career, the participants in my study held varied positions and had varied career ladders in comparison to one another. During the analysis, I wondered if women with similar positions, with similar career ladders, and with similar training would behave more consistently in keeping with their ways of knowing than those with various positions and from various career paths.

For example, I wondered if women administrators with training from student development such as Diane and Linda come through professional preparation which is more supportive of characteristics associated with women’s ways of knowing. Would other women who had that kind of relational training in student services behave like these two? This is in comparison to my wondering about women administrators who were trained in the quantitative subjects such as Susan in clinical psychology or Cecelia with her quantitative sociological research background where connection, relationship, and feelings were not valued.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Current Position and Career Ladder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Diane       | Director of Residential Life and Dining Services  
Associate Director of Housing Services  
Coordinator of Residential Education  
Assistant to the Dean of Student Affairs  
Assistant Director of Residential Life  
Area Coordinator of Residential Life |
| Carolyn     | College President  
Associate Academic Dean  
Department Chair  
Director of Educational and Personnel Services for State Community College System  
Dean of the College  
Project Director  
Coordinator of Instruction and Academic Advisor  
Social Services Caseworker |
| Susan       | Associate Academic Dean  
Professor and researcher  
Director of campus-wide teaching center  
Research Assistant |
| Cecelia     | Dean of Natural and Social Sciences  
ACE Fellow  
Mellon Scholar  
Professor  
Instructor |
| Linda       | Associate Dean of Student Affairs  
Assistant Dean for Residential Services  
Coordinator of Victim Assistance Program  
Assistant Director of Housing  
Coordinator of Family Housing  
Director of Greek Affairs  
Assistant Director of Greek Affairs |

Figure 10  Current Positions and Career Ladders

The women participants are all familiar with the literature, they all identify themselves as constructed knowers, and they all described that they want to be
constructed knowers in both their personal and professional relationships and behavior. Nevertheless, they each behave differently. Why do they behave differently?

Partly, it may be because they are different people, partly it may be because they are in different places in the organization, and partly it may be that they have come to those different places through different career paths. Various career paths can, of course, put fewer or more constraints on one’s behavior in an organization. For example, a "residential life path" will probably put fewer constraints on a constructed knower than a "dean of natural sciences path".

B. Findings

Each participant interview was unique. I found that, although the questions were pretty much the same and asked in a similar order, each participant responded from her own viewpoint, of course, giving varied emphases to the interviews. In this section, I will review BCGT’s women’s ways of knowing, outline the major themes that I found within each interview, then identify any patterns and themes that cut across all or some of the interviews.

1. Review of BCGT’s Women’s Ways of Knowing

Both the individual and collective themes from the interviews can be understood in terms of BCGT’s findings. In Chapter II, I describe BCGT’s ways of knowing and the
four additional subcategories of the ways through which, they conclude, women make meaning in their lives. A brief review of the BCGT’s categories is in order at this time.

The first way of knowing, silence, describes women who feel they have no voice, who "do not cultivate their capacities for representational thought" (BCGT, p. 25). In the second way of knowing, received, women passively acquire what they perceive to be concrete knowledge from listening to others.

The source of the third way of knowing, subjective knowing, is the self. For these women there are two characteristics of knowing: a women trusts her inner voice, personal experience, and intuition; and the quest for self involves women who are "actively and obsessively preoccupied with a choice between self and other."

In the fourth way of knowing, knowledge is communicated through procedures. BCGT divided this category into two parts. In the "separate mode," the aim is to construct truth; and, in the "connected mode," the aim is to construct meaning. Either way, women who use procedural knowing are intentional in their use of methods to convey information.

In the fifth way of knowing, constructed knowing, women combine the separate and connected modes of understanding. The aim is to understand through exploring the context in which information is shared. According to Bond, the constructed knower uses each way of knowing in
appropriate situations. The constructed knower is the most complete and effective knower with the largest range.

2. Themes

a. Philosophical Perspectives

   i. Diane. In the interviews, I heard participants talk about making decisions from philosophical perspectives using "guiding principles" and "spiritual perspectives" and making moral choices. Making decisions is a process which is affected by assorted experiences, and participants in the study spoke about what guides them in decision making. Although four of the five women administrators used different names and adjectives to describe their perspectives, each of the women implied the existence of these guidelines.

   Cecelia makes decisions from "guiding principles":
   
   ... another thing I try to hold in place [when making decisions] is what I call guiding principles. I'm a person who's gotta have a foundation in place. I gotta know why we are doing the thing that we're doing. The actual thing that we do then is kind of a "fait accompli."

   It was important to Diane that she know and accept the guiding principles from which a decision was to be made.
Diane felt that when everyone concerned agrees on such principles or trusts the person charged with making a decision, the actual decision is rarely questioned.

As an example, Diane told of a decision that she, as a director, and the two associate directors recently made. The decision involved moving residential directors around in order to better support the student population and bring in fresh ideas. She said that the decision "... was made in an atmosphere of trust, and it was guided in fundamentals [principles]." The staff did not quarrel with the decision, although it involved a potentially troublesome situation.

When I asked Diane to define or describe her guiding principles, she separated them from intuition and gut feelings.

... guiding principles feel more ... like thoughts to me. They feel more cognitive. I think they are pretty informed by intuition. I sure hope they are.

Cecelia's guiding principles come from her, the participant. They are informed by her intuition, but intuition seem to be a filter through which Diane applies her guiding principles.

ii. Carolyn. Like Diane, Carolyn told stories about the importance she places on relationships in making decision based on the circumstances of each situation.
Using her philosophical principles, Carolyn carefully established an admissions director search committee for a national search. She was "very deliberate" in appointing members so that the search committee had "balance" and that different segments of the campus community were represented.

I agonized over those things, meaning I was very diligent about putting this committee together. I was really looking for the people who represent the very good and strong components of the institution.

The composition of the search committee was especially important because the outcome of the search was critical to the college. As Carolyn stated, "We’d been in an enrollment decline," "we were in serious financial difficulties over the last couple of years," and "we knew we had to turn the situation around."

Literally at the end of months of committee work, with the campus community poised to learn the results of the work, Carolyn listened to an idea from the dean in charge of the admissions department, calculated the impact of a decision to not hire a director of admissions, and called a halt to the search. Carolyn described the situation she created:

So, you realize, you have the politics of this search committee that’s convened, out there doing
the best work possible, and I’m gonna tell them we’re not gonna do it anymore.

Carolyn used her guiding principle that calls for taking the circumstances and the relationships of the situation into account. She determined what was important for the committee members to understand so that they knew how significant the work they had done was to the process, to the final decision, and ultimately for the college community:

What they needed to know was that the work that they’d been doing was what helped us figure out that we were gonna do something else. I had to be very clear with them [that] it was not their failure that we didn’t hire a candidate.

At this point in the process, Carolyn went to great lengths to maintain trusting relationships with different segments of the campus community. Not only did she determine what was important for the committee members, Carolyn also had to orchestrate the timing of selling the concept to different segments of the community.

three groups had to be involved. . . . One is the President’s Council, to at least run this new model by as the new model essentially eliminates the Director of Admissions position. . . .

Meanwhile, I was working with the search
committee and said that we were thinking about
doing something else. Kinda, just trust me, I’ll
tell you what it is soon. And, third you have
the admissions staff who didn’t know anything
yet.

Carolyn described the way she went about directing
this major turning point for her institution by saying that
"We were very deliberate in the timing of things [because]
we couldn’t afford, in a place this small, to have [staff
members question] who’s your first among equals." Carolyn
was concerned for the people involved, concerned about how
they would feel, and concerned about how they would feel
about one another.

This decision stands out in all sorts of ways.
In terms of just taking a very different step,
risking not having something that every college
has. And then really, all the communications and
political issues of who needs to be in the loop,
who needs to be attended to, and how do you make
people feel [good] about the work they did.

Carolyn’s concern about relationships and people’s
feelings directed her behavior around this situation. She
was also concerned about what others would think of her:
"You know, I really can’t tell you what I thought going
into it [going into the meeting to tell the committee].
Whether they'd throw me out of the room or not." As it turned out, "the people who were on that committee believed me." Applying her philosophical principle of the importance of relationships in an unprecedented situation and building on the relationships she had established in her four years at the institution, Carolyn made risk-filled decisions which have paid off in the past year.

We had some difficult moments . . . at the end, we joked and we talked about these various moments. . . . Turns out this year that we have tremendous results to show. Now, if we'd had different results, I'm not sure what I could tell you. But, our applications are up 25% in an arena where most people are going down. And, our admissions deposits last week are up 97%, and housing deposits have doubled. . . . If I'd done this in my first year here, I don't have a clue what would have happened.

The results of Carolyn's decisions and behavior are community members who believe in her as the vision-maker who cares about them and an institution that is thriving.

iii. Susan. Another participant, Susan, was clear about the importance of "making critical decisions from a spiritual perspective." She listed her emphasis on using
a spiritual perspective to make decisions as the first thing that stands out for her. Susan feels that decisions from a spiritual perspective promote deep introspection about the meaning of life and make it more possible for people to have that meaning in their life, to feel empowered, capable, able to have a substantial life that feels balanced, meaningful, or good . . . where they feel in touch with themselves and that what they’re doing is consistent with what internally they want to be doing, that they’re operating not from dissidence but from a much more integrated sense of who they are and what they want to be doing all the way from moral decisions to work decisions to balance-life kinds of issues.

Susan said that using the spiritual perspective to make decisions has become a priority for her over the last few years of her life. Indeed, she has made her spiritual perspective a priority in her personal life and made dramatic changes in both her personal and professional lives in the last few years to ensure that she could come from that spiritual perspective more often. (See Personal Choices from Philosophical Perspectives.)

In her professional position, Susan spoke about the core of her beliefs: "It all starts from that basic core of believing that we are all, all-knowing and that what we
need to know is available to us." This is the core that Susan comes from when making decisions, when guiding colleagues, when making a determination about policy and curriculum, and when making decisions in her personal life.

iv. Linda. Another example of making decisions from a philosophical perspective came from Linda. She perceives herself as others recently described her, "as a very principled person." Furthermore, she believes in standing for who she is and has a "strong sense of needing to change things or improve things or just offer different perspectives."

Linda believes that she has been willing to "take big risks" for what she believes to be "right." Because of her commitment to stand for what she believes in, Linda has experienced both positive and negative consequences. At one point in her career, Linda’s position was eliminated when she refused to participate in a meeting to coerce a rape victim to drop charges because the perpetrator threatened to sue the university. The situation "help[ed] me define a little bit where the line is . . . what I thought was morally right."

The question that the situation brings to mind is whether Linda had a philosophical principle, that said to support her supervisor (who required her participation in the meeting), which was overridden by the circumstances of the situation. One question, however, has a clear answer: Linda has moral principles from which she makes decisions.
v. Summary. Four of the five women administrators in this study describe using philosophical principles that take the circumstances of each situation into account. For Diane, building trusting relationships with her staff creates a trusting environment when she appears to make different decisions from one situation to another. Susan's philosophical perspective has to do with attunement to a spiritual perspective. Linda spoke about her philosophical principles when describing how she works with others, and Carolyn considered the matrix of relationships as well as each person in a given situation.

I found the participants in this study to be similar to the upper level men participants in Kohlberg's study: where Kohlberg's men created moral rules of right and wrong from their experience that guided their behavior, the four women in this study had philosophical principles which they created from their experience. However, in Kohlberg's universe, the principles were abstract, intellectual principles to be rigidly applied regardless of the situation. The men would abstract a rule of behavior, apply it, and abide by the rule regardless of the situation. The four women in this study applied their principles within the context of a given situation and with regard to the relationships involved.

I believe that the women's "rules" tend not to be absolute and rigid rules of behavior like men's rules tend to be; rather, they are "rules in process". The rules the
women administrators used are rules of what is right or wrong given the situation and the relationships involved. Both men and women use a set of rules from which to make decisions; where men abstractly apply their rules to each situation, women apply their principles in consideration of the people involved.

In reference to Gilligan's findings, Gilligan implied that one either applied rules (men) or focused on relationships (women). Gilligan felt that the women in her study made decisions without an overall philosophy because they made decisions about each situation separately. However, for Diane, for example, whether it involved relationships, like Gilligan said, or impersonal circumstances of the situation, one of Diane's guiding principles is to take the circumstances of each situation into consideration. Diane does not separate relationships, situational decisions, and guiding principles. Instead, she feels the circumstances or relationships in each situation are important enough to factor into the decision.

In this study, four women administrators used guiding principles differently from Gilligan's theory about how women's use them. Gilligan's work suggests that a lot of women do not feel the need to sort out, to question, to develop guiding principles. She asserts that women's focus is more on relationships and that decisions are usually more situational than philosophical. Gilligan said that women do not rely on "rules" of fair play, et cetera, like
men do. Where men apply rules, regardless of the circumstances, four of the five women administrators in this study clearly showed that they synthesize the use of guiding principles and a focus on relationships.

Why is there a difference between the rules and principles used by men and women in the organization? Maybe being women administrators with careers in male-dominated organizations for 10-30 years has compelled the women administrators to develop guiding principles or "rules," in order to survive. Maybe their careers in male-dominated organizations have encouraged the women administrators to develop philosophical perspectives to give them a framework to work within the organization. These women may have developed their philosophical perspectives in order to function effectively, in order to "fit in." Perhaps being in the organization forces the issue for the women. Or, perhaps women simply synthesize the importance of relationships with the use of philosophical principles. Women apply more seamless, inclusive perspectives from one situation to another by adopting the philosophical principle to evaluate the circumstances of each situation as it comes.

b. Personal Choices from Philosophical Perspectives

The philosophical perspectives of the participants have led them to make interesting decisions about their personal and professional lives. Four of the five gave
specific examples that help to redefine what is important to them. For example, Diane and Susan each made a conscious decision to move from the same large institution to small ones. While some may see this as a step back professionally, the two participants both believed that they were moving toward something that was very important to them. Each woman had made a decision that was based on a desire to not be consumed by the organization and based on wanting to spend more time with family. (See earlier section on philosophical perspectives.)

Cecelia moved to a small institution because the woman president recruited her to be a part of a collaborative administrative team. As well, Diane wanted to experience the issues presented by a small institution. She also made this professional relocation because her former supervisor was a rigid hierarchical administrator. Diane wanted to be part of an administrative team that behaved from the perspective of women's ways of knowing, a style that would support her working according to her "guiding principles" (see earlier part of section on philosophical principles).

Susan moved to a small institution because I felt my life was very much out of whack, as did my husband; and, there was no real way we thought there [at the former institution] to get it back into whack; and we thought we were going to have to make a pretty dramatic change, which we did.
Susan continued that there were other priorities in her life.

It was a serious decision, but it was really for the quality of time with the younger children and for [husband] and I to finally have some time together.

In addition, she also wanted some time for herself: "I'm learning more and more, too, just to have some time for me . . . and trying to balance all those things."

Cecelia has recently been looking for a different position and hopes to be moving soon. Repeating a rationale for moving which is similar to the one that Diane and Susan used, Cecelia wants to move because "I have found that I have skills and talents that I didn't know I had." She does not want to move to a "bigger and better" situation, rather she is looking for a situation that will allow her to grow and use her newly-found skills and talents.

Still another woman administrator, Carolyn, reported that she was recruited and nominated to larger positions "on the national and international scene." She has not made the moves because she is "not sure that's what I want." Again, bigger and better is apparently not her goal.

These decisions by the participants help to redefine success using women's ways of knowing rather than placing
the emphasis on status, men’s primary definition of success. Rather than "the bigger the better", these decisions seem to come out of a desire to include more time for their personal lives. As discussed above, the women administrators want to be able to spend time with their families and partners, to engage in a wider range of activities while maintaining a close relationship with the core people in their lives.

c. Organizational Choices from Philosophical Perspectives

Women administrators spoke of making decisions in their professional role from their philosophical perspectives. Some of the participants spoke about the influence of the contexts within which they made decisions. Other participants spoke about the influence of administrative support.

3. The Contexts of Trust, Relationship, and Time

The participants in this study talked about the way they made decisions by working in a context which grows out of their philosophical perspectives. BCGT wrote that women resolve conflict within context and relationship. The women in this study supported BCGT.

A clear example of working within contexts was given by Diane:

Any decisions I make happen within a context. . . . I like to work within a context of
trust...whomever I’m making the decision with is being thoughtful and not being capricious. So that, when the decision is made, the staffs’ first impulse isn’t to question . . . [the fairness].

The context for Diane, the larger picture within which a single decision is made, is the context of trust. She wants her staff to trust her and for her to be able to trust members of her staff in making decisions.

Cecelia acknowledged contexts as being present, even when they are not acknowledged. She related an example of a decision she had made about reinstating a student staff member who had appealed a dismissal made by one of Diane’s professional staff members. Because Diane and the staff member had established a context of trust, the professional staff member was supportive of Diane’s decision even though he did not agree with it:

... he was upset because he felt like I hadn’t backed up his decision. But, he was absolutely fine about it . . . ‘I know you gave it your best.’ . . . I mean, he didn’t just roll over and say, ‘You’re the boss: anything you want.’ He went ahead and said, ‘This bothers me, and I assume you did the best job that you could do.’ I loved that whole thing.
This was a clear example of a leader who has the trust and confidence of a staff member, even when he disagreed with her decision. Diane stated that "... the way that we bridge differences of opinion is to, to be honest and to feel safe and to feel respected." Diane clearly believes in the importance of working within a context of honesty and respect.

Making decisions within the context of trust was also important to another participant. Susan related this same priority as she gave an example of creating change in the organization. Working within the context of trust was the key to moving the whole organization through an important change:

... having enough trust and substance to the relationship with them [between faculty and staff and the administrator] that when I asked them to come, they were willing to come and take a risk. .. when they knew they could take some heat .. . but they were willing to ...

Susan acknowledged that it had taken years to establish the context of trust: "I think that [the fact that the staff members were willing to step out] was really because of many years of other work we had done that [allowed them to be] willing to come and do that [willing to come and take a risk and some heat].
Taking the time needed to involve others seems to be another important aspect of working within a context: the context of time. Susan was one of the women administrators who seems to have taken a long-term view of the organization she is involved with. She did not expect quick fixes because she did not see the problems as purely technical problems. Rather, the problems for Susan are relational problems which can only be addressed over long periods of time with consistency. People were willing to move through change and make decisions because they were working within a context of trust on solving the relational aspects as well as the logistical parts of the problem. Seeing the relational aspects of solving problems is a critical difference between administrators such as Susan who behave from women’s ways of knowing and administrators such as Cecelia who behave from a more male way of knowing, seeing problems as technical or logistical problems to solve.

4. The Role of Administrative Support: Susan and Cecelia

Another issue of importance to the women administrators was administrative support. Susan is working with a president, Carolyn, who is supporting her by saying, essentially, take the time and do this right by bringing everyone on board; we’re going to be here for a long time.
In contrast, Cecelia is working at an institution that has an interim president and has not had consistent administrative leadership for over a decade. She is working with people who say "fix the problem now, get it fixed: I don’t care how." People in Cecelia’s sphere see problems as technical problems: they say to figure out how to fix a problem and just fix it, that’s all. The logistical or technical approach to problem solving is a characteristic of a quantitative thinker and is a characteristically male way of thinking.

Because higher education organizations are hierarchies, if the chief officer does not lead the community towards a vision, it is really hard for the people down the line to do anything. This is a crucial piece for further study.

The college where Cecelia works is in a state of flux. The college is searching for its third president in the past ten years. Various leadership agendas have been played out with no real stable leader possessing a community-based vision.

In contrast to Cecelia’s situation is Susan’s situation. Carolyn has been president for six years at the college where Susan works. There is not only leadership stability, but there has been a leader who has empowered members of her staff. Community-based decisions have been implemented, and fiscally the school is in better shape.
than it has been for a decade. The morale and self-image are high.

The importance of the impact of the chief executive officer of an institution such as Carolyn as a leader and visionary on the decision-making and behavior of staff, is an important area of further study. Susan, who works at the institution where Carolyn is the president, describes the leadership team that Carolyn has attracted:

... they're just decent people who operate from a big philosophical commitment to diversity and decency, and that's just who they are ... I think we've been real unusual in how much fun we've been able to have together ...

As Susan acknowledges the positive aspects of the leadership and institution, she also acknowledges the negative:

the place still has a lot of bitterness. It still has a lot of spite and nastiness and ugliness, and there is certainly plenty of mean [and] cruel things that happen.

And immediately following, Susan balances the negative with: "But alongside it, I think happen more positive things, more good things, more people who support each other."
It may have been easier for Cecelia to function in her organization if she had just gone along with the organizational norm and continued to have different rules for each person. Going with the organizational norm could have, however, created greater dissonance between Cecelia’s self-perception and her behavior, greater dissonance between Cecelia wanting to treat people with respect in open relationships yet behaving just the opposite.

Susan continued to describe the reason for successful relationship based on trust and respect: "... having had integrity in the relationships with those people ahead of time, having trusted them and respected them and they with me ..."

She also credits the relationships built in the context of trust and respect with making it possible for the college’s administrative team to take a risk together: "They’re all individuals with integrity ... I think that’s the heart of being able to get any of this to work."

The context of respect is an important part of the working relationships for both the people Susan supervises and the people she works with on the administrative team.

5. The Role of Relationships

Through the interviews I found that the fundamental principle that underlies the participants’ ways of knowing is relationship. Gilligan’s claim that relationships and connection to others were significant to women in making
moral decisions (Figure Two) was supported by the women administrators in my study. For example, in making decisions, Susan related that

if I have any control over it [making a decision], it always comes from having built substantial relationships with people, trying to understand where they’re coming from and working from there.

Further, the relationship with others is the cornerstone from which Susan builds her decision-making process. It is essential to her to support the people she works with. Everything else falls into place around that piece.

For Linda, there were several events in her life which provided examples of the priority that relationship has for her. One incident that reminded Linda of the importance of relationships occurred recently around having "a lot of people around me who were very ill" and two of them died. For Linda,

that time was very important to me [because] it helped me reclarify how important people are for me, how important my family is to me . . . [it] helped me realize how important my friends are as a support system.

Linda was clear about the importance of relationships in her life, and these include people in her life at work.
I've always been very connected with people that I work with. . . I've developed very good relationships with colleagues. . . I like being able to know people, know what's going on in their lives, what's happening with their children. . . it helps me figure out where people are coming from. . .

Another reason that Linda finds it is important to know the people she works with has to do with helping her understand why they are coming from a particular position in a professional situation.

If you're making a policy, and you're trying to make a decision, and you're working with the chief of police who now is in the middle of a divorce or his wife has breast cancer, you can have more of a personal connection with them.

Having personal connections with others not only helps Linda feel more at ease in the workplace, but personal friendships also evolve from professional colleagues. She said that getting to know others at work . . . just makes the workplace a much more reasonable environment. . . it just helps me feel more comfortable that I'm not working with just people who are widgets. They're people. . . and because I approach my work life that way, I
have made a lot of friends that are friendships now outside of the workplace.

A specific example of how a work-based relationship developed into a personal friendship involved a female in the police department . . . we started doing all the rape and sexual assault training. We chaired the personal safety committee together. We got to be, you know, pretty friendly; and she came out as a lesbian - had not come out to anybody on campus at all - and that was really important for her to feel, you know, comfortable.

And it took about three years to get to that. . . . But once she was able to do that, we’ve been extremely good friends. . . . She just called me last night [asking] what can I do about this problem: I have to fire somebody, and what do you think? And so, we have kind of one of those [friendships] that crosses work, but it’s friendship.

Yet another example of the role that relationships play for this woman administrator has to do with a group of women administrators who are in Linda’s geographical area.

. . . there’s eight of us . . . and we’ve been getting together for breakfast once a month.
These are women I’ve respected and worked with in some capacity for the last ten years . . . a very important group for me right now, and it grew out of more work kind of situations, working on committees together over the years. . . . I wish it could be more than once a month . . . we share personal stories [as well as] how do I deal with this racial conflict on campus, whatever. We can bring up any topic in group. Very important.

Susan’s stories about relationships are representative of all the participants in my study, and their stories support Gilligan’s theory that relationships are at the centerpiece for the moral development of women.

Concerning the concepts of relationships, of special importance in this study is the relationship that some of the participants have with one another. Although it was not a planned aspect of this project, it turned out that two teams of participants are employed at the same institutions. Carolyn is the president at the college where Susan is the assistant dean of academic affairs, and Diane is the director of residential life and dining services at the same institution where Cecelia is the dean of natural and social sciences.

The relationship between participants that I saw having the greatest impact on constructed knower behavior was with Carolyn as the president who was very supportive
of her assistant academic dean’s, Susan’s, constructed knower behavior. Carolyn supports her staff to behave using the descriptions of the constructed knower (reference Figure 5), and she wants her school to be the kind of school where people feel comfortable and work together, a college that attracts, employs, and encourages teamwork. All of these behaviors are typical of constructed knowers.

As an example of how Carolyn supported constructed knower behavior which included an example of her own constructed knowing behavior, recall the situation referred to earlier in this chapter:

... we were in the middle [of] conducting a national search ... [when we decided to] put in place an entirely new staffing model ... the dean came forward and said, ‘I hate to say this right now, but, I don’t think we should do this. I think we should think about something else.’ So, you realize, you have the politics of this search committee that’s convened, out there doing the best work possible, and I’m gonna tell them we’re not gonna do it anymore ... what they [the search committee] needed to know was that the work that they’d been doing was what helped us figure out that we were gonna do something else ... we were gonna adopt basically a team approach in [the department]
The typical (male) president would have said, "We can't listen to this: we're in the middle of this national search." Carolyn, however, applied her guiding principle of making a decision based on the circumstances of the situation. She encouraged a team approach for which she knew of no role model. It required taking a risk and looking at the situation, looking at the people involved, looking at the needs and resources of the organization. This was a characteristic of the way Carolyn applies her philosophical principles, a characteristic of a constructed knower.

The shift toward fostering understanding and growth and using all kinds of knowing is part of what makes Carolyn's school successful. When Carolyn became president, the college was suffering from enrollment declines and a low self-image. During Carolyn's tenure as president, the school has elevated in both enrollment and increased its academic standards. (Reference section on philosophical principles.)

Our applications are up 25% . . . our admissions deposits are up 97%. And housing deposits have doubled . . . I can't even find words to talk about it.

Not only have the admissions and financial pictures changed at this school, the president has worked with the academic community members' sense of self.
... when I came here, it was always seen as the poor sister ... [there was an] institutional inferiority complex. And, we’re doing lots of good things ... this is a place they’re proud to work in.

Part of the shift in enrollment and self-image has been because Carolyn has brought in people such as Susan who will spend a full year working on one project in order to include everyone’s voice and support: "... we’re learning how to make change collectively" (SRW, p. 15). The result is that everyone owns a piece of the project, changes are institutionalized, and people are committed to the college as a community.

6. An Account of the Growth of a Knower

The cognitive and moral development of the participants provided a fascinating aspect of the interviews. Although each participant referred to her ways of knowing when asked, the unifying thread in Linda’s interview was the theme of her growth as a knower, her cognitive and moral development. Perhaps because she had worked with the theories of this study in her own doctoral dissertation, Linda’s stories during the interview included references to the model developed by BCGT.

Linda’s stories describing her way of knowing as a child and as a student provide an intriguing study about
how a woman can grow and change as a knower. Reflecting on her childhood, Linda described herself: ". . . as a kid, I was very into exploration and . . . that subjective experience . . . testing out everything on your [sic] own." Linda was discovering the voice that comes from her own experience in contrast to the voice of authority given to others. Linda was discovering the voice of the subjective knower at an early age.

Linda further described who she was as a subjective knower, when left on her own, and how she was coerced to be a received knower in school:

as a kid I was much more of a subjective knower outside of school . . . I think what school tried to do to me . . . was to have us be very, you know, learn the facts, memorize reams of data and spit it back out.

In describing what it was like in school, Linda said that she was told to learn in a different way than the way she learned on her own. Rather than assuming that the way she learned was wrong, she maintained her sense of self and simply performed in a different way when required in school. The way she describes being asked to learn in school characterizes learning in a received way.

As she moved through school, Linda blended who she was as a knower with who the school wanted her to be. She recalled being influenced by a librarian who kept asking
her what she learned from each book she read. Linda found herself being prodded by the librarian to analyze how the information she had read related to her own experience.

I didn’t just accept what Burton Wilder said about animals or whatever. I kind of relayed it to what I saw squirrels were doing out in the back yard as opposed to what he said they were doing in the book.

In addition to learning what the author wrote about, Linda was able to maintain her own authority. She compared what she read with what she experienced; then, instead of dismissing her experience because it differed from the author, Linda accepted that what she saw in the backyard was as important as what the author wrote about. Through this process, Linda created knowledge based on her own observations. As we have seen in Chapter I, creating one’s own knowledge is a characteristic of a connected procedural knower.

Linda integrated both her personal way of learning and the way her school wanted her to learn: "... the Catholic schools were not good at enhancing creativity ... I excelled at that [creativity] also ..." Although her school did not reward creativity, Linda maintained her sense of creativity, another example of a connected procedural knower.
A pivotal experience for Linda as a knower came in high school when she consciously integrated her own way of knowing with the way her school wanted her to learn. Linda described the turning point in which she came to a conflict and had to make a decision:

it wasn’t until late in high school that I started to try and [consciously] kind of combine the two [Linda’s beliefs and what the school required] . . . I remember an experience in biology where we had to do the dissection, and I knew I had to do it to get the A . . . but I knew subjectively I could not do it because I could not. It was against my whatever to cut up this animal even though it was dead . . .

Linda believed that it was wrong to dissect an animal. Although she did not have a vocabulary to discuss it, and although she knew her grade would be unacceptable if she chose not to dissect the animal, Linda stood behind her own knowing in confronting an authority figure’s requirement.

The biology experiment encouraged Linda to acknowledge that how she learned was in contradiction to the ways her school wanted her to learn:

So, maybe that was the first . . . concrete time when it hit me that I was trying to kind of inter-relate these two types of knowing . . . how
do I learn, and it wasn’t working within this highly structured type of environment.

With all the other issues confronting an adolescent female, Linda confronted the confusion of who she was as a learner within a system that challenged the way she learned. She was "trying to kind of inter-relate", trying to not have to make a choice between how she knew/learned and the way her school wanted her to know/learn.

When Linda went through her masters degree program, a situation occurred that placed another cornerstone in her understanding of how she "kind of inter-relate[d]" the system of higher education with her own way of knowing. Linda accommodated the authority [her professor] while also validating her own knowing. In one course, all the readings were written by white men, and the class reading list did not include any women authors. In addition, the women class members were not called on to be included in class discussions. When Linda proposed to write her term paper on women in education, the professor was against the idea because he believed that there simply were not enough women of influence to write a paper on.

Going against her professor’s advice, not only did Linda write a paper on women in education, but that paper was her first presentation at a national conference. In retrospect, Linda summarized the importance of the situation by acknowledging that this incident was one of
several reminders in her life to tell her that knowledge-makers (professors) are not all-knowing: I look back on that as a time when it all came together for me: ... that the teachers of our knowledge are not all-knowing. She had known before, and the event in her master’s program was a large reaffirmation. Another affirmation that Linda’s way of knowing was valuable, even if it disagreed with the authorities in her life was to follow.

Eight years later in her doctoral program, Linda pointed out that the authors for one of her classes were all male. Her professor invited her to share a reading list of women authors. The following year, some of the readings Linda suggested appeared in the professor’s class syllabus. Additionally, the bibliography of women authors that Linda voluntarily prepared for the professor was sent by him to other members of his department with the encouragement to include the women authors in their classes.

Linda’s specific experiences describe one woman administrator’s development as a knower. While other participants’ stories showed glimpses of their development as knowers, Linda’s stories involved a deep reflection about herself as a knower.

7. An Account of a Perceived Constructed Knower
Confronting Organizational Norms

One of the most compelling realizations for me was brought out by the research tools. A participant related a
self-image as a constructed knower on the Initial Questionnaire. Yet, during the interviews, she described linear/separate/objective ways that she administered.

Cecelia’s responses to the abstract questions in the Initial Questionnaire have the lowest combined connected/constructed total which indicated that she perceives herself as a connected/constructed knower slightly more than the other participants do. If there were a correlation between the responses to the questionnaire and actual behavior, the total would also predict that Cecelia would behave as a constructed and connected administrator slightly more consistently than the other participants. Instead, many of Cecelia’s stories during the interview about her behavior were not compatible with the behavior of a constructed knower. In comparison to the other participants, Cecelia’s interview stories about her behavior seemed to come from the least constructed position among the participants.

For example, Cecelia described making decisions unilaterally, through a process in which she "played by the rules" and talked about situations "where it was win/lose." In her own words:

"I made some decisions . . .

"I made termination recommendations . . .

"I set clear limits . . .

"I confronted . . .

"I’ve made . . . people retract . . .
"I came along and said no more . . .

"I insisted . . .

"I also insisted . . .

"It was incumbent that someone come in and make some rules . . . there's a point where you have to be clean and direct and say this is it . . ."

These phrases describe a process of having power over the members of her division. They are words which describe the behavior of a separate procedural knower. And, of course, separate procedural knower behavior is associated by BCGT with the ways in which organizations are traditionally run by men.

For a specific example, Cecelia supervised a program director that she described this way: "He wasn't a team player . . . he wasn't consulting the other members of his discipline group [in spending program money]." Cecelia apparently wanted to include others and to be part of a team; here are characteristics that are closely associated with women's ways of knowing.

However, as she continued to tell the story, Cecelia described a leadership behavior which followed the typical organizational norm, making rules and confronting. Because the program director was overspending the program budget and, under the former dean, had been reimbursed without providing documentation, Cecelia decided that "It was incumbent that someone come in and make some rules . . . there's a point where you have to be clean and direct and
say this is it . . ." Making rules, being clean and confronting: characteristics associated with men’s ways of knowing.

In this situation, it would appear that Cecelia blended the two paradigms in her evaluation of the situation and in her behavior in response to the situation. On the one hand, she wanted the staff member to include others, a characteristic of women’s ways of knowing. Yet, on the other hand, she handled the situation the way that men often do, and that is by confronting and making rules.

One of the possible causes of this contradiction between who Cecelia reported herself to be on the Initial Questionnaire and who Cecelia described herself to be in the interview may have to do with the instruments. The Initial Questionnaire is a more objective-type tool which asks for responses on an abstract level. I believe that the Initial Questionnaire did a fair job of getting a start on each participant’s perception of self. In contrast to the Initial Questionnaire, in the interviews I asked participants to tell stories about real situations, to apply the abstract.

Another possible cause of the contradiction between Cecelia’s self-perception via the initial questionnaire and her behavior as described through her interview stories, could be the interplay between the ways of knowing. Behaving from a particular way of knowing is not as clear-
cut in an ambiguous real-life situation as predicting behavior is in a forced-choice abstract situation.

Still another cause of the contradiction between self-perception and behavior could be that making a particular decision could come from a constructed knowing, while the behavior of implementing it may come more from a separate way of knowing. One can construct a rationale for making decisions from connected/constructed way of knowing; but, in a given situation, one might behave from a separate way of knowing.

For example, when Cecelia began her position as dean of sciences, she sent out memos stating that "all previous agreements are off . . . everything is going to be out in the open." Bringing issues to the table, including everyone concerned in discussions, and treating people with equity are characteristics of a constructed knower. However, the description Cecelia gave of the way in which she implemented the decision was the portrait of a unilateral-separate knower: she announced her decision that previous agreements were dissolved, she moved the mail room, and she "made some decisions about personnel . . . made termination recommendations." Cecelia felt that her staff resented her for her decision regarding the canceling of agreements created by the former dean, agreements which compromised the integrity of equitable treatment among people in the various departments in her division; her decision to move a common room; and her decision about
termination notices. She shared that the staffs' reaction "... was very hard and very painful."

The reaction of the staff members may have been a reaction to the decisions, themselves or the way the decisions were made. Or, the staff may have been reacting to the way the decisions were implemented. The decisions and the rationale for making the decisions apparently came from the principles of a constructed knower; but, the implementation of the decisions came from what BCGT would characterize as a male way of knowing, a separate way.

Another reason there may be differences between Cecelia's self-image as a constructed knower and her confrontational behavior is the opportunities for practicing as provided by professional ladders. Another participant, Diane, came up through residential education where she virtually "lived process" on a daily basis including creating community and change in people's behavior, the basis of residential education. Creating community is a characteristic of acting from the constructed way of knowing that is associated with women's ways of knowing.

On the other hand Cecelia taught "creating community" in her sociology classes, an intellectual process. She had little professional opportunity to practice creating community. So, creating relationships was much more a part of the fabric of Diane's behavior than it was Cecelia's. Even though Diane has been a professional one-third of the
length of time that Cecelia has, Diane has consistently confronted administrative decisions with the goal of community.

Cecelia taught about making decisions with community and relationship as the goal for many years. It seems to me that when needing to apply the theory she had been teaching, Cecelia, instead, adopted the institution’s ways of leading by making rules. It seemed that she did not have as much regard for her relationship with the employee as Diane had. This response of Cecelia brings up interesting questions:

1. Did Cecelia only have a theoretical construct?
2. If that is true, does she only have a theoretical construct of women’s ways of knowing? Is it an abstraction for her?
3. Was she thrust into a situation where she did not have an opportunity to practice using women’s ways of knowing as an administrator?

I was unable to find the answers to these questions from the interview.

Another reason for behaving differently from her self-image has to do with organizational support. In contrast to the support that administrators such as Susan receive, Cecelia is the dean of sciences in a small institution where she is unsupported by her supervisors and colleagues. In the three years she has served as dean, Cecelia has
worked with different supervisors and under two different presidents, one of whom she described as "a disaster."

In her previous role of developing the faculty union, Cecelia came up against opposition on a constant basis, much like she is now being challenged as the dean. One develops a set of organizational responses to various situations over time, and one uses those responses as situations arise. Given Cecelia's history of constant non-support at the institution, it is understandable that when asked if she trusted the organization, Cecelia paused. Then, firmly, she replied "No. I do not trust this organization. . . . It has not been an organization . . . where people are accountable. It's a place where people aren't honorable." Cecelia feels that she is on her own.

From the outside, putting a sociologist in charge of the natural sciences looks like a set-up for frustration - both for the organization and for the individual - because natural scientists usually give very little respect to social scientists. Being a social scientist who is the chief administrator for the natural sciences is a very hard position to be in.

I had to learn all the so-called hard sciences vocabulary, working patterns, and things of that sort. . . . And then other things [such as] whether I could have a tough enough skin to go through the kind of personal attacks that
occurred at the end of my first year when I did some of the unpopular things.

While Cecelia has worked diligently gathering the vocabulary of the natural scientists, there was no indication from my interview with her that the natural scientists have responded in kind. Still another possible cause for Cecelia’s contradiction between self-image and behavior has to do with her beliefs about intuition and objectivity. One of the characteristics of the constructed knower is that she uses intuition alongside the more objective ways of knowing (Chapter II). Cecelia related that she tends to make decisions from a logical perspective, and when asked if she used intuition to make decisions, Cecelia responded that

I regard it [intuition] as a clue in situations when I respond both either negatively and positively to really call myself to question on that and to really look at why I have that impression. So, I guess what I do is use it as a signal, but I do then move into my rational logical mode to deal with it [the decision].

Cecelia acknowledged using intuition to get information, but then challenged it. She "... looks for evidence to disprove or support what I think my intuition
is telling me" because "we’re really socialized to mistrust our intuitions":

I think that those of us who went through education programs, Ph.D. programs, in the old days, really excelled because we were very rational, logical thinkers who had learned quite well how to play the doubting game.

Since then, Cecelia has educated herself about trusting her intuition, but filters her notions based on intuition through her objective, rational procedures:

it’s been an adventure in the last twenty years to learn to trust my own intuition and even to be, to be aware when my intuition is telling me something. So, that’s a little harder. . . . I regard it [intuition] as a clue in situations. . . . I really look at why I have an impression.

So, I guess what I do is use it [intuition] as a signal, but I do then move into my rational, logical mode to deal with it.

Reflecting on how she makes decisions, Cecelia described overriding her intuition with her well-developed objective mind. Researchers in Haring-Hidore’s study (see Chapter II) stated that the women administrators they interviewed needed to be more objective in order to be successful in an
objectivity-based hierarchical organization such as higher education.

Cecelia also talked of her feelings about ideas that are abstract: "I love abstract ideas but only in terms of their usefulness. . . . I don’t enjoy ideas for the sake of ideas." Cecelia needs problems to solve that are within the context of her experience. She continued by saying:

I was never good at abstract math. I don’t like literature for the sake of some abstract images. I want them to be concrete and tell me about people and things and process and life and a lot of that.

Cecelia’s feelings about abstract math are supported by other research that girls learn math more easily when there is a math problem to solve that can be applied to their own lives (Chapter II).

Before becoming an administrator, Cecelia was a professor. I taught for a few years at the same institution where Cecelia taught, and I can remember students coming to my classes who had just left Cecelia’s class. They would be talking about what an incredible teacher Cecelia was, how able to teach from a feminist perspective without being offensive to non-feminists. As a professor, Cecelia helped students develop their conceptual thinking skills, helped them develop their own paradigm.
The students described Cecelia as "nurturing" them when she was a professor.

As an administrator, Cecelia described a different behavior set. She described more of the behavior associated with the male paradigm, behavior ruled by logical and rational thinking. Is this what the organization demands from its administrators? She may have the formal authority as an administrator but no longer the informal influence that she had as a professor. If that is so, it is a scary place for a dean to be.

There were many variables in the ways the women administrators accommodate the organizations and in the ways the organizations accommodate the women. Perhaps the continuum of the variables came from each woman administrator as she described the gap between how she perceives she behaves in contrast to how the organization wants her to behave. The full continuum of the variables seemed to be defined on one end by Susan with a small gap: I am who I am, having to compromise very little with who the organization wants me to be. And on the other end of the continuum with Cecelia: "I am a compromise of who I am and who the organization wants me to be."

Cecelia uses intuition as a check but does not trust it; instead, she checks it against logic. Interestingly enough, Cecelia emerges as the one who has had to compromise the most with the rest of the organization.
8. Dealing with Conflict: Linda and Diane

Linda cited her brother’s death as a turning point in her life. Just before his death, Linda and her brother had an argument. Her brother died in an accident before they resolved their differences. Because of this experience, Linda noted that it is important to her to end discussions on a positive note in professional meetings as well as in personal exchanges.

[my brother and I] had one of those stupid teenager fights . . . he died on the 4th of July; and . . . we hadn’t made up or resolved that conflict. And it made me realize that I do not ever wanna leave somebody that I care about in a conflict situation. . . . So, I think that has had an impact on how I approach dealing with conflict. . . . I don’t think I avoid it. But I try and find ways to . . . negotiate it.

Cecelia’s stories indicated that she had incorporated some of the concepts of women’s ways of knowing into her leadership decisions around conflict. Her account of dealing with a difficult situation with a staff member showcased the important role of personal relationships and connections in stressful circumstances. As Diane said, "I believe that my personal connection better equips me at least, and hopefully the both of us [other staff members], to work through professional conflict."
Cecelia’s account of dealing with conflict in her current professional role began with a description of how she responded as a child to being "raised in a really, really very stressful - one of those bad childhood things." It was under these stressful circumstances that Diane found an "inner voice . . . my confidante . . . and I think that voice is still there." Diane’s inner voice continues to guide her in stressful situations.

Dealing with conflict is important for both Linda and Diane. Each woman has different experiences from which to create guiding principles in resolving conflict with Diane using her "inner voice" to guide her.

9. The Constructed Knower Administrator

In Chapter IV, the participants were introduced, interview data was presented, and the perspectives of the participants and myself as researcher were presented. The five women administrators who were interviewed provided much information for analysis. There were similarities as well as differences in how they perceived themselves, how they made decisions, how they communicated, and how they behaved.

The most significant understanding to come from the interviews was the realization that the universal gender difference is not the difference between men’s rules and women’s principles. Rather, the gender difference is how
the rules and principles are applied, what behavior comes from them, and why the behavior is different.

The rigid way that characterizes how men tend to apply their abstract rules and the flexible way that characterize how women tend to apply their principles define the continuum of behavior that is important for administrators in any organization. It is important to have a range of both elements in an organization because organizations need the balance. There is no "right" or "wrong" way to administer . . . it depends on the situation. The focus on the situation as a principle is the distinction between how men and women administrators use their philosophical principles.

In the following chapter, I will analyze the responses, draw conclusions, and explore implications of the participants' reactions.
CHAPTER VI
RESPONSES, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the research tools as they relate to the findings, to explore implications of the study, to draw conclusions, and to speculate on what this research can do for higher education administration.

A. The Research Tools

The Initial Questionnaire and the Interview Questions were the primary sources of information for this study. Secondary information was informally received through the telephone conversations with each administrator’s secretary that I placed to set up an appointment with each participant, and the information I acquired from the environment of each participant’s institution and the space where the interview was conducted.

1. The Initial Questionnaire

In the Initial Questionnaire, participants selected one of five responses in a forced choice inventory. They responded to situations suggested by Bond in her "hypothetical behaviors" chart (Appendix D). From the abstract situations, participants chose a response that would describe their own behavior in each hypothetical situation.
To be specific, let's look at the evaluation totals for the Initial Questionnaire. Obviously, in the Initial Questionnaire, all five participants perceive themselves as behaving from the constructed and connected knower position. Also, each of the participants responded that she behaves from a silent way of knowing less than any other way of knowing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Silent</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Subjective</th>
<th>Separate</th>
<th>Connected</th>
<th>Constructed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecelia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11 Initial Questionnaire Totals*

*the lower the number, the more the participant perceives she behaves as that knower.

2. The Interviews

For the interview questions, I retained the conceptual interview as developed by BCGT and Haring-Hidore, et al. However, there were several problem areas in the actual questions which I addressed.
As noted in Chapter One, both BCGT and Haring-Hidore, et al., were critical of two aspects of their responses. The two aspects involved the low quality of the reflective thinking by the interviewees and the blank stares of the respondents to some of the questions.

These two reactions to the researchers’ questions were confirmed by my own experience. Though I, too, wanted the interviewees to be more reflective, I also looked at the construction of the questions as a reason for the participants’ difficulty in being reflective in their responses.

In contrast to the two groups of former researchers, I began the interview with having the interviewee anchor her responses in her own personal context by recalling and describing a recent experience. When I then asked the interview questions from this context of the interviewees’ experiences, there were rich responses and few blank stares.

Second, I noticed that BCGT and Haring-Hidore, et al., asked their subjects to respond to abstract and general questions. By asking the women a question based on a practical application, I avoided the potential problems of BCGT and Haring-Hidore (See Appendices E and F for a complete list of the questions posed by the two groups.)

Third, BCGT’s analysis was focused on determining how their subjects made meaning. In addition to the goal of
determining how the women I interviewed made meaning, I also wanted to gather information on the following:

1. What is the role of relationships in the women’s leadership style and decision-making?
2. What is the role of feelings in the women’s leadership style?
3. How does understanding and knowing affect the women’s behavior?
4. How do the women’s ways of knowing affect difference or sameness in their personal and professional lives?
5. How have the women changed as knowers? What have been some of the shifts or turning points?

Although I worked on bringing interviewees back to the original questions, I found that the conversational style interview lent itself to departure from the original inquiry. In retrospect, I wish I had redirected the participants back to the original questions more often.

There was one interview in which I felt that I did an adequate job of redirecting. Carolyn easily became involved with tangents, and I did draw her back to basic questions. For example, one of the questions I asked Carolyn about was her shift from preparing for a career in science to preparing for a career in psychology. As she drifted from one topic to another, I kept redirecting Carolyn back to the original question. She was my last
interview, and I believe that I had acquired more experience in redirecting the participants by then.

The quotes I used in the second half of the interviews were not as helpful as the pilot studies indicated they would be. I recall reaching the beginning of the quotes in the interviews and wishing I did not have to cover them: I had too many potentially interesting follow-up questions based on what the interviewee had said which I did not have time to cover.

As I analyzed the interviews, I saw places where I wished that I had made the decision to go with a participant’s comment. During the interviews, I was aware of my time keeper duties. In retrospect, I saw where I went with the script of questions at some points when I should have gone with the participant’s comments.

The length of the interviews was another aspect of the process that I would do differently next time. For this script of questions, I would do a 1 1/2 hour interview and a second follow-up interview. The first hour and a half was intense and tiring. In contrast to the first hour and a half that went quickly, I found that for the last half hour I had to concentrate to focus. The interviewees responses drifted off the subject more in the last half hour, and each participant physically shifted positions more often during that time.

Along with a follow-up interview, I would do a follow-up mailing (see Appendix J) in order to validate
information I received in the interview. When I began analyzing the interviews, a list of questions emerged for which I had not built in a way to help me fill in gaps. Because I had not included the second mailing as part of the agreement with the participants, I felt that I could not ask them for more, after the fact.

B. Responses to Theories

In the "Purpose of the Study" section of this paper, I stated that there were several purposes of this study. In this section, I will explore what the study revealed in relation to testing the two hypotheses.

1. Haring-Hidore, et al.'s, Theory of Constructed Knowers

My first hypothesis, based on Haring-Hidore, et al.'s study, was that randomly selected women administrators in my study would identify, use, or relate to constructed knowing. Based on both the Initial Questionnaire and the interview, I found that all five participants self-identified as connected/constructed knowers and used ways of knowing associated with women in recent research.

The first indication that each woman administrator identified as a constructed knower appeared in the Initial Questionnaire (Figure 11). The constructed knower’s self-perception was also described in each participant’s interview as she told stories describing her behavior from that position. For example, Carolyn described how
important it was to her to have "all members of the community involved, to buy into the process." Diane described the importance of "working in the context of trust." Linda told again and again how important it was to establish "friendships with people I work with." Cecelia talked about "activity that was based on the principles of the good of the institution, the good of the faculty," indicating concern for the people and organization. And Susan talked about coming from "having built substantial relationships with people, trying to understand where they’re coming from, and working from there." (See Chapter V for more in-depth statements of self-perception as constructed knowers.) All of the statements describe characteristics of the constructed knower.

2. Bond’s Theory of Knowing and Behaving

The second hypothesis was based on Bond’s theory that there is a relationship between how one knows and how one behaves. In addition to finding that the participants identified as constructed knowers, I found that the majority of the stories that the participants related during the interviews were stories of behavior based on constructed knowing.

However, I found that behavior did not always follow self-identity as a constructed knower. Indeed, it seemed to me that no one totally behaved from the philosophical
perspective of one category of knowing or another, no matter what her self-perception.

One example of behaving with characteristics from more than one way of knowing occurred with Cecelia. When she first started working with one staff member, "I thought, 'Gees, I can't stand this.'" She could not stand her reaction to his behavior which initially followed the institution's pattern of getting an employee to change: confrontation. As Diane phrased it, "And I got in there and started beating him about the head."

But the employee did not change (Cecelia stated that her behavior "was totally ineffective" p. 8), and Diane was not feeling good about her behavior. With these realizations, Diane quickly decided that instead of confronting, demanding, and badgering the employee to change, "what I needed to do was change my approach."

Diane chose to focus on the relationship with the staff member by doing whatever it took to reach him, even though it involved teasing, a behavior that deviates from what would be considered a feminist approach.

By remaining flexible and changing her approach, by placing the relationship with that individual ahead of a rigidly held principle, Diane stumbled onto an effective technique in working with this employee. She started calling him a nickname, Mr. Man, making fun of his macho self-image, "and that works with him." But when she approached him using strict feminist principles,
... when I went in with the "I am uncomfortable with these behaviors," he would get defensive and protective and dig into his perspective ... but he responded to teasing, and I don't do growth through teasing ... but, I saw him laugh at himself, rather than digging into his behavior. He let it go a little bit. He loosened his grip.

Letting go of her own need to evoke change through the norm of the constructed knower, and letting go of her own need to evoke change using what she perceived to be a feminist and humane constructed knower strategy, Diane learned that having the relationship was more important than her need to either quickly have an employee do as she wanted or rigidly adhere to a particular philosophy of interaction. What she found was that the employee "loves to be teased. I think it's part of how he feels included, respected, and feels visible."

Even though the teasing style is not one she is most comfortable with, Diane chose to use it to get the employee to change because he feels "included, respected and visible," all characteristics which Diane wants to foster when she teases him. In other words, although teasing would not get Diane to change or to feel respected, her staff member experiences teasing differently than from the way Diane would; so, she is willing to meet him half-way by using the process that helps him. Diane is applying her
guiding principle to take the circumstances of the situation into consideration.

Through using teasing as a technique, Diane is honoring his experience, honoring the relationship as more important than administrative styles sanctioned by the organization. Acknowledging and honoring others’ experiences is at the centerpiece of importance for the constructed knower. Diane determined what the staff member needed and responded accordingly.

3. Kanter’s Theory of Position in the Organization

In some organizational development literature, an assumption is made that women and men are equally capable. In her analysis of the influence of organization and socialization on self-concept, Rosabeth Moss Kanter (see Chapter III) seems to assume that the most essential differences between men and women are determined by gender socialization and original placement in the organizational structure. There is an unexamined assumption of Kanter’s thesis that women and men are not only equally capable, but given the same opportunities, women and men would behave in the same ways. (See Chapter III.)

I have a problem with Kanter’s view that women and men would behave in the same ways if given the same opportunities. If the only goal of equality in higher education and other organizations is to enable women to do the same things that men have been doing, then women and
men will simply become equal partners in hierarchy, exclusion, and oppression.

Women must not only have equal access to the male game, women must change the game. Women must change the organizations where they work, not simply be partners with men in hierarchy, exclusion, and oppression. Given the chance, changing the game may not be difficult for women: because women create a philosophical principle of taking the circumstances of individual situations into account, changing the game might not be as hard as it had first seemed.

Underlying the issue of the status of women administrators in higher education is the issue of how women and men influence higher education because of the ways in which they perceive the world. As I have shown in this study, there is new literature which suggests that women and men are different in the way they make meaning of the information they receive, their ways of knowing, and, therefore, in the ways they influence their environment and are influenced by their environment.

If it is true that women and men have different ways of knowing, that women and men have very different perceptions of reality, the issues of women administrators in higher education appear difficult to overcome because the gender differences are always going to be there. In order to overcome them, we have to acknowledge the fact that the differences are going to be there, and women
men must be encouraged to create philosophical principles which allow them to consider the circumstances of situations, such as relationships.

C. Implications for Future Research

It is important to conduct future studies of women administrators in higher education. Numerous topics for further examination emerged from this work. Among the most interesting and important topics are the following:

1. Cognitive Development Research

A critical continuation of this research would be a replication of this study using male administrators in higher education. Another part of the puzzle of cognitive development involves using the interviews of this study and coding them using Perry’s protocol.

Also, Perry and BCGT found that women did not fit Perry’s schema. It would be vital to understanding adult cognitive development to re-evaluate Perry’s study given the new understandings that have emerged from research since the initial research and further to code Perry’s study using BCGT’s protocol.

Again drawing on the new understandings that have emerged from research since BCGT’s research, it would then be appropriate to use BCGT’s original interviews and code them using Perry’s protocol.
2. **Moral Development Research**

Yet another research study on moral development would involve using the interviews of this study and coding them using Kohlberg's protocol. To append to the current investigation, it would then be appropriate to use Kohlberg's interviews and code them using Gilligan's protocol.

3. **A Third Model of Cognitive and Moral Development**

It would be crucial to explore the possibility of synthesizing Perry and BCGT/Kohlberg and Gilligan by creating a third model which is indicated from this research study. The model would acknowledge and research how women use the philosophical principle that allows them to take the circumstances of each situation into account. It would research women's focus on relationships and inclusion. Are they mutually exclusive? Does a focus on the principle exclude a focus on the situation? Is it possible for individual men to learn how to focus on the circumstances of a situation and is it possible for individual women to learn how to focus on the principle? How does an administrator create the environment that invites men and women in the same organization to have that discussion, and out of that discussion comes the decision, the synthesis?

Of special interest would be to further explore the similarities and differences between self-perception and
behavior. What are other variables on the continuum between how an administrator perceives herself and how she behaves in organizations that support her and organizations that do not support her?

4. The Question of the Universal Woman

This study did not take into account the race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, or age of interviewees. It would be helpful to use the interview protocol from this study to determine contrast and relationship across racial lines, age groups, and to examine the implications of special obstacles that lesbian women encounter. Do lesbian women encounter homophobia in addition to encountering sexism?

5. The Imitation Man

There were indications in this study that not all women behave from the model of women’s ways of knowing. Another topic for further research involves women administrators who often behave like men administrators. What makes the difference between being a woman administrator who chooses separate procedural ways of knowing, which is associated with the way men behave, and using connected procedural ways of knowing, which is associated with the way women behave? Where does constructed knowing fit in?
6. **Leadership Behavior**

Another important area for study would be to create a sixth column for Bond’s table on women as leaders (Appendix D). Bond has projected BCGT’s findings on behavior in vital fields. It would be an important contribution to understanding women’s ways of knowing to continue projecting and researching the leadership behavior of women administrators in higher education.

7. **Standardized Tests**

It would be especially interesting to compare the results of this study with the results of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Kolb’s Learning Styles Inventory to determine the contrasts and relations between types, learning styles, and BCGT’s "stages of knowing." Would we be able to determine how an administrator would know or behave in a given situation based on either the Myers-Briggs or Kolb tests?

8. **Administrative Leadership Models: TQM and CQI**

Total Quality Management (TQM) and Continuous Quality Interaction (CQI) as administrative leadership styles are related to this study and a timely topic for further research. It appears to me that each of the two techniques is an attempt to blend the ways that men and women behave in organizations. The majority of the time that I have seen them implemented has not been a blend; rather, the
ways I have seen them implemented have simply allowed administrators to talk out of both sides.

The way the bosses are trying to bridge the gap between the male and female ways of behaving is by saying "this is going to benefit you, and I want you to have a voice...I want to have your input." But, to me, the philosophical piece is missing because the bottom line is still the dollar, the appeal to partnership is really a club, a threat: "you be a team player according to these rules, no matter what the circumstances of the situation, or you leave." Here is the reverse of the philosophical principle that the women administrators in this study use so well.

Many management and organizational theorists have realized since the end of the second world war that the hard-line-hierarchical model of organizational structure and management does not work very well for humans. It works in the short run, but it does not work in the long run. In the long run, it is not good for the health of the people or the organization.

What the management gurus have been recommending is the kind of involvement and alignment with being personal that is much more consistent with a synthesis of the male and female styles. The problem is that they are not aware that the attempts to employ participant and teamwork building really represent a more broadly human attempt at group building. They are not aware that this is an attempt
to restore a balance between male and female ways of interacting and understanding which was squeezed out with the development of the hierarchical organization.

The bottom line much of the time is still power and profitability. So, the TQM and CQI attempts simply become manipulations, using people. "We’re all a team" translates "You play the team game by the rules that we’ve laid out." "We’re all working together" translates "You do what I say."

The implementations of these reforms fall along a continuum. There are some reforms that are clearly manipulations; they simply shift the rules, but, "you had better still abide by them." The reforms are being superimposed on an organization that is not really changing. The attention structure has not changed to one of inclusion, relationships are not a priority, and philosophical principles are still rigidly being used. These reforms become gross manipulations.

There are other reforms that do empower workers more. Some realize that we have to be more broadly human. Things that have been associated with women’s ways of knowing have been integrated into these organizations such as functioning as a team, including people, looking at each situation separately, and being concerned about relationships. In these organizations, bosses really have given up authority, and teams are allowed to chose their
own leaders and to make their own decisions. All of these are part of TQM and CQI.

D. Summary

The topics for further research would serve to expand our understanding of how women administrators know and behave. Further research is necessary for understanding the contributions that women make when they follow their internal voices as administrators in higher education.

Equally important is the research needed to help both men and women administrators understand how they are behaving, why, and the impact of their behavior on people and the organization. Is it possible to educate men to be inclusive when appropriate and women to be objective when appropriate?

E. Conclusions

1. Research on Women Administrators in Higher Education

In this study, I have discussed the ways of knowing of women administrators and how their ways of knowing manifest in their leadership positions in higher education. Research about women's ways of knowing in the administration of higher education has been limited to date. Researchers have not yet had the opportunity to pursue the subject with the breadth or depth of Gilligan in the areas of women's moral development, or BCGT, in the area of research on women's cognitive development.
Even though research in this field is still a work-in-progress, a pattern of findings does seem to be emerging, in part because the number of women in administrative positions is increasing. The pattern seems to describe progressive stages as women administrators gradually increase in number and as women attain higher positions within the organization.

The pattern of findings describes two situations. The first situation is women being excluded from, then coming in small number into, higher education administration positions throughout the country (see Stages One and Two which follow). The second situation that the pattern of findings describes is what happens in each college or university as each organization hires more women administrators (see Stages Three and Four which follow). The stages are described in the present tense because the situations continue to occur.

a. Stage One

The first stage is exclusion. With rare exception, at one point women are virtually shut out of careers as administrators in colleges and universities. As women gain entrance to entry-level positions, a new stage appears.
b. Stage Two

Pearson, Shavlik, and Touchton (PST) (1989) described the second stage in terms of the larger picture: male-dominated higher education admits some women into administrative positions but insist that women adapt themselves to the dominant male ways of thinking and of administering.

In the interviews which I conducted, Cecelia would be an example of this stage (see Chapter V). She is the first woman dean of natural sciences at her institution, an academic area that has traditionally de-valued women's ways of knowing and behaving.

PST report that although male and female consciousness and expression are beginning to be explored as different and equal, women are not yet given equal importance in higher education. This fact did not surprise these researchers:

. . . the first institutions of higher learning in the United States . . . were never meant to provide appropriate education for women. Is it any wonder then that it has taken extraordinary measures to bring about the kind of changes necessary to provide high-quality education for women, free from the prejudices that have quite naturally resulted from history? (p. 8).

According to PST, because women's approaches are so different from men's, and because higher education had not made space for those differences, women have been forced to "accommodate." In this context, accommodation means that women are obliged to live by the values, organizational
structures and systems created by and for men. Until recently, women have negotiated the male higher education system by adapting to men’s values, often giving up their own values in the process.

PST called for changes in "institutions, structures, systems, and organizations....fundamental change to allow for women’s perspectives to emerge [so that] women may be fully who they are" (p. 8). The researchers called for change so that women will not have to do all the accommodating. Just as importantly, institutional change to accommodate women will allow higher education to take advantage of what women have to offer.

c. Stage Three

Another group of researchers published findings that describe the third stage in which male-dominated higher education and women administrators have adapted to each other as more women have gained greater influence in the administration of higher education. Where the first stage was exclusion, and the second stage demanded that women adapt to male modes, the third stage portrays women attempting to straddle the two systems. That is, women may express themselves and act from their female ways of knowing, while at the same time being sure to be skilled in the male ways too.

As administrators in higher education, Haring-Hidore and her associates (1990) wanted to understand how the
growing number of women function in the administration of higher education. They revised BCGT’s questions, interviewed women administrators in higher education, and found that their subjects were faced with responding to two conflicting situations.

First, using the BCGT protocol and confirming BCGT’s earlier findings, Haring-Hidore, et al., found that the women in their study were "constructed knowers," a personal way of knowing associated with women’s inclusive mode and different from the men’s exclusive mode. Constructed knowers are comfortable "creating" knowledge in a subjective way, rather than "uncovering truth" as an objective knower would do.

Although the women administrators in the Haring-Hidore study were in similar professional positions, they had varied backgrounds. Nevertheless, the researchers found that the women administrators’ ways of making meaning, of knowing, were fairly homogeneous.

At first, I saw a conflicting situation in Haring-Hidore, et al.’s study. The researchers valued objectivity and admonished their women administrator participants to be more successful administrators in higher education by being more objective. I had originally seen objectivity as being incompatible with women’s ways of knowing (see Chapter V). After analyzing the interviews in my study, I realized the role objectivity plays in being an administrator in higher education. For example, Linda objectively made a decision...
that courses in her doctoral work needed to include women authors and that she was going to write her term paper on women leaders in education. Through her willingness to take the risk to stand up for what she felt was right, she educated not only her professor, but he shared the information with professors in his department as well as future students. As the Haring-Hidore researchers found, higher education is still dominated by men and mens ways of knowing, and success in higher education usually means using mens ways to some extent.

The participants in both the Haring-Hidore study and this study found that they had to accommodate to male ways of knowing by being objective at times. In these interviews, Amy presented herself as someone who is accommodating to the requirements of the organization. She appropriately used objectivity when deciding whether to give termination notices to instructors who had been given chance upon chance of bringing their teaching skills to an acceptable level. Also, Diane used objectivity in determining that "Mr. Man" must be called on his behavior. And, they discovered through experience that objectivity was a useful tool to have in organizational relations because some situations call for it. Being able to access all ways of knowing, including the separate procedural knowing characteristics which is associated with objectivity, is a characteristic of a constructed knower.
Thus, the challenge: the collaborative researchers in Haring-Hidore’s group said that to be effective administrators, women administrators had to earn their place in this male-dominated institution by combining their constructed and intuitive (women’s) ways with objective (men’s) ways of knowing. The researchers concluded by admonishing constructed knowers to also be like objective leaders:

It is incumbent upon constructed knowers to hone their leadership skills and improve their practice in order to escape harsh criticism of what many consider an unpardonable weakness -- lack of objectivity.

d. Stage Four

The fourth stage of the interaction between women’s increasing administrative influence and higher education’s response is to move beyond male dominance in the administrative culture of higher education. This stage represents a shift in perspective from a model that demands that women adapt to a dominant male mode to a model that values the intrinsic worth of the female mode, fully accepting it, and balancing the two systems.

Carolyn and Susan, working together in their college, are demonstrating stage four. They are creating an environment in which people feel included, solve problems over long periods of time, and they understand that solving
problems are processes rather than technical problems to solve.

2. **A New Paradigm for Higher Education Administration**

   Emphasis on men’s standard of individual achievement and status has served organizations to this point in terms of productivity and competition. The rigid, rule-bound, status hierarchies have also created environments that are ineffective and unhealthy for the people in the organization and are bad for the organization, itself. Amy is an example of the dissonence created when rigid rules are applied and people in the organization are forced into behaving according to strict organizational norms that do not take the circumstances of situations into account.

   It is now time to incorporate attention on women’s standards of relationships and connections. When coupling the emphasis on relationship with the need for productivity, the potential for the same productivity is there. But, coupled with the productivity are people who say that the organization "wears well." If people work in a common enterprise, and they are powerful participants, the organization will be as or more productive than it was before.

   Assimilating women’s ways of knowing into the organizational structure and culture would not only sanction the characteristics, but it would also open these characteristics up for men to develop. When women are not
allowed to administer using constructed ways of knowing, all are deprived. Diane is currently working on this very issue. She is working to introduce "Mr. Man" to inclusive and relational behavior. In the process, she is modeling for him and her staff how to compromise with others instead of just confronting them.

Administrators who tend to be interactive and collaborative, who tend to include relevant people in decisions, who tend to ask new questions and develop new solutions, who tend to be flexible, who tend to balance personal ambition with the needs of the group, and who tend to desire to empower everyone - leaders like this would benefit any institution they serve. Leaders with these characteristics can bring people together in a common enterprise, can help people work more effectively together, can help people share information more productively. Susan clearly empowered the committee she worked with for a year in order to create the ground swell needed to institutionalize a major change in the way her institution treated students around registration. The process was as important as the product for both Susan and the institution.

In addition, leaders with the characteristics of a constructed knower help staff members move beyond self-interest to concern for the overall organization. Equally important, as members of the administrative team, they help the organization move beyond concern for the overall
organization to thinking of the effects of decisions on each member of the organizational community. These leaders inspire others to consider challenges and problems as opportunities, to question basic assumptions, to think for themselves, and to encourage staff members to aspire to achieving their own highest potential.

For example, Diane has used her relationship with "Mr. Man" to inspire staff members. She has modeled her willingness to admit mistakes and used the process to move herself and her staff through a challenge to an opportunity. Linda gave a clear message about caring for others and about moral decisions when she refused to participate in the meeting to convince the woman to drop the assault charges. Leaders like these are clear benefits to any organization.

Once an institution acknowledges the value of traits like these, it is likely to encourage them rather than to require the people who embody them to submerge the traits in deference to a set of other characteristics which challenge them. Indeed, simple self-interest should lead an institution to encourage the full expression of women's ways of knowing. To include characteristics that women generally possess transforms higher education administration so that all are beneficiaries. Inclusive leadership, more readily used by women, is enriching for men and women as well as for organizations. Certainly that has been the case at Carolyn's institution, where morale is
higher, admissions are up, and the organization is thriving.

An organization such as higher education takes a consequential step when it moves from seeing women’s ways of knowing as just different to seeing them as different and valuable. That critical shift in position moves the institution from exclusion, resistance, or intolerance to fully accepting and equalizing.

Establishing the equality of women’s ways of knowing, expressing, and acting brings higher education to the threshold of a whole new paradigm. That paradigm was implied by BCGT:

When scientific findings, scientific theory, and even basic assumptions of academic disciplines are reexamined through the lens of women’s perspectives and values, new conclusions can be drawn and new directions forged that have implications for the lives of both men and women (pp. 8-9).

What higher education can have is a blended mode of knowing, communicating, and deciding that can expand and enrich both genders. As more women enter positions of decision-making and responsibility, as more women enter the administration of higher education, women can learn to blend emotion and reason, subjective and objective, in their professional lives much like Carolyn is doing. She objectively acknowledged the need to change the direction a major search was going; yet, the sensitivity she used in handling the change incorporated her emotions and intuition.
And, equally important, men as professionals can learn to integrate their reason with emotion, their objective with the subjective. As each gender feels empowered to express its own ways of knowing and doing, as each gender assimilates characteristics that have previously been relegated to the other gender, as each gender understands the ways of the other, a new and valuable synthesis emerges from the previous polarity of male and female. That synthesis gives us something more whole, more fully human.

As far back as 1979, Palmieri wrote, "A better understanding of women's experience would permit, even force, a far-reaching revision of the broader fields of higher education and intellectual life in the United States" (quoted in BCGT, p. 190). Sixteen years later that revision is occurring, and women constitute the vanguard of the change.

The current movement to include women acknowledges the differences in women and men, and demands a change in the standard against which women are measured. By claiming their own attributes and voice and creating a new yardstick, women are forging more options for themselves now rather than only trying to fit into a man's world.

They are negotiating with men to create a world of equals:

Women are calling for institutions to recognize their worth fully and to stop assuming that knowledge about men and men's lives necessarily speaks to women and their lives . . . to start systematically educating women for leadership in society . . . to stop expecting them to give up their own strengths as women to become part of the male system. (PST, p. 444)
As women enter administration and higher education accepts their ways of knowing, a more balanced or equal educational system may emerge. Higher education needs women for the same reasons that all modern organizations need them: to balance the one-sided and increasingly dangerous paradigm of separateness, competition, and hierarchy that expresses the ascendancy of male ways of knowing.

Gilligan and BCGT brought us to the edge of the male paradigm in human development by differentiating between the human experience and the male experience. Beyond that edge, the new paradigm honors many voices and calls upon higher education to reconsider and reconcile gender differences. It offers the opportunity for higher education to allow expansion and development of the modes of knowing, saying, and doing that are most comfortable for both genders.

The shared conclusion of Miller, Gilligan, BCGT, and Tannen, that women are not all one way and that men are not all another way, is critical. Rather, women tend to exhibit one set of qualities and men another. Any two individual females or any two individual males may at times demonstrate more variation than exist between individual females and males. But, in general, women seem to favor one end of the continuum and men the other, and there is also a large area of overlap (see Figure 12).
Acknowledging the equal value of each gender's way of meaning-making invites investigation into specific qualities that have previously been ignored. Researchers are beginning to see that illuminating women's qualities contributes to the understanding that each gender's way of knowing is equally viable, that one way or the other may be more appropriate in specific circumstances, and, most importantly, that they are supposed to work together.

3. A New Paradigm for Higher Education: Women as Leaders, The Example of Politics

Is a blended paradigm of women and men's ways of knowing a viable possibility? Can higher education succeed in honoring women's unique strengths as leaders after they have been disempowered until now? Women's rapidly rising role in politics suggests that it can. The political arena can be used as a forerunner in blending women and women's ways of knowing with men's ways.

Because much of the power in society concentrates in political institutions, changes in the political culture have a ripple effect on many other institutions, including
higher education. This country is in the midst of a change concerning women’s participation in important institutions throughout our society, a change that is being led in many ways by women’s changing roles in the political system.

BCGT showed that women have tended to look to men as authorities, not to women, because men have dominated leadership in public life. Some of that is changing now. A massive response in 1991 to the Senate Judiciary Committee’s handling of the Clarence Thomas confirmation hearings; the widespread success of women candidates in the 1992 elections; the prominence of Hillary Rodham Clinton, an extremely effective woman, in the White House; the confirmation of the first woman attorney general; the presence of two women in the Supreme Court when there were none a decade ago; and other developments have politically catalyzed women. Women who have been working for acceptance in politics now find the public ready for a change, and they are moving to the forefront to sculpt a new political vision.

In order to leave their place as outsiders and to join the political process, women have had to overcome internal as well as external resistances. Former Governor Madeline Kunin of Vermont has said,

It is not lack of polling data or campaign contributions which keeps many women from ascending higher on the political ladder. It is fear and loathing of the political system itself (Goodman, 1989).
This is the kind of thing Amy is feeling when she says she wants to make a change. Amy’s feeling of her place in the institution is in contrast to the caring and inclusive environment being created by Eva and Dee. Precisely this fear and loathing, and their alienated status as former outsiders, make women effective agents for changing politics-as-usual. Governor Ann Richards of Texas said in her 1992 commencement address at Smith College, "Perhaps because we have been watching the show as spectators for so long, we are less likely to get caught up in the trappings and the ceremony."

Because women have been watching men make decisions that uphold the status quo, they have less investment in maintaining that status quo. Women, says Richards, can ask the question, "Why are we doing it this way? [and not accept the response] Because we’ve always done it that way." According to Richards, women may be more inclined to try different solutions because they have previously been excluded from the dominant process. Or, as Gilligan and BCGT noted, women simply tend to place less emphasis on status and are, therefore, open to new solutions.

And what precisely are the changes that women are bringing to the system? Madeline Kunin described some of what women want: "We would like to be advocates of...a less adversarial and more consensus-built system -- that is what we are more comfortable with..." (Goodman, 1989).
Consensus, inclusion: here again are the earmarks of the female paradigm.

Women are also bringing a second innovation to American culture. Although some people suggest that women seeking change want to turn our society into a matriarchy, this would be as limiting as the patriarchy we now have. Richards phrased it well in her commencement address: "Matriarchy is not what we’re after. When the scales are weighted in favor of one gender over another, there is exclusion and division" (p. 2). It appears to be inherent in women’s ways of knowing to integrate; so, instead of barring men’s thinking, women will work with men to incorporate both modes into decision making.

Women are being elected and appointed to important positions, not to displace men, but rather to rise to the challenge of change needed in leadership. And, as they come, women leaders are not only playing the leadership game; they are also changing the rules in order to have the system connect to, take care of, and include all of the ways of knowing that express the human condition.

For many such women, the goal is not to take power for power’s sake. Rather, as Governor Richards put it, women will join the process where there is support for making "just decisions, humane decisions, and where leadership is determined to meet the needs of all who are affected by it" (p. 6). Women are leading the way in balancing the
strengths of the patriarchal method with the strengths of
the matriarchal method.

Women are educational leaders who place equal value on
the processes of men and women. If men who still control
organizations accept that it is advantageous to both
genders to incorporate women and women’s ways of knowing
into the organization, the next step is to change our
organizations to reflect this reality. We need to put what
we know to work on the practical level by changing
organizational mores and patterns of habitual behavior that
have exclusively reflected male modes of knowing,
communicating, and making decisions. My concern in this
paper is to better understand one change: the impact of
women on one important organization of this society, the
administration of higher education and its impact on them.

Is it too early to say that hierarchies have seen
their day? It is clear to some that hierarchical
organizations are less efficient and less responsive to
human needs than more inclusive organizations. In
hierarchies there have to be losers, some individuals are
more powerful than others, and that power is based on
position instead of merit and the respect of colleagues.

Growing awareness of the contrast of hierarchical male
ways of knowing to the inclusive female ways of knowing is
giving women access to higher levels of administration.
Now, more women are in positions where they support and
nurture colleagues as well as rationalize and analyze fundamental policy.

When value is given to social interaction and decision-making that are characteristic of women’s ways of knowing, advantages of this more inclusive style appear. Women’s ways of leading base the position of power on cooperation, give importance to building relationships, and emphasize involving all people. Inclusive organizations are based on teams of employees acting as equals, exhibiting a willingness to reconsider assumptions. When women’s ways of knowing are honored, the focus is to complement, not to compete.
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DESCRIPTION OF PERRY’S STAGES

The following list gives a description of each of Perry’s positions. I have included a few selected descriptors from BCGT. The descriptors come from Perry except where noted.

1. Basic Dualism

   a. "student views the world in polarities of right and wrong, we and they, and good and bad" (BCGT, pp. 9-10)
   b. "passive learners are dependent on authorities to hand down the truth; dependency and trust in external authorities" (BCGT, pp. 9-10).
   c. "Problems solved by ...obedience, conformity to the right...will power and work should bring congruence of action and reward. Multiplicity not perceived. Self defined primarily by membership in the right and traditional" (Perry, foldout).
   d. "This set of assumptions may indeed be the simplest which a person in our culture may hold on epistemological and axiological matters and still be said to make any assumptions at all" (Perry, p. 59).
   e. "...the simplest set of assumptions about the nature of knowledge and values"
   f. "the world of knowledge, conduct and values is divided in two"
   g. construes all issues of truth and morality in the terms of a sweeping and unconsidered differentiation between in-group vs. out-group (p. 59).
   h. divides world between Authority-right-we, as against the alien world of illegitimate-wrong-others (p. 59).
   i. morality consists of committing to memory, through hard work, an array of...correct responses, answers, and procedures, as assigned by Authority (p. 59).
   j. Authority’s omniscience is so taken-for-granted that no distinction is made between Authority and the Absolute (p. 59).
   k. the form of the assumptions appears to derive from childhood experience at more concrete levels of function (p. 60).
   l. [these assumptions emerge] in consciousness at the abstract level [when] we are considering when a person first asks...‘what is truth?’...(p. 60).
   m. Only three or four of our students seem to have come to college while still viewing the world from this Position’s epistemological innocence (p. 60).
   n. [Authority and Truth are the same] (Perry, p. 61)
o. ...the student’s remark that when he came to college he didn’t suppose there was such a thing as a question that had more than one answer suggests that the parochialism of Position 1 may not bespeak 'intolerance' in the reactive or pejorative sense. It may express no more than the outcome of a culturally homogeneous or narrow environment. (Perry, p. 65).

p. In our records, the students appear to bring with them the expectation of identification with the college community. Students who arrive looking at the world from Position 1 simply transpose to the college the same sense they have developed in the community from which they come. The pressure for change therefore emerges for them as anomalies of experience from within the boundaries of this community (Perry, p. 65).

q. In our records, the confrontation with pluralism occurs most powerfully in the dormitory (Perry, p. 69).

2. Multiplicity Pre-legitimate

a. "student becomes aware of multiple perspectives that others hold (BCGT, pp. 9-10)

b. comes to understand that authorities may not have the right answers (BCGT, pp. 9-10)

c. comes to understand that some issues are a matter of opinion and taste instead of fact" (BCGT, pp. 9-10)

d. "Multiplicity perceived, but only as alien or unreal. ‘Others are wrong and confused’...leads to Opposition [to Authority]: ‘I am right; They (Authority) are needlessly confused (M).’...M is perceived but not as a signal of legitimate, epistemological uncertainty," (Perry, foldout).

e. [This ‘revolt’ is not against] "a homogeneous lower-level orthodoxy but against heterogeneity" (p. 73).

f. Perry = In [revolting the student] not only narrows the range of his materials, he rejects the second-level tools of critical analysis, reflection, and comparative thinking (Perry, p. 73).

g. As a developmental step from Position 1, this is a bold lonely renunciation of [Truth] in loyalty to self (Perry, p. 75).

h. If, at this early level, a student has taken his stand in Opposition against what he perceives as the vague chaos of Multiplicity gratuitously thrown at him by his teachers, he cannot use his education to work through the initial impression of needless confusion to the discovery of contextual Relativism (Perry, p. 75).
i. He [the student] accords pluralism of thought and judgment the status of a mere procedural impediment intervening between the taking up of a problem and finding the answer (Perry, p. 78).

j. ...wrestling with uncertainties is only a means toward the attainment of a certainty which Authority already has in its possession...(Perry, p. 78).

k. Management is suspected of presenting complexity simply as a covert way of eliciting more work (Perry, p. 79).

l. ...the limit of uncertainty...seemed to lie between the precision of the sciences and the vagueness of the humanities...(Perry, p. 79).

m. procedural versus interpretive: scientific vs. philosophical

n. ...sense of joy in the world’s opening up and of discovering diversity...freedom for self-regulation (Perry, p. 84).

o. [at this stage there are] tentative steps into individual responsibility, and they are forced by Authority itself (Perry, p. 85).

p. Authority is still there to help and to tell you what to do, but you must now go to Them; They won’t come to you (Perry, p. 85).

q. ...uncertainty and groping are legitimate and respectable only within strict limits. One should...know the answer or be able to find it quickly (Perry, p. 87).

r. ...despite all bewilderment and protest, a major concession has been made: some complexity, some groping in uncertainty has been given a place (Perry, p. 87).

s. As long as it is still conceived as a temporary exercise or a narrow area of freedom for exploration, Multiplicity has of course not yet attained the status of epistemological legitimacy (p. 87).

t. the Absolute remains secure and close at hand. The concession, however, has opened a path toward doubt (Perry, p. 88).

3. Multiplicity Subordinate - (not included in BCGT)

a. "Multiplicity perceived with some of its implications...Absolutes are not yet in view. But trust in Authority, at least in the ideal, is not threatened. Exercises in M may be enjoyed (A) or disliked (Ad)," (Perry, foldout).

b. ...student makes room in his epistemology for a legitimate human uncertainty...[it does not affect] the nature of truth itself...it only affects man’s relation to [truth]
c. the accommodation has loosened the tie between Authority and the [Truth] (Perry, p. 89).

d. How...are answers judged? This is the problem which preoccupies students...from this structure (p. 89).

e. uncertainty and complexity are realities

f. Authority has been perceived as grading on amount of rightness, achieved by honest hard work...[now] rightness and hard work vanish as standards [as professors (Authorities) are seen to grope for answers, too] (Perry, p. 90).

g. [the student] has the necessity to discover the grounds on which his own opinions are being graded (p. 91).

h. this sense of quantity is so pervasive, or even overwhelming...complexity and diversity are first experienced as irreducible (p. 91).

i. still sees the world of truth and value as the domain of Authority (p. 92).

j. Authority's insistence on continuing to pass judgment on their opinions even on matters about which Authority itself acknowledged ignorance of the Right Answer (p. 95).

4. Multiplicity Correlate or Relativism Subordinate

a. "an analytical, evaluative approach to knowledge is consciously and actively cultivated; a transition stage" (BCGT, pp. 9-10)

b. "Duality restructured in complex terms: right-wrong vs M. Absolutes may be doubted in M area or considered so inaccessible as to be impossible to bring to bear on human affairs...'anyone has a right to his own opinions'...this is still 'how they want us to think,' rather than a consequence of the nature of all knowledge" (Perry, foldout).

c. students split into one of two groups at this stage to understand 3 i, and rejoin at the fifth stage (p. 95).

d. each of the two views was developmentally equivalent [because] each represented an ultimate extension or accommodation of the old fundamentally dualistic structure before its capitulation to the vision of a generalized contextual Relativism (p. 95).

e. [one group of students conforms to Authority and learns the tools of intellectual independence] (p. 96).

f. [the second group of students] fight for their independence 'from' Authority...and pit themselves against the enemy within the very dualistic structure which they perceive Authority to be imposing upon them (p. 96).
g. [students in the conforming group are also broken into two groups: those who cooperate with Authority will 'catch on' to the skills of critical thought. The second group performs "purely in the context of 'what They want', and it remains an act of conformity, with final responsibility lying outside the thinker" (p. 96); it is difficult for an outsider to know from which of the two sub-groups a student is coming]

h. [Multiplicity correlate - the question remains:] what meaning will he ascribe to Authority’s evaluating his opinions in areas in which They acknowledge ignorance of The Answer? (p. 98).

i. M C = the Oppositional student...becomes entrapped by his own argumentativeness...he demands that Authority justify itself by reasons...and by evidence...[setting himself up to having] to do the same (p. 99).

j. M C = the bridge to the new world of comparative thought lies in the distinction between an opinion...and a supported opinion

k. MC = involves setting Multiplicity, as a world of its own, against the world of Authority (p. 100).

l. [Relativism Subordinate] this is the path from Position 3 to the vision of Relativism...that the majority of students followed (p. 100).

m. Relativism subordinate... allows the discovery of Relativism in Multiplicity to occur in the context of Authority’s world where Multiplicity is still something 'They want us to work on' (p. 100).

n. [RS - acknowledging the difference between 'what They want' to 'the way They want you to think']...is the structural foundation of Relativism (pp. 100-101).

o. RS - weighing of ‘more than one factor’ ...forces a comparison of patterns of thought, that is, a thinking about thinking (p. 101).

p. RS - independent-like thought gets good grades. Genuine independence of thought...is met later (p. 102).

q. Position 4 opens up ...escape through detachment (p. 107).

r. The ground is laid for a community in which 'we and They' can merge (p. 108).

s. [students assign relativism to a subcategory of dualism, a special case under dualism] (p. 109).

5. Relativism Correlate, Competing, or Diffuse

a. "student fully comprehends that truth is relative" (BCGT, pp. 9-10).

b. [student fully comprehends] that the meaning of an event depends on the context in which that
event occurs and depends on the framework that the knower uses to understand that event, and that relativism pervades all aspects of life (BCGT, pp. 9-10).

c. student understands that knowledge is constructed, not given, contextual, not absolute, mutable, not fixed (BCGT, pp. 9-10)

d. it is within relativism that Perry believes the affirmation of personal identity and commitment evolves," (BCGT, pp. 9-10).

e. "Relativism perceived as way of perceiving, analyzing and evaluating, not because 'They want us to think this way,' but intrinsically" (Perry foldout).

f. [There seem to be three stages of relativism: correlate, competing, or diffuse. Relativism Diffuse is] "the most fully developed of these structures" (Perry foldout).

g. [this stage] "accounts for a drastic revolution" (p. 109).

h. [so far] the students have been able to assimilate the new...to the fundamental dualistic structure with which they began...new [beliefs have] naturally forced them to make certain accommodations in the structure (p. 109).

i. [the students are at a stage of] radical reperception of all knowledge as contextual and relativistic (p. 109).

j. [student now moves relativism] "to the status of context...and assign dualism to the subordinate status of a special case" (p. 109).

k. [during this fifth stage, the student processes his knowledge that] the failure of a dualistic framework to assimilate the expanding generalization of Relativism (p. 110).

l. [the structuring of the relativistic world] is devoid of that focusing element of individual relevance that characterizes later developments (p. 110).

m. [this stage is] loose and vulnerable (P 110)

n. Relativism is perceived as the common characteristic of all thought, all knowing, all of man's relation to his world (p. 111).

o. the revolution [that occurs at this stage] is both the most violent accommodation of structure in the entire development, and at the same time the most quiet...almost no student in our sample referred to it as a conscious event, a discrete experience, a "realization" (p. 111).

p. what seems to happen is this. Relativistic thinking... gradually becomes habitual...first in...specific situations...then the student discovers new areas in which it is appropriate (p. 111).
q. this expansion, at first conscious, deepens the
tendency of the activity to become habitual...it
ceases to demand self-conscious attention (p.
112).

r. Complexity is assumed as a general state...and
dualism is now a special case (p. 113).

s. Both Relativism Correlate and Relativism
Competing should properly be thought of as
containing unresolved elements of transition.
The completed revolution is designated by our
title Relativism Diffuse (p. 115).

t. We chose the word "Diffuse" for its connotation
of vagueness or lack of focus...the student has
not yet faced...the personal and social
implications of his discovery. He may...feel
lost and confused in his new world, but he is
still without a clue as to what he might do about
it (p. 115).

u. authorities must themselves be groping in a
relativistic world. The hierarchical relation to
authorities is now balanced by a horizontal
relation in a shared context [this is a new
structure of community] (p. 122).

v. To observe both an act and its context, one
requires an alternate context in which to stand.
In offering a plurality of contexts, Relativism
provides the ground for detachment and for
objectivity (p. 126).

w. In our records no student who had once accepted a
relativistic epistemology as context showed
evidence of a generalized "regression" to
absolutism (p. 130).

6. **Commitment Foreseen** - (not included in BCGT)

a. Student will apprehend the implications of
personal choice in a world he assumes to be
relativistic (Hoffman).

b. despite the relativism of truth, I must decide
and act on my decisions (Hoffman).

c. "R accepted...Commitment may be perceived as a
logical necessity for action in an R world..."
(Perry, foldout).

d. If one construes knowledge and values as
relativistic, one is therefore threatened with
the possibility of humanly unbearable
disorientation (p. 134).

e. The word "Commitments," then, refers to
affirmations: in all the plurality of the
relativistic world - truths, relationships,
purposes, activities, and cares, in all their
contexts - one affirms what is one's own (p.
135).
f. He must affirm his own position from within himself in full awareness that reason can never completely justify him or assure him (p. 136).

g. He must commit himself through his own faith [examined beliefs] (p. 136).

h. Commitment is the act of an examined life (p. 136).

i. Commitment is foreseen as the resolution of the problems of relativism, but it has not yet been experienced (p. 137).

j. [there is] a new sense of responsibility for one’s own life and for others (p. 138).

7. **Initial Commitment** - (not included in BCGT)

   a. "First Commitment(s) or affirmation(s). Acceptance of their origins in self’s experience and choices, some intimations of implications" (Perry, foldout).

   b. the setting has now become stabilized. From this point onwards, our records reveal no major restructuring of the background of life (p. 153).

   c. The assumption is established that man’s knowing and valuing are relative in time and circumstance, and that in such a world the individual is faced with the responsibility for choice and affirmation in his life (p. 153).

   d. development now centers on this theme of responsibility (p. 153).

   e. [the student] discovers that he has undertaken not a finite set of decisions but a way of life (p. 153).

   f. [Positions 7, 8, and 9] describe degrees of seasoning which we felt to be broadly distinguishable (p. 153).

   g. Position 7 describes that state in a student’s life in which he has undertaken to decide on his own responsibility who he is, or who he will be, in some major area of his life (p. 153).

   h. Initial Commitments may emerge from one’s past, or from recently discovered interests, or from identifications (p. 156).

8. **Orientation in Implications of Commitment** - (not included in BCGT)

   a. "Some implications of Commitment realized: tensions between feelings of tentativeness and finality, expansion and narrowing, freedom and constraint, action and reflection. Prospect of (or even experience of) membership with authority in areas of Commitment (values, address to others, occupation, etc.)..." (Perry, foldout).
b. Position 8 describes a level of experience in which the stylistic issues of Commitment have emerged in greater prominence over external forms (p. 154).

c. Initial commitments do not settle as much as they seem to promise (p. 158).

d. Integrity of purpose in Commitment, together with freedom from old external constraints, require the individual to decide for himself how much he will judge his performance on his own experience of it, and how much value he will put on external judgments and rewards (p. 163).

9. **Developing Commitment(s) - (not included in BCGT)**

a. "Commitments expanded or remade in new terms as growth. Balances are developing in the tensions of qualitative polarities of style, especially alternation of reflection and action...Sense of being ‘in’ one’s life" (Perry, foldout).

b. Position 9 describes a maturity in which a person has developed an experience of "who he is" in his Commitments both in their content and in his style of living them (p. 154).

c. [this position] enlightened the character of Position 8.
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The following includes the authors' descriptions of their categories. The descriptors are taken from BCGT, page 15, except where noted.

1. **SILENCE**
   
   a. women experience themselves as mindless and voiceless and subject to the whims of external authority;
   b. representing an extreme in denial of self and in dependence on external authority for direction (p. 24);
   c. sees life in terms of polarities (p. 30);
   d. there is absolute truth that is true for everyone (p. 69);
   e. there is no comparison in the Perry system.

2. **RECEIVED KNOWLEDGE**
   
   a. listening to the voice of others
   b. women conceive of themselves as capable of receiving, even reproducing, knowledge from the all-knowing external authorities but not capable of creating knowledge on their own;
   c. strengthened through the empowerment of others, being thrust into roles of responsibility for others helps erode he belief that they are dependent on "them" for "truth," the act of giving rather than receiving that leads them to a greater sense of their capacity for knowing and loving (p. 47);
   d. there is absolute truth that is true for everyone (p. 69);
   e. this is comparable to Perry's dualistic stage.

3. **SUBJECTIVE KNOWLEDGE**
   
   a. truth and knowledge are conceived of as personal, private, and subjectively known or intuited; subjectivism is still dualistic in the sense that there is still the conviction that there are right answers...the fountain of truth simply...now resides within the person and can negate answers that the outside world supplies (p. 54);
   b. private conviction that authorities could be wrong and that everyone should do as he or she wants (p. 67);
   c. differentiation between thinking and feeling occurs for the first time (p. 69);
d. truth is absolute only for the individual... each person’s life experience gives a different view of reality from that of any other person (p. 70);

e. subjectivity is an interchangeable stage with the multiplicity step in the Perry system because of its emphasis on personal truth (p. 62);

f. usually means a denial of external authority (p. 134).

1. **the inner voice** - as women find their inner source of strength, a major developmental transition follows that has repercussions in their relationships, self-concept and self-esteem, morality, and behavior (p. 54); inner power (p. 57); firsthand experience is a valuable source of knowledge (p. 61);

2. **the quest for self** - often the new definition of self comes in terms of opposition to others, in opposition to family values (pp. 78-79); actively and obsessively preoccupied with a choice between self and other, minimal forethought and reason to "walk away from their pasts" (p. 77); shift away from the familiar contexts and relationships within which the old identity is embedded, often seem bewildered over the sense of loss of themselves once they distanced themselves from the feedback and reinforcement that family and community provided (p. 81); going it alone produces isolation from others (p. 83); the quest for self is the quest for voice (p. 133) and is primary (p. 134).

4. **PROCEDURAL KNOWLEDGE**

a. women usually arrive at this way of knowing after relying on a mixture of received and subjective knowledge, then encountered situations in which their old ways of knowing were challenged (p. 88);

b. make own choices while considering other’s needs (p. 91);

c. women are invested in learning and applying objective procedures for obtaining and communicating knowledge (p. 15);

d. the development of this way of knowing requires formal instruction; conscious, deliberate, systematic analysis knowing (p. 93);

e. women become increasingly skillful at executing procedures for obtaining and communicating knowledge combined with an increasing sense of control (p. 96);
f. the world is more complex and more manageable (pp. 96-97);
g. knowledge is a process, procedures are developed for understanding where others are "coming from" and how people go about forming their opinions, feelings, and ideas (p. 97);
h. more objective than subjective (p. 98);
i. practical, pragmatic problem solvers; to understand what is "real," you treat a situation as independent of your existence rather than use it for your own convenience or reinforcement ...treat it as you would a friend (p. 99).

1. the voice of reason - achieved upon encountering authorities who are not only benign but knowledgeable (p. 93); communication can occur, but it requires talk (p. 97);

2. separate and connected knowing - understanding implies personal acquaintance with an object while knowledge implies separation from the object and mastery over it (p. 101); the focus is not on knowing how They (authority) think, but in how they (equal status) think...the purpose is not justification but connection; orientation toward impersonal rules (separate knowing) versus orientation toward relationship (connected knowing) (p. 101); critical thinking is at the core of separate knowing, separate knowers are the opposite of subjective knowers (p. 104); connected knowers develop procedures such as empathy for gaining access to other people’s knowledge, see the other in the other’s terms; connected knowers begin with an interest in the facts of other people’s lives, but they gradually shift the focus to other people’s ways of thinking; separate knowers learn through explicit formal instruction how to adopt a different lens (p. 115); connected knowers begin with an attitude of trust, their purpose is not to judge but to understand, women seem to take naturally to a nonjudgmental stance (p. 116); connected knowing arises out of the experience of relationships...requires intimacy and equality between self and object, not distance and impersonality...goal is understanding, not proof...mothers served as models for connected knowing and fathers served as models of separate knowing (p. 183).
CONSTRUCTED KNOWLEDGE

a. integrating the voices of feeling and thinking - women view all knowledge as contextual, experience themselves as creators of knowledge, and value both subjective and objective strategies for knowing (p. 15);
b. begins as an effort to reclaim the self by attempting to integrate knowledge that they felt intuitively was personally important with knowledge they had learned from others (p. 134);
c. this position is preceded by a period of intense self-reflection and self-analysis (p. 135);
d. it is in the process of sorting out the pieces of the self and of searching for a unique and authentic voice that women come to the basic insights of constructivist thought: all knowledge is constructed, and the knower is an intimate part of the known (p. 137);
e. answers to all questions vary depending on the context in which they are asked and on the frame of reference of the person doing the asking (p. 138);
f. all knowledge is a construction and that truth is a matter of the context in which it is embedded (p. 138);
g. experts must have an appreciation for complexity and a sense of humility about their knowledge (p. 139);
h. ambiguity is not troubling and complexity is enticing and are challenged by conflict between authorities (pp. 139-140);
i. truth is seen as a process of construction in which the knower participates (p. 140);
j. capacity to feel related to another person in spite of what may be enormous differences (p. 143).

Overall, BCGT describe nine stages. They have five large stages and four additional sub-categories. In reviewing the nine, I could see the possibility of having nine overlapping stages that women weave in and out of on a daily basis depending on their relationship to the topic.
APPENDIX C

CHARACTERISTICS OF BCGT’S CONNECTED & SEPARATE MODES OF PROCEDURAL KNOWING
# Characteristics of BCGT’s Connected & Separate Modes of Procedural Knowing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Connected Knowing</th>
<th>Separate Knowing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The name of the game:</td>
<td>The &quot;Believing Game&quot;: looking for what is right—accepting</td>
<td>The &quot;Doubting Game&quot;: looking for what is wrong—critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals:</td>
<td>To construct meaning—to understand &amp; to be understood</td>
<td>To construct truth—to prove, disprove, &amp; convince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relationship between the knowers:</td>
<td>collaborative: reasoning with the other</td>
<td>Adversarial: reasoning against the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The knower’s relationship to the known:</td>
<td>Attachment &amp; closeness</td>
<td>Detachment &amp; distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nature of agency:</td>
<td>Active surrender</td>
<td>Mastery &amp; control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of emotion:</td>
<td>Feelings illustrate thought</td>
<td>Feelings cloud thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure for transcending subjectivity</td>
<td>&quot;Objectivity&quot; achieved by adopting the other’s perspective</td>
<td>&quot;Objectivity&quot; achieved by adhering to impersonal and universal standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis of authority:</td>
<td>Commonality of experience</td>
<td>Mastery of relevant knowledge &amp; methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths:</td>
<td>Expansive, inclusive</td>
<td>Narrowing, discriminating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerabilities:</td>
<td>Loss of identity &amp; autonomy</td>
<td>Alienation &amp; absence of care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistemology</th>
<th>View of One’s Own Mind and Voice</th>
<th>View of Mind and Voice of Students/Colleagues</th>
<th>Views of Relationship with Others</th>
<th>Role of Education</th>
<th>Character of the Teaching/Working Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silent knower</td>
<td>Feels stupid, deaf, and mute; feels she can’t teach or learn from others; words are weapons</td>
<td>Deaf and ute; can’t learn; either has knowledge or does not; knowing and knowledge are static</td>
<td>Peer dialogue lacks value; fear of betrayal; remain distant and guarded</td>
<td>Sort out those who have knowledge from those who don’t; enforcement of discipline and rules</td>
<td>Frequent assessment &amp; discipline; one-way questioning &amp; accountability; structured rules &amp; hierarchies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received knower</td>
<td>Goal is to receive, store, and transmit without modifying information; learns through memorization and recitation</td>
<td>Experts should give advice and are not to be challenged; non-experts should listen and absorb; only experts merit power</td>
<td>Emphasize giving help and advice; listen to others’ expertise; judge right and wrong of others’ ideas and behaviors</td>
<td>Source of information; teach the answers; provide access to experts</td>
<td>Rigid roles as teacher or learner; lecturing by expert; quite, attentive, obedient learners; fact-finding and memorizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective knower</td>
<td>Discover inner voice; truth comes from inner voice and experience, not authorities; values individuality</td>
<td>Each individual is unique; each has individual truths and realities that have little import for others</td>
<td>Enjoy exchanging stories; nonjudgmental, accepting of differences; learn little from others; experience is personal, not generalizable</td>
<td>Arena for spontaneity &amp; individuality; protect ideas from evaluation or judgment by others</td>
<td>Expertise is not valued; more speaking and writing than listening and reading; nonjudgmental; laissez-faire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural knower</td>
<td>Goal is to articulate thoughts and feelings; uses procedures to evaluate and guide thinking</td>
<td>Individual has thoughts and feelings to be developed; can learn procedures for good questions and answers</td>
<td>Value sharing and understanding one another's views; help each other articulate and support own perspectives; can learn from one another</td>
<td>Acquire and practice procedures for inquiry; gather information, analyze &amp; test one's own and others' ideas; uncover truths</td>
<td>Active; mutual listening, questioning and explaining; analyzing alternative views; value dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructed knower</td>
<td>Can collaborate in construction of knowledge through dialogue with self and others; create new synthesis; not merely uncover information</td>
<td>Inventors; potential for generating knowledge; valuable ideas and collaborators; should listen to heard &amp; mind of self and others; responsible for thinking through and making choices</td>
<td>Relationship is greater than the sum of its parts; ask lots of questions; challenge; collaborate to share, evaluate, and create new synthesis</td>
<td>Develop skills in collaboration &amp; construction; create rather than discover truth &amp; knowledge; work with others to draw out our best thinking</td>
<td>Highly interactive &amp; collabora-tive; group-initiated pursuits; much dialogue; flexibility in roles, focus and process; mutual responsibility; share &amp; evaluate views and reframe new questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Lynn A. Bond, Professor of Psychology & Dean of the Graduate College, the University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405.)
APPENDIX E

INTRODUCTORY LETTER
FOR POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS
April, 1994

Dear _________________:

In working on my doctoral studies in the School of Education at UMass-Amherst, I am looking at how women administrators in higher education do their work. A colleague, _________________, suggested that you might agree to participate in my study.

The purpose of this qualitative study is to explore the relationship between cognitive/moral development and organizational leadership in adult women. I am interested in learning more about both how women administrators in higher education perceive themselves as knowers and what knowing strategies they choose in particular situations. This work is based on the research of Jean Baker Miller, Carol Gilligan, the authors of *Women’s Ways of Knowing*, Deborah Tannen, Lynne Bond, and Marilyn Haring-Hidore, et.al.

If you agree to participate, please respond to the enclosed questions. Mail your response to me with a copy of your current resume by March 5, 1994. Upon receipt of all responses and resumes, I will ask some respondents if they will participate in interviews that will last approximately two hours.

If you are one of the respondents selected, I will contact you to set up the audio-recorded interview. After the interview, I will share a copy of the full transcript with you and invite follow-up comments. Your participation will be confidential, and all discussion and analysis of the interview will be presented in a manner to ensure anonymity.

At this time you are invited to participate in the first phase of this research. I will contact you within seven to ten days after mailing this to discuss your interest in greater detail.

If you prefer to contact me, please feel free to contact me at

(413) 367-9282.

I appreciate your consideration and look forward to talking with you.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Teagan
Doctoral Candidate
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
APPENDIX F

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
I agree to participate in the research study conducted by Elizabeth Teagan, a doctoral candidate in the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts. I understand that the research involves the study of women administrators in higher education and their ways of knowing.

For this study I agree to:

a. respond to a questionnaire and provide a current resume;
b. participate in an audio-recorded interview which will last for approximately two hours;
c. read a transcript of the interview and make additional comments; and
d. answer follow-up questions.

To my knowledge, there are no foreseeable risks. I have been assured that any information that I offer will be kept strictly confidential. Names and identifying references will be changed.

I understand that the interviews will be tape recorded and that all audio tapes will be erased two years after completion of the study. I understand that either the tapes will be transcribed by the researcher or, in the case that another will transcribe the tapes, that all names will be erased before being heard by the transcriber.

I understand that there is no monetary compensation for participation in this study.

I acknowledge that I have the following rights:

a. the right to withdraw from part or all of the study at any time;
b. the right to review the material; and
c. the right to participate or not without prejudice.

I have read the foregoing statement and discussed it to my satisfaction with Elizabeth Teagan. She has also answered my questions about the study. I agree to participate in this study.

February , 1994

Signature of Participant Date

_________________________________________________________ Printed Name of Participant
APPENDIX G

INITIAL QUESTIONNAIRE
WAYS OF KNOWING AND MEANING-MAKING

This forced-choice questionnaire consists of five sets of six statements about how people make meaning of experiences. Each statement will fit how you make meaning to a greater or lesser degree.

Please rank order each set of statements according to how well they describe the way you make meaning more of the time or less of the time. Use the following numbers:

1 = first choice  
2 = second choice  
3 = third choice  
4 = fourth choice  
5 = fifth choice  
6 = sixth choice

Be sure to assign a different number (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6) to each of the six statements in each set.

Assign only one number to each item in a set: do NOT make ties.

Each set must be completed.

Respond quickly. Do not dwell on any one statement.

Note: There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. There are only your answers.
1. **Relationship Between Self and Understanding**

- Sometimes I collaborate in constructing knowledge through dialogue with self and others.
- Sometimes my goal is to receive, store, and transmit information without modifying it.
- Sometimes I feel silent, deaf, and mute; words sometimes feel like weapons.
- Sometimes truth for me comes from an inner voice and my own experience, not from authorities.
- Sometimes my goal is to construct the truth: to prove, disprove, and convince.
- Sometimes my goal is to construct meaning: to understand and to be understood.
2. **Relationship Between Self and Colleagues**

___ Sometimes I feel that I cannot learn: I either have knowledge or I don’t.

___ Sometimes I believe that each individual is unique and has his/her own truth and reality.

___ Sometimes I look for what is right; I am accepting.

___ Sometimes I follow the advice of experts and do not challenge what they say.

___ Sometimes I generate knowledge and listen to the heart and mind of myself and others.

___ Sometimes I look for what is wrong; I am critical.
SET THREE

1 = first choice
2 = second choice
3 = third choice
4 = fourth choice
5 = fifth choice
6 = sixth choice

3. **Relationship of Self and Others**

   - Sometimes I believe it is important to give help and advice.
   - Sometimes I like being adversarial and reasoning against others.
   - Sometimes I ask lots of questions, create new information, and collaborate with others to synthesize and evaluate.
   - Sometimes I guard and distance myself from my peers because they may not be correct.
   - Sometimes I accept the differences of others although I do not believe I can learn from their experiences.
   - Sometimes I like to reason with others, and value sharing and understanding other’s views.
SET FOUR

1 = first choice  
2 = second choice  
3 = third choice  
4 = fourth choice  
5 = fifth choice  
6 = sixth choice

4. **Relationship Between Self and Education**

  __ Sometimes I value my individuality and want to protect my ideas from the judgment of others.

  __ Sometimes I create rather than discover truths and knowledge and collaborate with others to do so.

  __ Sometimes I am the source of information and can teach the answers.

  __ Sometimes I analyze my own and others’ ideas and achieve objectivity by adopting another’s perspective.

  __ Sometimes I rely on those who have knowledge to help me determine what is correct and to establish rules.

  __ Sometimes I develop and practice procedures and achieve objectivity by adhering to established standards.
5. Relationship Between Self and Working Environment

- Sometimes I value using logical and discriminating methods for narrowing down options to get to truth.

- Sometimes I enjoy structured environments with rules, hierarchies, discipline, and frequent feedback.

- Sometimes I prefer the active roles of speaking and writing over the passive roles of listening and reading.

- Sometimes I enjoy highly interactive and collaborative environments with flexibility in roles, focus, and process.

- Sometimes I prefer fact-finding, memorizing, lecturing by experts, and clearly defined roles.

- Sometimes I like to dialogue and analyze alternative views with mutual listening and questioning.

* Developed by Elizabeth D. L. Teagan based on "Hypothesized Relationships between Epistemological Perspectives and Views of Self, Others, and Education" by Dr. Lynne A. Bond; University of Vermont; Burlington, VT.
WAYS OF KNOWING
Evaluation Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Silent</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Subjective</th>
<th>Separate</th>
<th>Connected</th>
<th>Constructed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. **View of One’s Own Mind and Voice**

2. **View of Mind and Voice of Others**

3. **View of Relationship with Others**

4. **Role of Education**

5. **Character of the Teaching/Working Environment**

**Totals**

---
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APPENDIX H
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
The following interview schedule was developed by Elizabeth Teagan from an interview schedule developed by BCGT and used by Haring-Hidore, et. al.

[Prior to the beginning of the actual interview, the following explanations should be made.]

Based on your written permission, I will tape record this interview. A code number will be assigned to the interview, both in tape form and in transcript form. In order to preserve confidentiality, records will be kept in locked cabinets and reports of the study will not identify individuals.

I am trying to understand how women in higher education administration reflect on thinking and the ways they come to know things. I am also interested in how the ways women think and know affect their decision-making and leadership behavior.

The following questions will focus on how you think and know. We will also discuss the impact on you as an administrator.
I. INITIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

"Sometimes, the way we feel and behave is different from how the organization in which we work expects us to feel and behave."

[Hand pencil with eraser and the Initial Questionnaire to interviewee]

"This is your initial questionnaire. When you first worked with it, you determined how you believed you would feel or behave in various situations. Take another look at it: quickly read it again and place an "E" next to one statement in each set that best describes how you believe your organization expects you to feel or behave."

[After she has finished, take the Initial Questionnaire and pencil from the Interviewee.]

II. INTRODUCTION

One of the things I want to learn more about is how people make sense out of situations where they are uncertain about how they want or "ought" to behave. We often do not know how we make meaning or know about things until we are challenged and are "put on the spot" to justify our way of knowing about an issue or circumstance.

So, what I want to look at with you in these questions is how you bridge that gap between

1. having an experience,
2. making sense of that experience, and
3. explaining your way of knowing about that experience.
III. QUESTIONS

QUESTION #1: WAYS OF KNOWING AND MEANING-MAKING

Recall a recent work experience where there was a conflict in a decision-making process between you and a colleague in your organization. Describe your experience of the situation.

How did you handle the conflict?

Did you always do it that way?

Identify when you began to do it this way?

What triggered that approach for you?

How did you learn to do it this way?

Remember how you did it before that?

Place this in time: do you understand this approach to have been taught you in school?

Were you influenced to use this approach by your family or friends?

Did you learn or use that approach in college, high school?

Is that typical of how you always worked through a situation like this?

If not, what other ways have you used?

If yes, how did you learn to do it this way?

When and how did you figure out to do it that way?

Have you ever experienced a situation where you did not behave as you just described?

What did you do instead? How would you account for that difference?
IV. WAYS OF KNOWING

A. Separate and Connected Procedural Knowing

The following comments are designed to promote discussion of separate and connected knowing. Encourage the person to respond spontaneously. Probe only to elicit information that has not been offered spontaneously.

[Describe separate knowing if the interviewee is not familiar with the concept: an example of separate knowing is using the scientific model.]

**QUESTION #2**: Tell me about a situation you have analyzed using the scientific model.

a. Is the separate way of knowing a strategy that you use or an identification of the only way you know?

b. Where did you learn to use the scientific model?

c. In what situations do you use the separate WOK? How was it a turning point in your intellectual development?

**QUESTION #3**: What’s your opinion of the following statements gathered by other researchers:

"I never take anything someone says for granted. I just tend to see the contrary. I like playing the devil’s advocate, arguing the opposite of what somebody’s saying, thinking of exceptions, or thinking of a different train of logic."

**QUESTION #4**: Please respond to this statement:

"When I have an idea about something, and it differs from the way another person is thinking about it, I’ll usually try to look at it from that person’s point of view, see how they could say that, why they think that they’re right, why it makes sense."

- **If "yes"**: Describe a situation in which this has happened. Tell me about the process for you.

- **If "no"**: Describe a situation in which you had an opportunity to be empathetic and avoided or denied it.
B. Procedural and Constructed Knowing

[The following comments are designed primarily to promote discussion of procedural and constructed knowing.]

**QUESTION #5:** Please comment on the following:

"I believe it is important to be objective and unbiased about things."

Recount a situation in which you were objective.

**QUESTION #6:** Describe your experience of the following statement.

"Once upon a time I really hoped I'd be able to figure the world out. I really thought if I were only smart enough, I could figure it all out and settle things. It's different now. Now I see the world as wonderfully complicated and elusive. Nothing ever gets settled. Nothing is resolved."

**QUESTION #7:** How do you use thinking and feeling to make your decisions? Please give me an example of a recent decision you made using each.

VI. KNOWING AND BEHAVIOR

**QUESTION #8:** Tell me about a situation in which you have chosen to behave in a way that is not consistent with your own understanding, where you went against how you wanted to act.

[When you have understanding of an issue, how does that understanding affect your behavior/decisions?]

**QUESTION #9:** Describe the most recent experience you've had where you made a decision that went against how you believed the organization expected you to decide.

Tell me about that.
VII. AUTHORITIES IN WORK LIFE AND PERSONAL LIFE

**QUESTION #10**: Tell me about an authority or expert in your professional life.

a. Who comes to mind when you think about experts in your everyday life?
b. What are these experts like?
c. What are some characteristics they have in common?

**QUESTION #11**: Tell me about an authority or expert in your personal life.

a. Who comes to mind when you think about experts in your everyday life?
b. What are these experts like?
c. What are some characteristics they have in common?

**QUESTION #12**: Tell me about a time when you had an idea or an opinion about something that differed from an authority or expert’s opinion in your work life.

a. How do you handle situations like that?
b. How do you decide who is right?
c. How do you make up your own mind?
d. Do you feel differently about disagreeing with authorities now than you did in the past? How? Why?

**QUESTION #13**: Tell me about a situation similar to or different from the following statements:

a. I had one professor who was really special. She knew a lot herself, and she still had respect for whatever we had to offer in class. She had a way of elevating what a student said. She got a lot out of teaching us and learning from us, and we learned from her.

Next:

b. I had one supervisor who was really special. That supervisor knew a lot and still had respect for what I had to offer the organization. That supervisor had a way of elevating what I had to say.
VIII. TRUTH VERSUS truths

QUESTION #14: Describe a recent work situation in which there was only one clear "right" answer?

a. In general does it seem to you that usually there is only one answer that is really right or true, or can there be more than one?

b. Would you explain what you mean by that?

c. Why do you think there can/can't be more than one answer what is really right/true?

d. Does it depend on the situation? How?

e. Can you say that some opinions are better than others? How so?

f. Are all opinions equally right, do you think? Can you say an opinion is wrong?

IX. RELATIONSHIPS

QUESTION #15: Describe a recent leadership situation in your job. Tell me about how you made decisions in that situation.

a. How do relationships function in your leadership style?

b. Do you have colleagues who are friends? Do you treat them differently from other colleagues who are not friends? Tell me a little about that.

QUESTION #16: The structure of your organization may put some boundaries on how long it will/can absorb employees not performing the way you want them to. Tell me about a situation when you balanced your support of the employee and your protection of the organization/students from the employee's lack of performance?

a. When an employee is not doing her/his job, how do you handle it?

b. What happens when you try to help the employee through your relationship with them to get them to do their job?

c. What happens when they do not respond to you trying to help them through your relationship with them? Tell me about a situation in which that happened.
QUESTION #17: Tell me about a situation where you had a choice to recommend someone for hire. One candidate had the specific knowledge and, in your opinion, would be detrimental to the office relations. The second candidate did not have the specific knowledge; but, with investment could learn the knowledge AND would be a real asset to office relations, someone with whom work would be a pleasure.

[Are you a product person, a process person, or a blend of product and process?]

[What is more important to you: the capacity to learn/know or having knowledge?]

[Knowledge becomes obsolete quickly...] [What do you value most: knowledge or knowing?]

[How did you learn to value the process of knowing versus to gain knowledge?]
The following information was supplied by Jill M. Tarule in October, 1992, as the coding protocol used by the authors of Women’s Ways of Knowing in their research for use by this researcher on this research project.

Directions for Reading Transcripts:
Ways of Knowing Interviews

Understanding how ordinary people think about thinking is not easy. People are seldom asked to stand back and think about how they know what they know, so they are not very articulate about their ways of knowing. As one woman said on being interviewed about such things, "I’m telling you these things, but I ain’t never thunk them." Even children and adults who are being given very elegant formal educations find these questions hard to answer, but usually they also find them fascinating, since their teachers and professors have seldom asked them to reflect on how they know.

Educators, psychologists, and philosophers have only recently begun to understand the epistemologies that ordinary people develop as they try to make sense of their experiences in the world, and so you will have only rough maps to guide you. Understanding frameworks for meaning-making that are distant from your own is difficult and requires a great stretch of the imagination. We hope that as you collect and analyze your data, you will share the new insights and understandings you have gained so the maps will become clearer and more detailed, and imagining the epistemological frameworks that others use will get easier and easier.

The first step towards understanding someone’s ways of knowing is to read through the transcribed interview, getting a brief overview of the interviewee’s story of herself as a knower.

Then we slowly reread the interview looking for those statements that suggest the underlying assumptions that the speaker holds about the nature of knowledge and of herself as a knower. Using the descriptions of positions in Women’s Ways of Knowing as a guide, we begin classifying the epistemological frameworks or perspectives (positions) held.

Coding is greatly facilitated if your interviews are typed in a computer. We pull up a file with the transcribed interview on one screen, while the file with the Reader’s Notation Sheet is on a second screen. Specifically, we put the interview transcript, which has been typed in Word Perfect, in our computer as "Document 1"
and the Reader’s Notation Sheet as "Document 2," so that we can move blocks of text from the transcript to the notation sheet.

Every time we come across a quote that we believe indicates the speaker’s perspective on knowing, we copy the quote in the appropriate space on the Reader’s Notation Sheet. If we come across a quote that could reflect two different ways of knowing, we copy it out in both sections.

After we have assembled all of the salient quotes, we reread each quote and write—next to the quote—an explanation of the reasoning we have used in categorizing the response. The explanations are distinguished from the quotes by some convention. We indent, but brackets would serve as well. These explanations will allow others to follow the reader’s train of thought for establishing reliability, settling disagreements, etc.

The work of copying out and categorizing all of these quotes can bring out a deeper understanding of the interview, so we then reread the entire interview and the assembled quotes at least one more time. During this round of reading we often find that material that once seemed insignificant is now suddenly full of meaning. Reinterpretations can also lead you to move quotes from one category to another. New quotes are then added, old ones moved, and interpretation are modified as needed.

We then reread the assembled quotes and explanations and write a summary paragraph or two, describing the person’s ways of knowing in words. In summarizing the material we think of the interview as the person’s story of their intellectual development. We pay attention to the tenses used and ask such questions as, Is the person describing a current approach or one she now discounts? If the position or framework is clearly discounted or transcended, little or no credit would be recorded for this position.

We then record numerically the Ways of Knowing Position(s) which seems best to describe the person’s framework. As Perry instructed his judges, try to find "the least worst fit" between the position(s) and the person. First, indicate the number(s) of the predominate framework(s) in the appropriate space at the top of the Reader’s Notation Sheet, using the following conventions:

1. If all of the material seems to reflect one framework (position) the corresponding number will be recorded (i.e. 3 will indicate a consistent Subjective Knowledge perspective).
2. If the material suggests that two different frameworks are being used pretty much equally, the corresponding numbers of both will be recorded with an intervening slash (i.e. 2/3 would indicate approximately half Received and half Subjective Knowledge).

3. If one framework predominates, but there is a substantial amount (roughly 1/3 of the quotes) of thinking suggesting another position, record the major (predominant) position, followed by the minor (subordinate) position in parentheses: e.g., 3/4 would indicate approximately 2/3 reflecting Subjective Knowledge and 1/3 reflecting Procedural Knowledge. (While we may indicate in our written summary the presence of positions which appear only faintly in the interview, we want the numerical summary to include only those positions that seem to have achieved a substantial presence.)

4. Summarize in a sentence or so at the end of the Reader’s Notation Sheet the thinking that led you to assign the numerical score(s).
APPENDIX J

PARTICIPANT PROFILE
### Family

#### Ethnic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother's</th>
<th>Father's</th>
<th>Family's</th>
<th>Your's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What meaning does this have in your professional life?

---

#### Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother's</th>
<th>Father's</th>
<th>Family's</th>
<th>Your's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What meaning does this have in your professional life?

---

#### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother's</th>
<th>Father's</th>
<th>Family's</th>
<th>Your's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What meaning does this have in your professional life?

---

#### Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother's</th>
<th>Father's</th>
<th>Family's</th>
<th>Your's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
What meaning does this have in your professional life?

______________________________

**Religious/Spiritual Background**

Mother’s ____________________________
Father’s ____________________________
Family’s ____________________________
Your’s ____________________________

What meaning does this have in your professional life?

______________________________

**B. Position in Family**

**Birth Year**

Brothers ____________________________
Sisters ____________________________
Self ____________________________

**II. SCHOOLS AND TRAINING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Fr-To</th>
<th>Interest/Major Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Grade School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. High School

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

E. Undergraduate

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

F. Masters

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

G. Doctorate

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

H. Other

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

III. MODELS/PEOPLE OF INFLUENCE

Who have been your top three role models or people of influence? How did they influence who you are?

A. __________________________________________________________

B. __________________________________________________________

C. __________________________________________________________
IV. PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

A. Positions (from first to present)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>From-To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Supervisory Experience (from first to present)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Who You Supervised</th>
<th>Your Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. LEADERSHIP TRAINING

A. What have been the most meaningful leadership training experiences you’ve had?

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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B. You spoke about your process of leadership/decision-making and the research done by Gilligan and Belenky, et al. (BCGT) during the interview. Given your current understanding of the work of Gilligan and BCGT, how would you describe yourself in their terms? (Provide abstract of each.)

VI. OTHER

In light of the interview and additional time of reflecting, what are other knowings/feelings/thoughts/issues/etc. that you would like to share?
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