



CREaTE

Canterbury Research and Theses Environment

Canterbury Christ Church University's repository of research outputs

<http://create.canterbury.ac.uk>

Please cite this publication as follows:

Griffiths, V. (2009) Women managers in higher education: experiences from the UK. The International Journal of Learning, 16 (10). pp. 397-405. ISSN 1447-9494.

Link to official URL (if available):

This version is made available in accordance with publishers' policies. All material made available by CReaTE is protected by intellectual property law, including copyright law. Any use made of the contents should comply with the relevant law.

Contact: create.library@canterbury.ac.uk



Women Managers in Higher Education: Experiences from the UK

Article for The International Journal of Learning

Author:

Professor Vivienne Griffiths
Canterbury Christ Church University

Corresponding author:

Prof Vivienne Griffiths
Faculty of Education
Canterbury Christ Church University
North Holmes Campus
Canterbury CT1 1QU, UK
vivienne.griffiths1@canterbury.ac.uk

Final reviewer-accepted copy, 2009

©Vivienne Griffiths

Published in *The International Journal of Learning*, 16 (10) 397-406
ISSN 1447-9494

Women Managers in Higher Education: Experiences from the UK

Abstract

In this article, case studies of women undertaking middle management positions in two UK universities are presented and analysed, within the context of continuing under-representation of women managers and leaders in higher education. In-depth interviews were carried out with women heads, or former heads, of department, in order to obtain their perspectives on their day to day management experiences, longer term strategies and goals, relationships with colleagues and leadership styles. The women all perceived their greatest strength as people management and collegiality, and gender was embedded in their work in a complex way. Some comparison between women's leadership experiences in the two universities is also made. Recommendations for universities to enhance the opportunities for, and status of, women managers and leaders are suggested in conclusion.

Keywords: Women Managers, Leadership and Management, Higher Education

Introduction

The number of women entering higher education has increased significantly over the last ten years, as have the numbers of women working in higher education and gaining promotion. However, women are still under-represented in senior management positions and among the professoriate. Within the context of increasing demands for high quality leadership and management in higher

education, it is important to study women who have already succeeded in obtaining senior university positions and to identify the leadership skills and qualities that they bring to such roles. It is also vital to highlight the characteristics of forward-looking, supportive academic environments, in which women's potential for academic leadership is recognised and rewarded. Before turning to the experiences of women managers, we start by discussing the wider context for the study.

Women students and managers in higher education

The study is located within the policy context of rapid global expansion of higher education over the last ten years. A study of 30 countries by OECD (2002) found that women students represented 54 per cent of all graduates in 2002. In the UK, enrolment in higher education has increased by 33 per cent since 1996, especially in part-time courses, with increasing diversity in the student body. This includes a rise in the number of women entering higher education, representing 57 per cent of undergraduates by 2006-7 (HESA 2007). We can certainly see very high rates in some countries; for example, 96 per cent of women in Iceland go into higher education, and 91 per cent of women in Australia (OECD 2007). However, women still make up only 24 per cent of science and engineering subjects and less than 40 per cent of all research students worldwide (Newman 2008).

The number of women academics has also increased, but not as rapidly as the number of women students, and there is still a large under-representation of

women in leadership and professorial positions. For example, a study in the 1990s of women managers in 11 countries from the USA to the South Pacific (UNESCO 1993) found that, while women were more strongly represented in middle management positions, women deans and professors were still in the minority and women vice-chancellors were rare. The current position in the UK has improved since then, but not dramatically. According to Warwick (2004), just over a third of all academic staff were women in 2004, whilst only 13 per cent of professors were women, the majority of these in the arts, humanities and healthcare. This proportion rose to 18.5 per cent of professors by 2009 (Research Europe UK 2009). In addition, the gap between men and women's pay in universities has also increased. Men were paid 13.9 per cent more than their female colleagues in 2007-08, an increase on the pay gap recorded for 2006-07, which was 13.7 per cent. Thus, whilst the student population is increasingly female, the senior positions are still predominantly held by men, who are paid more highly than women for the equivalent roles.

Previous research on women academics

The stark picture which emerges from an analysis of current statistics is reinforced strongly by recent research on women academics, including studies of women managers in higher education. Research findings confirm the continuing under-representation of women in management and leadership positions in higher education (Bagihole 1994, Heward 1996, Rosser et al 2003) and their

marginalisation in structural and cultural ways (Quinn 2003, Wisker 1996). Particular reasons for this situation identified by researchers include the hierarchical nature of universities (Kettle 1996, Madden 2002), traditionally male models of management (Hornby & Shaw 1996), the lack of positive female role models and networks for women managers (Bagihole 1994, Wisker 1996), male resistance and stereotyped attitudes of women's roles (UNESCO 1993).

The UNESCO study (1993) found a contradiction between perceptions of male and female managers. For instance, male managers were expected to be firm and authoritative, whilst women managers were expected to show these characteristics as well as more traditionally female qualities such as nurturing and empathy. The study also argued that women managers tended to be more idealistic in their leadership aspirations, and less interested in power and status than their male counterparts. Similarly, a study of 50 women in leadership positions in eight universities in Australia (Blackmore & Sachs 2001), carried out in a period of radical change in higher education, found some contradictory positioning of women managers, giving rise to a 'cultural clash' (ibid p. 51) for many women. The authors' overall conclusion was that male managers benefited more from restructuring than women, as women managers were still excluded from power positions.

On a more positive note, some studies stress the transformative potential of women managers. Wisker (1996) argues that women only training and women's networks are important for women, in a context where largely male models of management are still prevalent, while studies in the USA (Madden

2002, Rosser et al 2003) reinforce the importance of mentoring. Rosser et al (2003) highlight the positive perceptions of women managers and their leadership effectiveness. These authors emphasise the positive contribution that women managers can make and the importance of moving away from traditional, top down management and leadership cultures in higher education.

Context and methodology

This study was carried out in two universities in the south of England: an 'old' pre-1992 university and a new university, formerly a teacher training college. University statistics show that in the old university, women represented 46% of lecturers, 31% of senior lecturers, 16% of professors and 0% deans; the senior management team consisted of three men and one woman. Overall women were under-represented in senior posts. In contrast, in the new university, 50% of senior lecturers, deans and senior management team were women, while 33% of professors were women. At the time of the study, both universities were engaged in major restructuring. A marked difference can be seen between the old and new universities. In the old university, the number of women professors was below the national average, while in the new university it was nearly double. Likewise, at the old university, while there was only one woman in the deans and senior management team combined, in the new university 50% of both roles were held by women. Thus, at the new university, women were far more strongly represented in leadership as well as management roles.

The sample of 12 women managers was drawn from arts and social science departments. At the old university, the sample consisted of five current and one former heads of departments, with varying lengths of time in post, ranging from one to three years. The size of departments ranged between 10 to 40 academic staff on varying contracts, with a number of associate tutors from 4 to 200. Two of the women were professors, one was a reader and the others senior lecturers. Their ages ranged from mid 30s to late 50s and they had been at the university from between four and 24 years. These women constitute the case studies analysed in this paper. The sample at the new university consisted of a comparable group of women managers in relation to responsibilities, age and experience; interviews with this group are in progress and some initial points of comparison will be drawn from these preliminary findings.

This was a pragmatic sample, as I selected the women from those I knew from my own leadership position at both institutions. An interpretive, case study approach was used (Cohen et al 2000) in order to elicit the perspectives of the women on their management roles. In-depth interviews were carried out in the women's offices and tape recorded. The interviews explored the women's perspectives on their day to day management experiences, longer term strategies and goals, relationships with colleagues and leadership styles. Factors affecting their role, such as prior management experience, training, support from departmental colleagues and senior university managers, were also investigated. In order to protect anonymity, all names and some personal details have been changed. I also assured the women of confidentiality by transcribing the

interviews myself. Given the nature of their roles and the work they were describing, these measures were particularly important.

In analysing the findings, some major themes emerged: the importance of prior experience and training; nature of the work and management styles; relationships with colleagues and senior managers. Rewards and challenges of the role and gender issues are embedded in each section and will be drawn together towards the end of the paper.

Prior experience and training

Interestingly, all the women had prior management experience, albeit on a smaller scale, in non-academic contexts in either the public or voluntary sectors, not always related to their current discipline. They all mentioned how useful this was when moving into heads of department roles, although three of the women stressed that their previous management work had been easier, due to hierarchical structures being more clear-cut outside universities. Only one of the women in each university had held a management role in another university.

None of the women in the old university had been promoted into the role; the professors had been promoted prior to becoming heads of department or taking up senior positions. In the new university, promotion followed the taking up of management roles for three of the women, and academic management career structures were more clearly delineated. Reasons for taking on the head of department role varied. Frances explained: 'I hadn't done it before so it seemed a

reasonable thing to do, to make a contribution to the collective good.' In contrast, Vanessa took the job over from someone who 'couldn't carry on' rather than from choice. She explained, 'I needed to give something back to the university. No one said you should do it, there was no obligation but I felt morally obliged.' Both women expressed a sense of collegiality and moral value of the role; this underpinned all the women's descriptions of their work at both universities.

Most of the women at the old university had had little or no training for their role. For instance, Vanessa felt completely unprepared, especially as she had to take on the job at short notice. In contrast, the most recently appointed manager, Marian, had had a long induction 'to ensure a smooth handover when I took over the role', and some individual coaching by a woman trainer, which she found invaluable, as in other studies (Madden 2002, Rosser et al 2003). Three of the women managers were attending the newly introduced academic leadership programme, which was available to some heads of department nominated by the (all male) Deans, therefore restricted by senior male gatekeepers. The university policy is now for all managers to receive training. However, for the current women managers, it was seen as a case of 'too little, too late.' Marian felt a lot of time had been wasted 'by people moaning about university restructuring'. Liz, on the other hand, found it useful to meet other managers and realise that 'everyone's got the same issues...some people had worse experiences.' In contrast, at the new university, training for management and leadership roles was available for those aspiring to the roles and this was generally well received.

Two of the women at each university belonged to a women only action learning set and found it very useful indeed. The groups operated under strict rules of confidentiality, enabling women to talk about issues and problems openly in an atmosphere of trust. Frances stressed, 'The women's group is important. Being a senior woman in this kind of environment is challenging and needs a particular sharing approach to help.' This echoes Wisker's (1996) view that women only training is important. In the context of this study, the group seemed particularly important, as several of the women managers felt unsupported elsewhere, particularly by their male line managers. This was more evident at the old university, whereas at the new university, the women felt better supported by their line managers. Nevertheless, the action learning sets were seen as valuable in both contexts.

The nature of the work and management styles

Frances's word 'challenging' summed up a great deal of the way the women described their work as heads of department. This fell into two broad areas: firstly, the day to day, immediate business, or as Margaret put it, 'loos, car parks and cups of tea.' Frances described it as the 'sheer kind of pragmatic detail. Always urgent, tricky, needs creative problem solving but not particularly difficult. Time consuming and irksome.' Both women mentioned the huge quantity of emails they received, which Margaret found 'relentless...desperately hard to keep on top of.'

All the women mentioned dealing with people on a day to day basis as a major part of this immediate but ongoing work. Margaret spent a lot of time 'sitting down with people and talking about workloads. Quite time consuming'. Both Liz and Vanessa had an open door policy, which they thought was important to their way of working. Liz said, 'People can pop in to say they're worried about a student or to pass the time of day...It works for me, I have a real sense of how people are feeling.' Similarly, Vanessa explained: 'People feel they can knock on my door any time. Most people feel I'm very approachable even if I can't solve their problems.' Jane also spent a lot of time meeting individual members of her department, but unlike the other two, preferred to make appointments, perhaps because she had a much larger department. The way that Liz and Vanessa described this approach sounded like a semi-counselling role, and was central to their view of good people management.

The second major area of work was more strategic, including longer term planning, financial management and other major projects, such as curriculum change and appointments. This was also very time consuming and left little time for either teaching or research. Frances described the 'constant drip drip of development work,' although she preferred this to the immediacy of other aspects and felt she handled the big issues better. All the women talked about having a reflective, measured approach to the larger matters, which involved a range of complex activities such as gaining consent from faculty for curriculum or organisational changes, dealing with senior management, as well as writing planning documents and generally having an overview of the work of the

department. As with day to day matters, relationships were always at the heart of the process. Overall, there were no major differences in the range of work or approaches to it between the two universities, although there were some differences in emphasis and priorities, with research being more highly established at the old university.

The complexity and multiplicity of management roles in higher education are stressed in other studies (e.g. Rosser et al 2003, Wepner et al 2008). Wepner et al (2003) highlight four dimensions of leadership: intellectual, emotional, social, and moral, all of which are centrally involved in managers' decision-making and problem solving. These dimensions were certainly evident in the way the women managers in this study talked about their work.

Relationships with colleagues and senior managers

Most of the women managers described the importance of a collegial approach to working with academic staff in their departments and often put others' needs first. Frances described this as a 'kind of service mentality'; she and others stressed the importance of building good relationships, boosting morale and ensuring that all staff were working together positively. This was particularly difficult at a time of organisational change, as stressed by Blackmore and Sachs (2001). Liz took a great deal of personal interest in her colleagues, stressing that issues like 'kids and mortgages' impacted on how people were working, and were therefore important to know about. She regarded this responsive approach as a gendered aspect of her management style, and a potential weakness as she could get too involved.

However, Wepner et al (2008) stress that all managers in higher education, both male and female, draw on emotional and social domains, and these are important dimensions of their work.

Liz and others had management teams to act as sounding boards and help them with strategic aspects of their role, but described dealing with difficult situations in an individual way. Difficulties with colleagues could blow up into major problems, as Margaret reported with feeling in relation to two particular events she had dealt with during her time as head of department. Marian took a lot of time to think through how she would deal with potentially difficult issues and tried to pre-empt dissent by having sound reasons for her actions. On the advice of her coach, she acted very much from her own 'core values', rather than acting as others expected. Although she felt she adopted an inclusive approach, she also acknowledged that she could be - and needed to be - authoritative at times. Other women managers also described the tension between collegiality and authority, some finding the latter aspect easier than others, as other studies have also found (e.g. UNESCO 1993, Wepner et al 2008).

The women managers had varying opinions about the amount of support they felt they had from immediate line managers. Frances identified a prospective shift from the dean as a key support role, as the university reorganised in what she saw as a more top down way. All the women had had to forge relationships with their respective senior management team which some had found harder than others, a finding echoed in other studies (e.g. Bagihole 1994, Rosser et al 2003). For example while Liz, a more experienced manager, frequently went straight to

the top, Marian, a new manager, was more diffident about contacting the senior managers. In the old university, Liz was aware of the gender imbalance in the senior team which had an impact, describing it as the 'culture of the corridor, very much boys together'. Masculinised cultures in universities have been reported in many other studies (e.g. Madden 2002, Quinn 2003, Wisker 1996). In the new university, however, this was less evident, as the senior management team had an equal mix between men and women; any criticisms were directed towards the women as much as the men, but in general the university leadership was well liked and appreciated for their transparent and open approach.

What all the women stressed was that, as middle managers, they had to play a mediating role between their own departments on the one hand and senior management on the other. This was one of the most challenging aspects of their role, especially during restructuring, similar to findings by Blackmore & Sachs (2001). The women described the difficult, sometimes uncomfortable, balance between keeping their departments on board and implementing new initiatives from the top. Frances described it as a 'very lonely job' because of the perceived lack of support from senior management. She and others found it particularly hard to keep going when resources and staffing were stretched. Financial pressures were evident at both universities because of the economic recession; this was more visible at the new university where a business culture had operated for some time.

Gender and authority: contradictory terms?

What emerges strongly from the interviews is a set of potential polarities, between collegiality and authority, top down and bottom up management styles. Because of the nature of their middle management role, made more extreme because of reorganisation, the women managers were constantly negotiating and renegotiating their position in relation to their departments on the one hand, and senior management on the other. There were tensions and difficulties in trying to balance these two aspects, as identified in other studies of both male and female managers (e.g. Rosser et al 2003, Wepner et al 2008). However, some of this tension also came from being women; there was evidence of contradictory positioning and dual expectations of women managers also reported in many other studies (e.g. Blackmore & Sachs 2001, Kettle 1996, Madden 2002, UNESCO 1993).

Frances articulated this tension with great insight, when she described gender and power as 'fault lines', underpinning both individual academics and the university culture as a whole, as well as wider society. While she did not experience overt sexism as a woman manager, she felt strongly that 'embedded assumptions' about how men and women should act often impacted on what she did, such as gendered expectations that women managers would be more emotional than men. Vanessa also stressed that she had made a conscious decision not to show emotion to senior colleagues, for fear of being labelled or thought unable to cope. Particular strengths that the women managers cited included their collegial approach, attention to detail, sensitivity to process and personal

dynamics, versatility and flexibility. What some of them felt they did less well was to set boundaries, delegate and be assertive, although this varied according to their personality and length of time in a leadership role. They recognised that these perceived strengths and weaknesses were highly gendered; some found it easier to acknowledge their own authoritative nature than others.

In spite of difficulties, overall the women found the role rewarding, and enjoyed aspects of it at a personal and professional level. Margaret described it as 'quite creative, like a jigsaw puzzle, how the pieces fit together...I like it and like doing it.' She found the most rewarding aspects were successfully supporting the promotion of colleagues. Vanessa cited how well her colleagues had 'pulled together' and worked successfully towards a major internal review of their work. Jane mentioned the positive feedback from colleagues as well as some senior managers, and a sense of having more control over her own and colleagues' work. Marian summed up her own feelings about the role very appositely: 'My own research is about caring...I'm very aware of the balance between caring and authority...When you go into a particular [management] situation, there is something that is very individual, self-reliant, being prepared to accept yourself as an authority figure.' For all the women managers, this personal insight and professional development had been a steep learning curve.

Conclusions and recommendations

As can be seen from the case studies, being a woman manager in a university context is a tough job, particularly where the culture is largely male-dominated, as

in the old university. At the new university, where women held management and leadership roles more frequently, the women managers felt more supported overall, and the structure enabled career progression into leadership roles, with subsequent promotion, more easily than in the old university. Management training was also more effective and embedded in the new university. However, the nature of the work itself and the women's approaches to it were very similar, calling on great resilience, strength of character and sheer stamina.

As in Wepner et al's study (2008), all the women managers demonstrated and drew strongly on the four dimensions of leadership in their work: intellectual, emotional, social, and moral; some consciously downplayed or hid the emotional dimensions, however, because of concerns about being labelled over-emotional in a gendered way. The findings of this small-scale study reinforce those of other research (e.g. Blackmore & Sachs 2001, Heward 1996, Rosser et al 2003) in terms of the complexity of the work, the difficulties faced by women managers on a day to day basis, as well as the strengths and many positive attributes that women can bring to management and leadership roles.

In order to capitalise on these strengths, universities need to provide adequate training, including some one to one coaching or women-only group training, as these were found particularly helpful by the women in this study (see also Madden 2002, Rosser et al 2003, Wisker 1996). There also need to be spaces for women managers to get together to discuss issues and problems, such as the action learning sets described earlier. Importantly, senior managers need to be sensitive to the inevitable demands of middle management roles, and be willing to

provide support and encouragement. There are larger structural and cultural issues about the ways that universities are managed generally, but these are beyond the scope of this article. Overall, there is a need for more women managers and leaders to act as positive role models to others, as well as to the still-growing number of women students in higher education.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all the women managers who talked to me about their work, for sharing their time, thoughts and insights.

References

- Bagihole, B. 1994. Being different is a very difficult row to hoe: Survival strategies of women academics. In S. Davies, O. Lubelska & J. Quinn (Eds.) *Changing the subject: Women in higher education*: 15-28. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Blackmore, J. & Sachs, J. 2001. Women leaders in the restructured university. In A. Brooks & A. Mackinnon (Eds.) *Gender and the restructured university*: 45-66. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Cohen, L. et al. 2000. *Research methods in education*, 5th edition. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Higher Education Statistics Agency 2008. *Students in higher education institutions 2006/7*. London: HESA.
- Heward, C. 1996. Women and careers in higher education: What is the problem? In L. Morley & V. Walsh (Eds.) *Breaking boundaries: Women in higher education*: 11- 23. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Hornby, P. & Shaw, S. 1996. Women in management education: The token topic. In L. Morley & V. Walsh (Eds.) *Breaking boundaries: Women in higher education*: 78- 89. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Kettle, J. 1996. Good practices, bad attitudes: An examination of the factors influencing women's academic careers. In L. Morley & V. Walsh (Eds.) *Breaking boundaries: Women in higher education*: 52-66. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Madden, M. 2002. The transformative leadership of women in higher education administration. In J. DiGeorgio-Lutz (Ed.) *Women in higher education: Empowering change*: 115-144. Westport, Connecticut, USA: Praeger.
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development 2002. *Education at a glance: OECD indicators 2002*. Paris: OECD.
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development 2007. *Education at a glance: OECD indicators 2007*. Paris: OECD.

- Quinn, J. 2003. *Powerful subjects: Are women really taking over the university?* Stoke on Trent: Trentham.
- Research Europe. 2009. UK & Ireland in brief: Academic women still paid less than men. *Research Europe*, April 2009: 274.
- Rosser, V.J., Johnsrud, L.K. & Heck, R.H. 2003. Academic deans and directors: Assessing their effectiveness from individual and institutional perspectives. *Journal of Higher Education*, 74(1): 1-25.
- UNESCO 1993. *Women in higher education management*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Warwick, D. 2004. *Women and leadership: a higher education perspective*. The Barbara Diamond Memorial lecture, University of Westminster, 17 March 2004. http://www.hero.ac.uk/uk/inside_he/archives/2004/our_place_at_the_table6205.cfm (Accessed 29.7.08).
- Wepner, S.B., D'Onofrio, A. & Wilhite, S.C. 2008. The leadership dimension of education deans. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(2): 153-169.
- Wisker, G. 1996. *Empowering women in higher education*. London: Kogan Page.