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ABSTRACT

An exploratory study examines gender differences in career pattern development within higher education administration. Male and female administrative personnel within a major State-wide system of higher education are paired by title and institutional type. A five year, 1979 to 1984, longitudinal design is employed in order to study career moves and changes over time. This study has a theoretical context that incorporates three levels of analysis: social structural, organizational and social psychological. Career determinants at each level are identified and new career influences are uncovered as an outcome of the descriptive analyses.

The 1979 findings indicate that gender differences do exist. Age and age at entry into administration show women being older in both cases. Entry routes, career obstacles and marriage and family patterns also show gender differentiation. Institutional context emerges as an important variable. These outcomes are used to anchor the 1984 follow-up phase. Gender differences in the impact of the internal labor market, the nature of career enhancers, and the content of perceived discrimination are evident. Age and context are further confirmed as significant career influences. A concluding movement cohort analysis shows little similarity of outcome between paired partners after five years.

Conclusions are reached based upon the power of gender, time period and context to constrain careers. Support for the three levels of analysis is evident both independently and interactively. Variables
within two or more levels frequently combine to facilitate career
development for men and to hinder it for women. Applications from the
results are then addressed so that the findings can lead to the develop­
ment of more equitable procedures in the hiring and promotion practices
within higher education administration.
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Gender differentiation within professional career development has been the focus of extensive theoretical and empirical effort during the past fifteen years. As women sought employment in non-traditional sectors of the labor market, attention was directed toward an examination of the ways the careers of these women differed from those of their male counterparts. Several researchers documented the existence of such differences in the earlier years of this effort (Faunce, 1977; Fennell, Barchas, Cohen, McMahon and Holdebrand, 1974; Hennig and Jardim, 1977; Kanter, 1977; Rosen and Jerdee, 1974; Schein, 1973).

Most of these studies examined the career development patterns of women in business and industry. The hypothesized determinants of gender differentiation tended to center upon social psychological attributes or personality traits possessed by women as a product of gender role socialization. Personality traits such as passivity, emotionality and indecisiveness along with such social psychological attributes as fear of success, learned helplessness and risk avoidance were cited as constraints upon career entry and advancement (Faunce, 1977; Freeman, 1971; Horner, 1971; Rosen and Jerdee, 1974). That such stereotypical gender role assumptions were not valid for all women did not dampen their ability to operate to the detriment of female professionals (Mark, 1981). Moreover, this early focus tended to emphasize how women were deviant, i.e., departed, from the normative, and male, pattern of career development.
During this time little attention was paid to the careers of women in higher education administration. This was so despite the fact that women were substantially underrepresented within administration, especially within high-echelon posts (Finlay and Crosson, 1981). Even by 1979, women within higher education administration were still clustered in low and middle-level positions, and were concentrated in posts which tended to reinforce stereotypical perceptions of appropriate roles for women (Van Alstyne, Withers and Elliott, 1977). Hence, despite the general focus on access and advancement of women into non-traditional posts, and despite a decade of affirmative action mandates, the opportunity structure within higher education administration remained constricted.

The need for research in this area was highlighted by several writers. Gappa and Uehling (1979) pointed out that information on women in administration was limited. Moreover, they went on to say that,

What little there is concerns the number of women occupying certain types of positions and their salaries. A complete assessment of the status of women administrators must await information about their particular assignments, the methods by which they obtained their positions, the length of time they have had them, and the factors that have influenced their success in obtaining positions and performance in them.

(Gappa and Uehling, 1979:45)

Rosalind Loring (1979) also documented the need for study in this area. She noted that during the period, 1970-1979, there was less than a five percent increase in the number of high-echelon posts held by women in administration. She commented that relatively little research existed
to assist women in obtaining posts of this type. Most research con­
centrated on the social psychological variables already noted. She called
for research on the "mechanisms for success" in management (Loring,
1979:3). Gordon and Ball supported this point when they commented that
little had been written or researched about what institutions were
doing to promote the movement of women into the administrative struc­
ture (Gordon and Ball, 1977:46). These writers underscored the need
to explore the career development patterns of women in higher education
administration from a broader perspective than the early work on the
impact of gender role socialization.

Two additional levels of analysis must be added to this social
psychological level. The first is the organizational features of the
bureaucratic context of the particular worksite. This is the point of
contact between the individual woman and the representatives of the
institution who control access and subsequent advancement. Interaction
variables which operate as exclusionary forces at this juncture must be
identified (Lockheed and Hall, 1976). The structural determinants
within the organization are a complementary force, supporting these
interaction dynamics. Rosabeth Moss Kanter (1977) has written exten­
sively about such issues as opportunity, power and numerical distribu­
tion as examples of such forces. Lastly, the actual bureaucratic
structure must be taken into account. The location of posts within
that structure, the extent of discretionary authority, the potential
for advancement, and the principal service population are all
bureaucratic elements which could produce gender differentiated career outcomes within higher education administration.

The second level of analysis which must be added to any study of career pattern development is the social structural. These are broad contextual features of the larger social order which impact upon both the organization and the individual. Within higher education administration, the implementation of affirmative action mandates is one such circumstance. The policies and procedures governing hiring and promotion have been altered by these externally imposed requirements in an attempt to open the opportunity structure within higher education administration. However, after a decade or more, the results have not been dramatic (Finlay and Crosson, 1981). Additional forces at the social structural level may be countervailing the ability of affirmative action to effect equality of opportunity. The nature of career lines within higher education administration and the employment market for administrators are two such elements. Career lines may be short, i.e., dead-end early, within just those positions most available within the current labor market. Affirmative action mandates may facilitate entry but cannot impact upon advancement since the entry posts are structurally limited by these alternative forces. The study of gender differentiated career development must then incorporate social structural variables, and must be sensitive to the interactive effect of these and other variables that influence career moves and changes.

Leonard Reissman in "A Study of Role Conceptions in Bureaucracy," clearly articulates the need for this three-level analysis. He writes,
The content of the responses [in his study] was viewed as constituting a synthesis of three functionally interrelated levels of defining the situation in which the role is performed. The first consists of the culturally prescribed behavior which conforms to the normative standards of society. The second level consists of the bureaucratically defined behavior required by the formal structure of the organization. The third level is that of the individually defined behavior which takes into account not only the requirements already distinguished, but also adds to it the unique individual elements. This includes the synthesis of the individual's experience and the conception upon which he acts.

(Reissman, 1972:253-4)

The three levels which then must be taken into account are the social structural, the organizational and the social psychological. Career pattern development involves stages spread over time. As Taylor noted, the dimensions of such a career are reciprocally related to personality and to life style (Taylor, 1968:293). Other writers join in calling for a multi-level approach. It has become clear that focusing on only one level actually distorts rather than clarifies an understanding of career development (Beck, Horan and Tolbert II, 1978; Kanter, 1977; Spilerman, 1977; Williams, 1976). The present study endeavors to incorporate these three levels of analysis into an exploration of gender differences in career pattern development within higher education administration.

The proposed study is exploratory. The absence of systematic studies of gender influences on administrative careers within higher education dictates this methodology. Prior studies have also been limited by samples which compare men and women at different administrative levels and sometimes across management and non-management positions. Mark (1981) noted that comparisons at the same level are
She further concluded that "comparisons between males and females at the same levels of administration might reveal more similarities than previously reported in the literature" (Mark, 1981:193-4). The present study attempts to heed this recommendation by utilizing a matched sample design. A male and a female administrator in a similarly titled position at the same institutional level, i.e., university center, Arts and Science college or community college, are paired with each other. This insures comparability at a given point in time. Prior and subsequent career development differences are then linked to gender with a higher degree of confidence in the validity of the conclusions.

Career patterns are clearly developed over time. It is also the case that career determinants at each of the three levels of analysis shift, and, if stable, shift in emphasis over time. A further limitation of earlier studies on higher education administration has been their cross-sectional nature (Mark, 1981). A longitudinal study is required if a comprehensive understanding of career development differences among men and women is the goal. Comparability at one point in time may be the product of differential access routes. Moreover, subsequent career moves and changes may be quite different despite the common position at a particular date. The only way to assess these possibilities is with a study that spans an extended period of time. The current exploratory study assesses career development during the five year period, 1979 to 1984. Current and retrospective career data are gathered in 1979. Sample members are followed and recontacted in
1984. Current and prospective data are gathered at that point. The focal five year period anchors the exploratory analysis and permits a view of career development over time.

In summary, it was evident in 1979 that information on the substance of the career development patterns of administrative women within higher education was sparse. An assessment of the access and advancement patterns of female administrators was needed. This examination needed to be coupled with the ways such patterns departed from the traditional pattern of male administrators. Additionally, the analysis needed to go beyond the social psychological level to incorporate career variables at the social structural and organizational levels. Only then can the forces which influence gender differences in career outcomes be fully understood. The present research addresses these issues by undertaking a five year study of career development among matched pairs of male and female administrators within a major State system of higher education. The exploratory design permits an analysis of crucial variables assumed to be career determinants from prior theoretical and empirical efforts. Additionally, the flexibility of the design allows alternative variables to emerge which shed further light on the nature of gender differences in career development. The research outcomes are then applied to the institutional context of higher education in order to insure greater equality of opportunity to anyone aspiring to an administrative career.
CHAPTER 1
THE THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL CONTEXT

I. Introduction

An integrated approach to career development involves charting the contributions each level of analysis, social structural, organizational and social psychological, makes to the overall access and advancement patterns of men and women within higher education administration. Reviewing each level separately will facilitate an understanding of the power of each level. Gender disparities and gender similarities can be identified. The reality however is that the three levels interact to both support and at times to counteract one another. Comprehending this interlocking helix of career influences is necessary before the nature of gender differentiated patterns can be fully understood. Such understanding is required before equality of opportunity can be attained.

At the social structural level, the power of external mandates such as affirmative action upon the opportunity structure within higher education administration must be noted. The interaction of these forces with market conditions demonstrates the combined power of cultural and structural factors to set the broad context within which administrators must develop their careers. Their ability to do so also rests upon the structure of career lines within higher education administration itself. Each occupational sphere imposes conditions upon the access and advancement potential of incumbents. The rigidity of such career line progression and career pattern development is a major force in determining career outcomes. These factors impinge upon the individual without
being readily amenable to personal influence. They constitute powerful context constraints which must be taken into account in any study of career moves and changes.

The organizational level is the point where the individual confronts the bureaucratic structure. There are objective features of that structure which set conditions on career movement. Institutional characteristics and elements of the bureaucratic structure itself are two such factors. The type of position and the location of a post within the bureaucratic hierarchy both, for example, operate to influence opportunities for access and advancement. Additionally, it is at the organizational level that the individual confronts the mechanisms of exclusion. The non-traditional candidate must overcome the resistance of organizational incumbents to admitting someone who is different. The techniques of boundary maintenance are often subtle and support the continuance of institutional sexism. The organizational forces operate to facilitate access for men and to impose burdens for women. The impact of affirmative action should mitigate these distinctions. Whether or not that is the case will illustrate the interactive power of the differing levels of analysis.

The third level of analysis is the social psychological. This has been the most widely examined component of gender differentiated career pattern development. Gender role socialization differences have been viewed as the key explanation for gender differentiated outcomes. The way women are socialized is viewed as a limiting factor for pursuing career development. It is assumed that women must divest themselves of much of the content of early socialization in order to attain success
in management. Linked to this is the impact of marriage and family upon women as they move through the life cycle. Since both career movement and family commitments are developmental, i.e., shift over time, the issue of changes during the life cycle in the content of these two areas is a crucial concern. Again, the interactive power of two levels of analysis may operate to place differential constraints upon men and women.

Elements within each of these three levels of analysis will be discussed in detail. Structural factors, organizational elements and social psychological variables will be presented so that the complexity of career pattern development can be understood. The interactive context within which career development takes place must be detailed. An equation representing that context would be:

\[ A_{1-n} \times B_{1-n} \times C_{1-n} = \text{Career Outcomes} \]

where 

- \( A = \) Social Structural Factors
- \( B = \) Organizational Variables
- \( C = \) Social Psychological Elements

The research results and conclusions will be discussed within this framework. The overall goal of expanding the understanding of gender differentiated career pattern development can then be achieved.

II. Social Structural Factors

A. The Era of Affirmative Action

An examination of gender differentiation in career development during the period 1979 to 1984 must take into account the impact of externally imposed requirements. During this period, institutions of
higher education were compelled to actively create access and advancement opportunities for classes of people who were previously excluded. Women within higher education administration were one such group.

The requirement that institutions work to increase the representation of minority group members on their staffs largely rests upon Executive Order 11246 as amended. This order mandated government contracting agencies to specify in every non-exempt contract that the contractor will take "affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated, during employment, without regard to their race, color, religion, sex or nation origin" (Travis, 1976:51). This specific order was buttressed by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act as amended, and by Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (Benokraitis and Feagin, 1978). These three mandates, along with others, e.g., the Equal Pay Act of 1963, created an environment which should promote the access and advancement of women into higher education administration. Gender differentiation in career pattern development should reflect the power of affirmative action to open the opportunity structure.

Institutions of higher education clearly understood the affirmative action mandates. Plans were developed in order to positively and aggressively remove formal and informal barriers which prevented access and advancement by minority group members, women included. The accent was upon active non-discrimination and upon results (Benokraitis and Feagin, 1978). The long term goal was to bring about structural changes that would eliminate institutional sexism so that, in fact, affirmative action plans would not be needed
(Farley, 1981). The issue is now the extent to which these forces have been able to create such shifts within higher education administration during the initial decade of principal activity, which is also the decade just prior to this study, 1969-1979.

The results show only limited improvements in access. Very few studies show any improvement in advancement. For example, the 1975-1976 Biennial Survey of Administrative Compensation conducted by the College and University Personnel Association surveyed 18,035 full-time administrators. White men comprised 79% of that sample. Approximately 14% were women. White women received a median salary only 88% that paid white men. White men held 96% of the chief executive positions and over 80% of all others (Van Alstyne, Withers and Elliott, 1977).

These results are not atypical. In 1977, of over 2,500 accredited colleges and universities surveyed by the American Council on Education, only 5% were headed by women (Finlay and Crosson, 1981). Women administrators were clustered in low and middle-level administrative positions such as Assistant to the Dean, Assistant Dean or Associate Dean. Women were also in such gender stereotyped posts as head librarian, nursing dean and student personnel services director (Gappa and Uehling, 1979).

In more recent assessments, the data are still not encouraging. A preliminary report on senior women administrators stated that the changes from 1975-1983 were not dramatic. The report indicated that in 1975 there were 1,625 senior women administrators, i.e., Deans, Vice-Presidents, Provosts and Presidents, throughout all accredited institutions of higher education. This produced an average of 0.6 senior
women per institution. By 1983 the average was still only 1.1 senior women per institution or 3,084 total women (Touchton and Shavlik, 1984). While this nearly doubled the numbers, the representation is still minimal. These figures come at the end of better than fifteen years of affirmative action mandates and plans by institutions to increase the numbers of women, especially women in high echelon posts.

Women however are beginning to appear in greater numbers at the lower administrative levels. By 1978, 38% of Registrars were women; 46% of Affirmative Action Officers were women; and, 38% of head librarians were women (Sandler, 1979). Additionally, a 1975 study by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges found that the number of women administrators was increasing but that this increase was occurring in low-level management. Most women were still concentrated in low and middle level administrative posts (Gappa and Uehling, 1979).

The results then consistently document the limited participation of women even in the face of years of affirmative action legislation. Moreover, women are often better qualified than their majority group counterparts, and women are often held to a higher standard of performance. So, women who are distinctly superior may be able to attain access and advancement but women who are merely average tend to do badly when compared to men who are also average (VanderWaerdt, 1982).

These recent trends are also occurring in the face of a reduced commitment to affirmative action by the principal enforcement agencies of the federal government (VanderWaerdt, 1982; Farley, 1981; Scott, 1979). These trends underscore that changes in the opportunity structure continue. Such shifts are now more oriented toward a reactive than
a proactive stance. The impact of these shifts has major implications for a review of career development patterns between 1979 and 1984.

The reports indicate that access has occurred but that advancement is limited. Access routes for men and women may then differ due to the impact of affirmative action in the early 1970s. Women may also be more recently recruited into their posts than men as institutions attempted to meet initial requirements for increasing the representation of women on their administrative staffs. Advancement patterns, following the reported trend, should be fairly restricted for these same women during the five year period of this study, 1979-1984. This period coincides with the lessening of both governmental and societal support of affirmative action programs. Each of these guiding hypotheses will be addressed within the research.

The proposed research then spans a crucial period. Affirmative action mandates were in effect long enough by 1979 to have an impact upon access. However, the limited ability to advance should also be evident. Future career aspirations may take the present climate into account. The temporality of affirmative action efforts is a key element within the structural press under consideration. It is evident that change has occurred within the crucial junctures of the proposed study. The extent to which the results reflect a pattern consistent with these shifts will support the contention that structural forces must be factored into any study of career development.

B. Career Lines and Patterns

Career lines and patterns comprise another structural element impinging upon the individual administrator. Here the press arises
from the occupational sector itself. Each sector has a process of recruitment, progression and termination that any incumbent must take into account if he or she is to attain access and advancement (Glaser, 1968). The factors in this process comprise the content of career development patterns. It is however the social structure within that sector which conditions the circumstances surrounding what content can actually be secured. The issue of career lines and patterns within higher education administration is then crucial to understanding gender differentiated moves and changes.

The term career pattern will be used to refer to an individual's particular job history. The term career line will refer to a work history common to a portion of the labor force, i.e., a sequence of positions common to a number of individuals within the particular segment of the labor force under study (Spilerman, 1977). Hence, a person's career pattern may or may not follow an occupational career line. The career line can be viewed as more typically representing the career development pattern of traditional incumbents in gender segmented occupations. For example, within higher education administration the career line has been developed almost exclusively by the career patterns of male incumbents given the paucity of women in higher education administration (Digest of Educational Statistics, 1978; Howard, 1978). Gender differentiation can then be accounted for by the ways in which female career patterns depart from career lines for particular administrative positions. Moreover, the utility of the career line as a conceptual tool is highlighted by the recognition that career lines are relatively stable, intermediary structures within
occupations which relate individual behavior to organizational context (Spilerman, 1977). The career line focus upon intermediary structures where the level of the individual confronts the social structural elements of the workplace in patterned social processes is then especially crucial to understanding gender differentiated patterns.

Career development is then movement along a career line. Career line progression demands movement through job sequences with some measure of determinable regularity over time. It is a sequence of positions, increasing in status and typically age-graded (Spenner, Otto and Call, 1982). Position movement and stability are patterned by a set of normative prescriptions associated with that occupational sector. In short, a career line connects the social structure of the workworld with the individual and does so over time.

A major element within this conceptualization is the link with age. Career development is dynamic. The focal issues shift as the individual matures, both in chronological terms and in terms of professional competencies. There are many theories which trace this developmental sequence (Srebalus, Marinelli and Messing, 1982; Richard Hall, 1975; Pietrofesa and Splete, 1975). Most of these trace career development from initial choice in late adolescence to retirement. Many theories link these career stages to psychological needs that are also age-based. One approach that departs from this framework and thus provides a better direct link with occupational career line progression was developed by Gene Dalton, Paul Thompson and Raymond Price (Morgan, 1980:43-60).
Dalton and his associates propose a four-stage professional career progression. In Stage I access to the career line is attained with an entry-level post. The central activities are oriented toward helping, learning and following directions, that is, establishing himself or herself as a competent beginner. Socialization into the occupational sector is a predominant Stage I activity. Stage II is oriented toward major contributions to the field. The individual is working independently and fine-tuning his or her professional skills. It is the period within which a professional reputation is built. Stage III builds on Stage II but broadens to include other interests, new ideas and the application of skills to new areas. This may entail taking care of others who can now benefit from his or her expertise, as he or she did in Stage I. The formal supervisory position is the most advantageous post for the exercise of Stage III activities. Stage IV is characterized by increasing power. The person is able to shape the direction of his or her organization or field. He or she is considered a senior resource with an established reputation. These stages are typically not recognized within the formal organizational structure but are nonetheless informally known by the incumbents. Perceptions of individuals are tied to whether or not they fit the stage they should be in given their age and time in the field. These four stages also coincide with a decade division of the work years between 25 and 65. The content of each decade is then assumed to be different although the boundaries are not necessarily rigid (Dalton, Thompson and Price, 1977).
The content of career development then is sequential. However, the pattern of movement or mobility has been almost exclusively charted by studying the career line progression of men. How career development unfolds for women has only recently been reviewed. These efforts centered upon the effects of sex role stereotyping, occupational barriers, marriage and family obligations, and personality factors (Osipow, 1975). Emerging from this body of knowledge is the conclusion that career development for women is more complex than that for men because of the differential impact of this combination of career constraints. As Fitzgerald and Crites (1980:47) point out, the traditional career development theories may be "necessary but not sufficient" to understanding the career development of women. The conclusion from a range of studies is that there are some elements of career development that are shared by both men and women; however, there are several important areas of gender difference. Most of these rest upon the conflict between the traditional roles of women and the demands of work, or upon the attitudes of others about the competencies of women within the workplace (Osipow, 1983). Each of these issues will be discussed in subsequent sections of this review.

These gender-based concerns are further tied to the career lines particular to higher education administration. The concept of career pattern development is dependent upon the existence of a relatively stable set of career lines. There is some indication that such lines within higher education administration are not this stable. Scott (1979), for example, notes that higher education administration appears to be a bureaucracy in its formal structure but is not in its
position hierarchy. Many middle management positions have limited mobility in a nonetheless highly stratified setting. There is low career development due to this horizontal structure at exactly the point where career mobility is most anticipated. Kanter (1979) also notes that the career lines within higher education administration are short, i.e., there are few positions between the entry post and the top of the career ladder. This horizontal structure makes it possible to reach a dead end relatively early in one's career. Many such roles are highly specialized so that transfer to a new career branch is difficult. Such short lines limit the progress of women into high echelon posts. Access into a range of entry posts is possible; but, too often, advancement is curtailed by the administrative structure itself. Moreover, the posts where women tend to gain incumbency are precisely those with the short career lines. The interactive effect is thus even more powerful.

Two aspects of the career development literature are especially pertinent to this point: longevity and hierarchy (Taylor, 1968). Longevity underscores the patterned progression of career lines. Stages, wherein career emphasis and content differ, are the basis of such progression. Hierarchy deals with the fact that career lines imply mobility. The person moves from one stage to another and in doing so increases his or her power, prestige and income. However, it appears that higher education administration may not be structured in a way that allows such mobility. If career lines are truncated or do not exist, then the study of career pattern development rests on more individualized adaptations to these circumstances.
The career pattern of administrative women may be different in relation to both these career factors. Women are now entering higher education administration as affirmative action policies and changing definitions of women's roles open the opportunity structure. However, it is likely that many women are transferring from other occupational sectors. They may come to administration at a later point in career development. What happens as women enter a system that is not truly hierarchical yet still assumes the career stage conceptualization, linking progression and age, is a major exploratory focus for this study.

Gender differentiated career pattern development is then an important element in grasping career distinctions between men and women. The impact of career lines within higher education administration along with the differences in career stage content for men and women must be assessed. As the analysis is completed, results may emerge which will shed light upon the areas of both gender difference and similarity in career development. This will again be done within a context that stresses the interactive effect of forces at the social structural, organizational and individual levels.

C. Labor Market Conditions

A third structural feature is the labor market conditions within a particular time period. In developing a career pattern all persons, regardless of gender, must confront these conditions (Berg, 1981). Such conditions can be exceedingly powerful factors in constructing the individual's access to opportunities for career development since they represent external conditions over which the particular
person has little or no control. Nonetheless, they must be acknowledged and taken into account as potential determinants of his or her movement along a career line.

Two aspects of the labor market within higher education will be discussed. Both represent possibilities for gender differentiated outcomes. The first condition poses the idea that an internal labor market exists within higher education administration. The structural features of the internal market are evident. Movement within institutions or within systems may thus be facilitated. This may be intensified for women who may find being a known entity an advantage in reducing the barriers to access. The second feature is market vitality. Here the issue is the extent to which the market is expanding or contracting during the period under study. The opportunity structure can permit access and advancement only when position availability exists. In an era of fiscal constraint, the ability of non-traditional candidates such as women to gain access, or even to maintain access, can be problematic. These two areas again set the background dynamics of career development within higher education administration.

An internal labor market existing within higher education administration would present a formidable element of institutional press upon the individual. The concept of an internal labor market as used here refers to an administrative unit within which the pricing and allocation of labor is governed by a set of administrative rules and procedures rather than such pricing and allocation being directly controlled by traditional economic variables such as supply, demand and open competition (Doeringer and Piore, 1971:1-2). Positions within
the internal labor market are thus protected by these rules and procedures from the direct influence of the external labor market conditions.

If an examination is made of hiring and promotion practices within higher education administration, it becomes evident that conditions which characterize an internal labor market do operate. For instance, there is a strong element of position specificity. Abilities are demanded which are not easily transferable since they are anchored in the characteristics of the institution. There are demands which must be learned on-site and are not a part of formal training. Lastly, there is a substantial element of custom whereby operational rules are largely based upon past practice and precedent (Doeringer and Piore, 1971). All three of these conditions are present in higher education administration, albeit principally within its informal structure.

This distinction between what is actually practiced and what is formally stated as modes of operation is significant since it does appear that within higher education much formal policy does not acknowledge the existence of an internal labor market. Rather, such policy posits the existence of free market conditions. This is indicated by the national searches and the need for specific educational credentials. However, a closer look at the process and result of these policies and procedures speaks strongly to an internal labor market. These objective elements may be integral components of the techniques of evaluation and placement but they are not the only factors. They can be overridden by the elements defining position specificity. Additionally, because these are not part of the formal selection
process, they are all the more powerful in their impact. In fact, the failure of equal employment opportunity legislation, including affirmative action, to substantially increase the representation of minority group members in such positions may be linked to the ways in which assumptions are made that external market conditions persist when that is not the case.

The area of greatest interest for gender differentiation is the use of internal candidacy in order to attain access. The advent of affirmative action mandates compelled institutions to add women to their administrative staffs. The safest choice would be a woman already employed at the institution or at a sister institution. In speaking about such internal movement, Slocum (1966:257) stated that a definite etiquette existed where the usual norm in higher education administration was that the job sought the man not the reverse. It can be assumed that this procedure for recruiting internal candidates persisted as the administrative incumbents within this study were achieving access. This would mean that women hired in the early 1970s should have utilized the internal labor market more than men. Such gender differentiation would again speak to the interaction of several variables in producing career outcomes.

A variable overlaid on the concept of internal labor market is the extent to which that market is not higher education as a whole but is restricted to the level or type of institution of current employment. This is especially so for the community college segment of higher education. In fact, the dual economy conceptualization is a useful one here. The differences between the institutional milieu of the community
colleges versus the four year colleges and universities are so substantial that they fit the core-periphery distinction of the dual economy (Averitt, 1968). The importance of institutional context as a system property affecting career development rests upon past studies. These have typically focused upon milieu considerations in regard to such variables as instructional commitment and research orientation (Blank, 1978). In a 1979 study, a factor analysis of items related to institutional context produced findings which point to contextual differences that could also impact upon administrative careers. Halley and Little (1979) found that on factors indicative of institutional demands and career opportunities, university and four year college faculty loaded on similar factors while community college faculty loaded on a completely different set of issues related to institutional context.

The recent report by Touchton and Shavlik (1984:4) also documents the need to distinguish institutional type when considering market conditions. They note that the community college share of all women administrators increased from 24% to 31% during the period from 1975 to 1983. Doctoral granting institutions remained the same at 12%, while liberal arts colleges dropped from 43% to 35% during this same period. Van Alstyne, Withers and Elliott (1977) also found that hiring practices for administrators differed markedly by type of institution in that two year colleges employed more women administrators than four year schools. Clearly the concept of a dual or multiple economy within higher education administration must be taken into account. The labor market may then be quite different for men and women at the different institutional levels. Throughout the exploratory study the variable of
institutional type will be introduced into the analyses. Its importance as a career element, given these indicators, can then be assessed.

Market vitality is a structural feature which also interacts with the internal labor market to affect access and advancement. During a period of expansion such as higher education enjoyed in the 1960s and early 1970s, applicants were operating within a seller's market. In this context access and movement among positions was relatively open and responded more fully to external market conditions. However, higher education today is no longer a growth industry. Both employers and employees in a buyer's market tend to alter their behavior. These shifts promote the creation of internal labor market conditions which may further reduce the vitality of a market already suffering from stagnation. In such a period, employment stability becomes a paramount consideration for workers. This consideration contributes to the movement toward an internal market. Since this also minimizes costs to the employer, it becomes attractive to both workers and management (Doeringer and Piore, 1971).

While it is evident that market vitality and internal labor market conditions interact, it is also apparent that any analysis is further complicated by the fact that market vitality is position-specific. While higher education as a whole may not be expanding, there are areas where turnover is relatively high, or where the very lack of growth has generated institutional demands resulting in the expansion of positions. For example, there has been a growth in administrative complexity, new technologies and off-campus constituencies. This has resulted in the addition of positions with
specialized functions, e.g., financial managers, institutional researchers and management information systems analysts (Scott, 1979). These may often be staffed by women seeking entry; but, they are precisely those posts with short career lines. They will dead-end early and advancement will be limited.

It is also true that not every position seeker possesses the qualifications for those posts where availability is greatest. Labor market pools come into effect when making such position assessments. The impact of industry organization within a particular region or community is a significant factor in comprehending the underlying features of career development. Evaluating distinctions among gender differentiated career development patterns necessitates an assessment of market vitality by position. This is a complex task. However, in a regionally based internal labor market such as a state-wide system of higher education, the extent of opportunity for entry and advancement is tied to a narrow range of position availability. The resultant disparities need identification since these labor market conditions produce an opportunity structure with potentially gender differentiated elements. One area which could illuminate indications of these market vitality issues is an analysis of the process of application. Gender differences in search techniques and in the rate of success would support the importance of addressing these constructs within a study of career development.

The internal labor market, the dual economy conceptualization of two-year versus four-year institutions, and the issue of market vitality by position, all comprise structural features which influence...
the career development activities of individual men and women. The use of internal candidacy, the power of the type of institution, and the characteristics of entry positions into higher education administration will all be examined in the analyses. When these elements are linked to career lines and patterns as well as to the overall context of affirmative action, a more complete understanding of the impact of structural forces upon career development will emerge. An integration of these variables with those at the organizational and social psychological levels will document the complexity of gender similarities and differences in career development and point toward future directions for further theoretical and empirical efforts.

III. Organizational Context

The organizational context is the point of interaction between the individual seeking access or aspiring to advance and those who are the evaluators, determining whether such goals will be attained. Career movement is in part determined by the agreements among those already within the organization that the applicant meets the criteria for inclusion. This is so whether initial entry or advancement is the objective. Any minority group member confronts exclusionary forces at this juncture which are not experienced by applicants from the traditional candidate pool. A summary of these dynamics, operating at the organizational level, is needed in order to fully comprehend the conditions influencing gender differentiated career outcomes.
A. The Dynamics of Exclusion

As women strive to gain access and advancement parity with men, it is crucial to explore potential gender similarities and differences in the process of attaining incumbency. Without such study, expectations that women must model the career development patterns of men in order to be viewed as legitimate candidates for administrative posts will continue to lead to circumstances which effectively exclude or limit access and advancement. Moreover, assumptions of gender differences in social psychological characteristics also function to produce differential evaluations of men and women. These differing expectations influence both the process of gaining entry into administrative posts and assessments of subsequent performance within those positions. Here the assumptions are based upon the belief that women do not possess the requisite attributes for effectiveness within the management hierarchy (Schein, 1973; Rosen and Jerdee, 1974; Touchton and Shavlik, 1978). A framework is needed in order to explore the hypothesized operation of these combined forces in creating an alternative and more closed opportunity structure for women.

Expectation-states theory supports the analysis of these dynamics. This theoretical orientation allows for an understanding of the ways in which gender functions as a diffuse status characteristic. Possession of such a status sets up a series of expectations about the person which then may force him or her to make accommodations. These accommodations result in the development of the gender differentiated career patterns under study. Expectation-states theory defines a status characteristic as a characteristic around which differences in
cognitions and evaluations of individuals or social types come to be organized. A diffuse status characteristic is one whose states are associated with various specific and general expectations (Berger, Fisek, Norman and Zelditch, Jr., 1977:36). A diffuse status characteristic then functions to broaden the consideration of attributes beyond those specifically acknowledged to be crucial to fulfilling role demands.

Expectation-states theory outlines the operation of this process through the conceptualization of status saliency, spread of relevance and burden of proof assumptions (Berger, et al., 1977). Saliency will exist if the status characteristic is known or believed to be directly related to the task, or if the status characteristic provides a basis for discrimination between the factors subjected to evaluation. Moreover, the diffuse status characteristic, because of the general expectation states associated with it, also becomes linked to task assessment through indirect relevance bonds. In this case the status characteristic is not directly connected to the task demands but becomes salient because the diffuse status contains expected traits which are assumed to be linked to task performance. Lastly, the burden of proof assumption permits a status characteristic to enter the situation even if there are no beliefs associated with it that are linked to the task. This assumption states that, if salient, the status characteristic is assumed relevant unless it is established that it is not so. The burden of proof is, in short, upon dissociating the status characteristic from the task. If this is not accomplished, the differentiating characteristic will be assumed salient regardless of the lack
of direct or even indirect relevance. That is, relevance spreads under burden of proof to include all that is not explicitly excluded.

The possession of a negatively evaluated status characteristic should then result in the operation of this process so that individuals will either be excluded from the role or be required to break the bonds of relevance in order to gain incumbency. In severing such connections these individuals are likely to evidence characteristics which separate them from those individuals who possess the positively evaluated diffuse status characteristic.

The operation of gender as a diffuse status characteristic has been demonstrated by several studies dealing with expectations based upon stereotypical assumptions of appropriate gender role behavior for men and women (Ruch and Newton, 1977; Lockheed and Hall, 1976; Fennell, Barchas, Cohen, McMahon and Holdebrand, 1974). This process involves a sequence of hypothesized routes when applied to higher education administration. First, the saliency assumption is activated because the gender of the individual is assumed by the evaluators to be directly relevant to adequate fulfillment of role responsibilities within higher education administration (Faunce, 1977; Hennig and Jardin, 1977; Fennell, et.al., 1974). Such direct relevance assumptions operate in evaluating the likelihood that female applicants could be effective within an administrative position. The saliency assumption is also fulfilled because gender clearly operates to differentiate candidates. Evaluators are aware of the gender of individuals and such awareness, even if direct links are not assumed, compels gender to become salient. Next, spread of relevance occurs when the gender of the individual is assumed
by the evaluators to be indirectly connected to task performance. For example, an assumption that women are overly emotional, indecisive, and passive will operate to structure the situation. Although gender does not bear directly upon the task, it now has indirect linkages which make the diffuse characteristic, via sex role stereotypes, highly relevant. Through the spread of relevance assumption, it is as if a direct relevance bond now exists between performance and gender. Assumptions about individuals like the female applicant or incumbent are formed. These include personality traits and social psychological characteristics associated with women as a group. From these assumptions about what women are like, beliefs are generated about what women can be expected to be like in previously undefined situations such as incumbency in an administrative post. Lastly, even if gender is not assumed to be related directly or indirectly to task performance, unless it is disassociated by explicit exclusion it will, under the burden of proof assumption, enter into the evaluation of the individual. Evaluators must then be confronted with direct evidence that gender is not related to performance capabilities. Otherwise, stereotypical gender assumptions will be activated to the detriment of the female candidate who possesses the negatively evaluated status within this situational context.

These processes then operate as forces which exclude an individual woman because women as a group are perceived as lacking the attributes and characteristics demanded of able administrators. The diffuse status characteristic of gender is devalued for women. Possession of it poses limitations on access and advancement. Gender differentiation should then be evident within career development at
specific junctures. For example, entry routes into administration may be different for men versus women. Men should be more able to utilize institutionalized entry routes whereas women would need to develop alternative pathways to overcome the impact of the devalued status. These routes of circumvention would dissociate gender as a salient characteristic in order to gain access. Such routes should be more individualized for women, as each person finds her own techniques for breaking the bonds of relevance that create the negative association between gender and competence in the minds of evaluators. It is also likely that these routes would require additional investments of time since the established support structure aiding candidates with the valued status characteristic would not be open to those possessing the devalued status characteristic.

The effect would then have multiple outcomes. Women should evidence entry route differences from men. Moreover, women are likely to be different from one another in the routes taken into administration. Additionally, women should enter administration later as their career development reflects the extra time needed to acquire background characteristics that dissociate gender. The interaction of affirmative action mandates with these dynamics may also result in a rise in the number of women who have recently entered administration. Such mandates would compel evaluators to dissociate gender or, even more pointedly, to include gender by affirming the need to employ compensatory guidelines so that the formally devalued status is now a positive attribute. The interactive effects of the differing levels of analysis
are again a crucial element in comprehending the range of forces determining career development.

Expectation-states theory then directs the focus of concern to be placed upon the point of contact with the academic institution. However, other organizational constraints within this context also apply differential pressure to male and female applicants. The desire for homogeneity within bureaucratic structures is one such press upon non-traditional candidates. As one moves within the bureaucratic hierarchy, the range of discretion in fulfilling role requirements tends to increase. With this increase in the fluidity of position performance comes a desire on the part of established personnel to maximize the similarity of the perspective incumbent to those already functioning within the organization (Kanter, 1977). At this level of responsibility, the criteria for effective decision making are diffuse and the impact of decisions often long term and indirect. This means appropriate role behavior can only be loosely specified. When such uncertainty exists, the importance of attributes beyond formal, technical qualifications greatly increases due to the fact that the direct relationship between such qualifications and performance is lessened. Here the power of the devalued status is at its peak since it becomes one anchor for evaluating "fit" with the organization and its representatives. Homogeneity itself becomes the foundation for the confidence which must be placed in the prospective incumbent. The threat posed by potential incumbents who are socially dissimilar (outsiders) can produce a renewed emphasis upon homogeneity and boundary maintenance. Women, because of their possession of the negatively
evaluated diffuse status characteristic, are viewed as such outsiders. Unless gender becomes explicitly dissociated from considerations of the individual's capacity to function within the organization, gender becomes an exclusionary attribute for women. It would be an inclusionary one for men since the press toward homogeneity would permit the utilization of gender as a means of identifying those who are similar from those who are not. Each individual woman must then overcome this push toward homogeneity. She must dissociate the negatively evaluated status characteristic from the assumptions of the evaluators regarding her capabilities as an administrator.

The combined impact of the homogeneity principle and the possession of the devalued status characteristic forces women to document their right to inclusion. Such proof of potential "fit" within the organization is consistent with the contention that men are generally hired for their potential, i.e., assumed "fit," whereas women are often hired based upon their accomplishments, i.e., proven "fit" (Touchton and Shavlick, 1978). Proof of homogeneity must be offered. Such legitimation techniques might take the form of acting positions, nominations from respected others or internal candidacy. These would operate to dissociate the gender of the female applicant from the considerations of her competence to perform within the role. These forms of legitimation validate the suitability of the woman when homogeneity concerns are raised by her possession of the negatively evaluated status characteristic. When these circumstances are merged with the social structural elements within higher education administration, system properties oriented toward maintaining the status quo
are clearly evident. Such system properties within higher education may function as latent mechanisms to differentially structure the context within which men and women pursue career advancement. Tied to the interaction dynamics generated by gender as a diffuse status characteristic, these structural determinants further explain the forces producing gender differentiated career outcomes.

B. Structural Determinants Within The Organizational Milieu

Rosabeth Moss Kanter's study of structural determinants of behavior in complex organizations provides support for the conclusion that multiple forces within the organization are operating to facilitate or limit career development. She identified three key components of the institutional milieu which organize an understanding of the ways in which the responses of individual men and women operate to produce gender differentiated career pattern development (Kanter, 1977). These three factors are opportunity, power and relative numbers, i.e., the quantitative distribution of similar social types within the organizational hierarchy.

Opportunity structures within the particular types of institutions are a crucial career pattern variable. The overall opportunity structure for the field is a broad social structural dynamic. The particular organization also has its own opportunity structure which constrains mobility both within the institution and outside its confines. A review of the problems of blocked opportunity will highlight these effects. Kanter points out that mobility can be blocked in at least three types of circumstances: 1) when there was never much opportunity to begin with; 2) when the individual had lost out in the
competition for advancement; and, 3) when people had come to the present post through the wrong career path, i.e., they could handle the present post but they had the wrong combination of background characteristics to effect advancement (Kanter, 1977:136-8).

Each of these circumstances poses special problems for the non-traditional candidate who has a devalued status characteristic. In the first instance, access may occur but advancement will not because there is a very limited career line. This problem has already been discussed. The positions available within the current market are often those in this category, e.g., Assistant to the President and Affirmative Action Officer. Moreover, these are safe posts for the institution. The non-traditional candidate can be hired; but, she is hired into a post with narrowly defined responsibilities and close supervision. When this is combined with a short career line for the post, the institution assumes very little risk in admitting an outsider. Yet, external demands that such outsiders be included are met. Everyone may initially be satisfied with these arrangements since it will take time before the advancement limitations are evident to the newly arrived incumbent.

The second instance, where advancement is limited by the individual losing the competitive struggle for mobility, could be, for women, a direct result of the difficulty of advancing to posts with more fluid role requirements and extensive discretionary power to set policy and procedure affecting the institution itself. Both the exclusionary dynamics of the devalued status and the mechanisms associated with boundary maintenance are activated since the risk to
the institution and its employees is substantial. The likelihood of overcoming these additional barriers when the non-traditional candidate is in competition with someone possessing the valued status characteristic is low. Externally imposed mandates, having been met at other levels within the institution, are not as compelling a countervailing force as they were when entry was the issue.

The third consideration is especially pertinent. Mobility is limited when people come to the present post with the wrong combination of background characteristics. Here is a classic double bind situation for the non-traditional candidate. As noted, women must break the bonds of relevance linking gender and assumptions of competence in order to attain access. This will involve alternative pathways, additional documentation, and longer periods of time in posts which may not be directly applicable to the one now sought. While all of this is required for access, it will deter advancement. This should be especially the case for the woman who is a direct beneficiary of affirmative action. She may have spent many years in a relatively obscure post. With the advent of affirmative action, she may, often as an internal candidate, i.e., someone safe, be moved into an administrative post. Because of this advancement, she assumes further advancement is possible. Her aspirations are heightened; but, when mobility is sought, it cannot be achieved due to the combination of factors now under consideration. In fact, it would not be uncommon for a single woman to be confronted with all three of the limitations on mobility cited by Kanter. This discrepancy between access and advancement will be analyzed within the current research. It clearly
speaks to a significant issue within gender differentiated career development. It is also one which will persist into the future since the desire for advancement is now the crucial issue for women who entered administration during the past decade.

Power is the second structural determinant Kanter raises as a career variable. Power is a product of placement within the management hierarchy. The formal bureaucratic structure specifies the distribution of authority. However, the ability to accomplish tasks and motivate personnel is more often a result of power derived from the informal structure, that is, the shadow structure that operates beneath the surface of the formal organizational structure (Kanter, 1977:165). As Kanter (1977:166) points out, the people with functional power are those who have access to the tools for action. They can command the resources necessary for accomplishment. There are several ways in which non-traditional candidates are limited in cultivating this type of informal power. Two of the most critical are the lack of sponsors or mentors and the inability of the person to effectively utilize the routes to informal power. Kanter (1977:177) identifies three criteria which must be met in order for job-related activities to increase the power commanded by the individual. Such activities must be extraordinary, visible and relevant. An overview of the ways women are limited from access to such activities will underscore the difficulties non-traditional candidates have in gathering such informal power. Without such power the person is perceived as less effective and this perception denies the individual the influence needed to accomplish even formally defined tasks. A
destructive cycle of increasing powerlessness results and the individ­
ual alone cannot easily reverse this trend since the power under study
is more influential than based in authority.

Extraordinary performance of a job activity requires a task
where there is enough discretion in approach so that the creativity
and skill of the individual can become evident. Power cannot be
accumulated via the ordinary and expected. Merely doing your job
well is not enough (Kanter, 1977). The more routinized the activities,
the less likely it is that the circumstances of the role will permit
the development of a power base. Yet, it is just these more narrowly
defined tasks that characterize the posts most open to access by women
and other non-traditional candidates. As noted, not only is the risk
to the organization lower but these posts tend to be more available
within higher education administration today, as specialized knowledge
is required. The double bind circumstance arises again wherein the
post permitting access then imposes limitations on advancement and the
development of personal power within the organization.

This situation is compounded by the risk-taking that is
involved in increased visibility. Newcomers cannot as easily afford
such activities. Their visibility is too tightly tied to their deval­
ued status. The press upon the individual is to establish "fit," not
to draw attention to uniqueness. Moreover, women more than men tend
to be low risk-takers, to focus on performance of the tasks alone, and
to avoid politics and the development of a power base (Warsaw, 1978).
These factors all combine to reduce the likelihood that women will be
viewed by supervisors or, as importantly, by subordinates as having
power, especially the informal power needed to move around within the formal structure.

Sponsors or mentors are an invaluable aid to the beginner. These social connections with people who are more advanced in their careers, and who wield more power within the organization, assist the individual in career moves and changes. Much of this help is in the form of teaching the newcomer the informal structure and promoting the newcomer as a person with ability. This is the essence of the "old boy network" which teaches the informal rules of operation, provides introductions and personal recommendations, and intervenes in promoting mobility for the protegé (Gordon and Ball, 1977). Women have not typically had the benefit of such mentoring. Men have not tended to select female protegés and the number of women in positions where mentoring can be accomplished has been slim. Moreover, professionally successful women have often treated subordinate women with aloofness (Ashburn, 1976:20). Women are only recently becoming aware of the need for networks to support career development (Kleiman, 1980).

Reinforcing these conclusions is further work which points toward a differential content within the mentoring relationship when the protegé is a woman rather than a man. In a study by Arlene McCormack (1984:6), she reported that three types of mentoring information tended to be transmitted to protegés: 1) instrumental information concerning the appropriateness of behavioral cues; 2) emotional support which dealt with heightening the self-image of the protegé; and, 3) navigational information which involved sharing knowledge about resources and the informal operational procedures of the
workplace. McCormack (1984) found that women were less likely than men to obtain the navigational information from mentors when such mentors were available.

Once again the explanation could rest on the possession of the devalued status. In attempting to demonstrate "fit," the mentor may focus upon sharing definitions of appropriate conduct and providing emotional support to the outsider. It is also likely that women in non-traditional posts would find such information useful. Both mentor and protegé are rewarded. However, it is the navigational information which is crucial to cultivating the power base Kanter (1977) speaks to as a key element in career advancement. The mentoring activities for women may then have a more present-time focus, i.e., assisting her to "fit" now, whereas the mentoring activities for men may have a more future-time focus, teaching men "the ropes" so that mobility is facilitated. Major ramifications for gender differentiated career development outcomes result from this alternative focus. Again, for women, what may assist with successful entry runs counter to the knowledge needed for successful advancement. The ability to accrue and manage the power Kanter (1977) identifies as a structural, not personal, determinant of career movement is then not equally likely for both men and women.

The third organizational element Kanter (1977:208) addresses is proportion. Being a numerical minority in a context where your devalued status is both highly visible and routinely associated with assumptions that limit perceptions of competence and power has profound implications for career differences among men and women. Relative
numbers, from the one person "token" to equal distribution, dictate a developmental sequence of accommodations by the workers within an organization.

Kanter (1977:209) identifies four group types based upon proportional representation: uniform groups where the typological ratio is 100:0; skewed groups where the ratio is roughly 85:15; tilted groups where the ratio is approximately 65:35; and balanced groups where the ratio approaches 50:50. It is in the skewed groups where the pressures for boundary maintenance are highest since it is there that the dominant segment has been exposed to the minority influx. Boundary maintenance behavior is activated in the face of a direct threat to homogeneity. This has not occurred in the uniform groups where the threat is not yet real. It is not until arrival at ratios closer to the tilted groups that the variable of proportion ceases to operate as an exclusionary force. Here then is another observation related to women within higher education administration. While women have gained access to non-traditional posts, the overall advancement of women is relatively modest at best. This may be due, in part, to the dynamics generated by the skewed group ratio. Some women do enter but not in large enough numbers to attain the tilted ratio needed to facilitate additional women gaining access. In fact, the most difficult period should occur just after initial entry when expectations for further access are greatest among outsiders but when conditions within the organization have actually worsened in terms of admission of outsiders, i.e., the skewed group circumstance.
The impact of the skewed ratio situation upon the non-traditional incumbent is evidenced by behaviors that are a response to token status but which are often attributed to the individual. Such individuals are confronted with performance pressures, boundary maintenance and role encapsulation (Kanter, 1977:230). Despite the formal occupational role, the behavior of the female incumbent becomes housed within the familiar roles for women. In short, the devalued status is a master status. Her job performance is evaluated against the backdrop of gender being a diffuse status characteristic.

The outsider's response to these conditions is to increase the number of conservative behaviors and to reduce risk-taking (Kanter, 1977:236). Once again the issue of establishing "fit" is evident. By avoiding attention attracting behaviors the woman is able to minimize the impact of her token status. Yet, the accumulation of power which is needed for mobility rests on visibility and risk-taking. For the token woman to engage in such actions however confirms the visibility of the devalued status. Moreover, failure in a risky situation is taken as demonstrable evidence of the inability of the class of individuals to succeed within the role. In short, visibility and risk-taking are perceived differently depending upon the status of the actor. Identical behavior begets differential labeling. Costs to the organization and to the psychological health of those in token statuses result. The solution however is in an organizational response, i.e., moving toward equal numbers and providing support mechanisms during that transition, and not in making "fit" the responsibility of the individual.
The three structural determinants, opportunity, power and relative numbers, then set the contextual aspects of the organization. Their impact is gender differentiated. For women, a double bind situation often results where accommodations to a present set of circumstances will hinder the ability to successfully negotiate a future set. The key issue is that these forces are tied to the organization and not the individual. The nature of gender differentiated career outcomes, and their persistence over time, can be understood more fully with this approach. These organizational features will be examined in the present study as career movement and perceived career obstacles are analyzed. Significant gender differences in these areas will support the premise that organizational factors must be included in any study of career development.

C. The Bureaucratic Setting

The bureaucratic structure within institutions of higher education also contains elements which operate to differentiate the careers of men and women. These characteristics focus upon the particular position the person holds and where that post is located within the bureaucratic hierarchy. It is the position itself which serves as the intermediary connection between the more broadly based features of the institution and the interactional dynamics of face to face contact. Positions are then dynamic entities rather than static assumptions. With this orientation, a richer and more complex picture of career pattern development emerges.

Two key position features will be identified in order to illustrate the importance of monitoring these bureaucratic features
throughout the exploratory study. The first is whether the post is a line or staff position. The supervisory functions of line positions versus the support functions of staff posts represent a dichotomy which reinforces the traditional assumptions of gender-appropriate roles (Lipman-Bluen, 1984). Secondly, the location of the post within the bureaucratic hierarchy is a crucial career development determinant. Whether the post is an entry level position, one at middle management or a senior administration position interacts with the gender of the incumbent to influence both perceptions of competence and the potential for advancement. A review of these two features will also support the possibility that additional elements will emerge from the analyses to confirm the dynamic nature of the bureaucratic setting as a career influence.

1. Line and Staff Position Distinctions

Line positions are those where the incumbent has supervisory responsibilities over other employees as well as policy setting authority in determining institutional procedures for offering services to the organization's constituency. Staff positions are those where the incumbent provides a support function in the form of a specialized approach to some organizational need (Place and Armstrong, 1975; Caplow, 1976). These differences in function may lead evaluators as well as subordinates to make differential definitions of the situation based upon the gender of the applicant or incumbent. For example, in line positions the previously discussed stress on homogeneity may function more powerfully than in staff positions. In staff posts role demands tend to be both more tightly specified and more subject to
supervisory oversight. Additionally, staff positions are more likely to demand very specific, technical criteria or training as prerequisites to incumbency than line positions where requirements may be more fluid. These position characteristics would support a lessened tendency for gender to function unchecked as a devalued status characteristic in staff positions over line positions. For staff positions, technical competence could dissociate gender as a salient consideration. Supervisory oversight would allay concerns centered upon the assumptions of stereotypical attributes interfering with adequate role performance. Such is not so commonly the case with line positions. The authority and fluidity contained within role requirements allows gender to operate more fully as a limiting status characteristic. Possession of the negatively evaluated status characteristic would, under these circumstances, tend to heighten the uncertainty regarding the candidate and thereby promote the boundary maintenance inherent in the principle of homogeneity. This position distinction, institutionalized within the bureaucratic structure of higher education, may then operate as an organization property which impacts upon men and women in ways which promote gender differentiated career development patterns.

Several reports outlining where women are located within higher education administration support the inclusion of this dichotomy in assessing career development. The underrepresentation of women in major policy making positions has been documented by Finlay and Crosson (1981) in "Women in Higher Education Administration: Status and Strategies." Fully 95% of all college students attend institutions where the top line posts are held by men. Van Alstyne, Withers and
Elliott (1977) also report that when women are in line positions, they tend to be posts supervising traditionally sex-typed disciplines. Close to half of the women at co-educational institutions were found in only seven of fifty-two positions: head librarian, nursing dean, bookstore manager, registrar, student financial aid director, home economics dean and information office director. Gappa and Uehling (1979:46-47) summarize additional reports which all support the same conclusion: women are not typically found in line posts in academic administration. Moreover, when that does occur, women tend to be found in posts that reinforce stereotypes about women's skills in student counseling and service-related occupations.

Line positions also tend to be posts on an established career path. Both the incumbent and the employer tend to share definitions about the career pattern progression of the line administrator. Staff positions are not in this mold. They tend to be more technically based with limited mobility (Scott, 1979). Yet, it is in the specialized staff areas that positions within higher education administration are most available. Posts with these technical functions offer women entry, and entry into a post where competence is easily evaluated. However, such competence is not easily transferrable to a higher echelon post. Advancement is restricted since preparation, i.e., the assumption of career line movement, is not present. The risk to the organization remains high should the individual advance since evidence of "fit" within an authority exercising and policy setting post has not been established. A good technocrat may be a poor leader. This risk is heightened by the possession of the devalued status characteristic.
Hence, allowing someone with an "outsider" status to gain entry to a staff position, especially an entry-level post, is a low risk activity for the organization. The incumbent's impact on the institution as a whole is both narrow and closely monitored by the line person to whom he or she reports. However, movement to a line post is a high risk for the organization. It involves placing the person in a position of authority where the institution can be impacted in significant ways without prior knowledge of the person's ability to function effectively at this level. Such risk is further heightened when the person possesses a non-traditional status heavily linked to characteristics not typically associated with leadership. The response of subordinates to this move may also create problems for the organization even when the outsider is objectively competent (Kanter, 1977; Faunce, 1977; Schein, 1973). The perception of inability can create a self-fulfilling prophecy wherein the newly appointed line administrator is not permitted to lead and, in fact, without such acknowledgement of her right to do so, she quickly comes to a point where she cannot function effectively (Kanter, 1977).

The conclusion then is that the line versus staff dichotomy may be a crucial consideration in gender differentiated career development. It is expected that more women will be in staff rather than line posts. Most entry posts will be staff positions. And, women in staff posts will have difficulty moving to line posts. This is again a double bind. The circumstances of entry in and of themselves limit the likelihood of advancement. This line and staff distinction then interacts
with other career dynamics in producing career outcomes which may be different for men and women.

2. Management Level Distinctions

Several studies have pointed to the importance of the location of the post within the bureaucratic hierarchy as a career variable. Some of this work overlaps with the line and staff dichotomy. Most entry-level positions are staff posts whereas most high echelon positions are line posts. However, there are further issues worth consideration. The movement from a low level line post to an upper level line post may be subject to problems similar to the staff to line movement. Certain administrative units may have a greater number of low and middle management posts. Mobility within such a unit would thus be structurally constrained. Moreover, the impact of affirmative action could influence the placement of women within the bureaucratic hierarchy so that women in senior posts might be different from men in senior posts, and might be different from younger women in areas of career pattern development. Younger women in entry posts may be more like their male counterparts as the opportunity structure at the point of access is now more open. All of these areas point toward a need to explore gender differences across the range of management levels.

In a recent preliminary report on the number of senior women administrators within higher education administration, Touchton and Shavlik (1984:3) report that the highest concentrations were in positions in academic affairs, followed by student affairs. Between 1975 and 1983, the proportion of women serving as chief academic officers was unchanged at 12%. However, the proportion of women in
dean or director positions rose by a substantial 40%. In student affairs, the total share of positions held by women actually dropped by 18% although women holding top posts in this sector of higher education administration remained relatively constant at about 30%. Change had also occurred at the chief executive level. More women had moved into this highest campus post. This trend was occurring at the public institutions where women have traditionally not held this post. When 1975 and 1981 data are compared, five times as many women chief executives exist at four year public institutions, and four times as many at two year public institutions. These figures reflect net gains where a woman replaced a man in the chief executive post (Association of American Colleges, 1982:9).

At the other end of the management hierarchy, the numbers of women have also increased. The largest part of this increase is indeed at the lowest management level (Gappa and Uehling, 1979). Moreover, entry is often into posts with short career lines or stereotypical activities (Van Alstyne et.al., 1977). Moore (1983) has also pointed out that institutions of higher education have created a career structure that clusters women in positions at the bottom of many career ladders. This is also the point both Kanter (1979) and Scott (1979) make in regard to the horizontal structure of higher education and the limited mobility of the middle manager. Each of these findings supports the need to think of management levels within higher education administration as a career determinant.

The issue of where a post is located within the clustering of institutional services is another pertinent issue. Many of the new
posts within higher education administration tend to report to the Office of the President or the Dean of Fiscal Affairs. They are the highly specialized, low mobility posts Scott (1979) has identified. Conversely, the two areas reported upon by Touchton and Shavlik (1984) are academic affairs and student personnel services. Both of these contain a more established and more linear career line. Here mobility is possible in a structural sense in ways it is not in the other areas. The problems here may be more related to scarce availability and boundary maintenance than the absence of a career line altogether.

The former, more available, positions then have features which, once more, support access not advancement. They are also safe for the institution. There tends to be more personal discretion in hiring since there is less college wide input with posts outside traditional career lines. This also means objective credentials can be less specific. Tasks are narrowly defined so competence can be closely monitored. And, positions can be created in response to immediate need and merely plugged into the existing administrative structure. These low-level posts then are, from the organization's perspective, ideal posts for non-traditional incumbents.

Within the academic and student personnel services areas this is more difficult. Career lines are more institutionalized so that greater risk to the organization exists when an outsider is admitted. At the entry level this may be minimized even in a line post such as Department Chairperson. However, even here the potential for movement does exist since the career line is in place. Movement closer to the terminal point becomes more difficult as fewer posts
exist, even moreso in a closed, internal market system. Boundary maintenance is heightened due to the more global position responsibilities and the potentially skewed group ratios, given that few women have traversed the career line.

Affirmative action mandates may operate at this point in assisting women to advance along one of the more established career lines. Women who have put in their time in staff or low-level line posts may be advanced into upper management in order to meet outside requirements. These women should be least like their male counterparts since their prior work histories would show the effect of the limitations gender imposed. Advancement beyond this first promotion should be problematic since the requisite background experience and skills have not been developed over time. Younger women, on the otherhand, should confront an opportunity structure within these traditional career line units of higher education administration that may even be advantageous. Affirmative action, coupled with revised cultural definitions of the role and competencies of career oriented younger women, may influence employers to hire or promote these women in preference even to men. Risk is reduced and external guidelines are met. Once again, the interactive effect of several dimensions of each level of analysis is the key to comprehending career development.

This section has highlighted the need to pay attention to aspects of the bureaucratic context in understanding gender differences in career moves and changes. The dichotomy of line and staff posts is one feature. So, too, is the location of the post within the overall bureaucratic structure. Distinctions between entry, middle and upper
management posts in the risk an outsider poses to the organization have been delineated. Overlaid on this is the differing structure of each unit within the bureaucracy of higher education administration. Some units, such as business affairs, may permit access without much opportunity for advancement. Others, such as academic affairs, may limit access as well as advancement, especially in the upper management levels. The role of affirmative action may also have influenced these dynamics. Each of these areas will be monitored within the exploratory study since each appears to bear upon gender differences in career development within higher education administration.

The conclusion from this overall section is that organizational variables are crucial to the study of careers. Institutions represent the point of contact for the individual. Their role in career development and gender equity must be analyzed. Movement must be away from the characteristics of the individual woman and how she is unique, i.e., different and thus responsible for figuring out how to attain "fit," and onto the institutions which must take the initiative in assuring both access and advancement opportunities. The scope of study must then be broadened so that the extent to which the organization facilitates or impedes movement is taken into account. Organizations and the positions within them must be regarded as dynamic entities rather than static assumptions. This would encourage a realistic approach to the study of gender differences in career moves and changes, and a richer and more complex picture of overall career development would emerge (Kahn-Hut, Daniels and Colvard, 1982).
IV. Social Psychological Variables

Social psychological variables have been the principal explanatory tools for comprehending gender differentiated career development patterns. Gender role socialization is viewed as the crucial element. Boys are taught to act in ways that promote the acquisition of traits that prepare them for the workworld. Girls are taught to act in ways that prepare them for the traditional roles of wife and mother. These latter behaviors are not those associated with career success. Moreover, early gender role socialization leads to adult choices in education, training and experience which further limit career development for women. In short, early gender role socialization conditions adult options so that constraints persist over time. Additionally, others hold expectations based upon these same considerations. Organizational and structural factors reinforce such circumstances so that the interactive effect is potent beyond the power of any one element. Taken together, gender differentiated career outcomes are the result.

Success attribution is one area that illustrates this process. Women are taught to credit their success to factors outside themselves whereas men are taught the opposite. This difference in a social psychological variable has a major impact on the definitions of self that promote career success. The impact of gender role socialization also produces differences between men and women in the management of marriage and family roles. Women are trained to assume responsibilities within these roles which often conflict with the demands of career development. The impact of being a wife and mother upon career
advancement is more constraining for women than the corresponding roles of husband and father tend to be for men. Lastly, the developmental life cycle is different for men and women. Movement through the age ranges has differential content for the two sexes. The social definitions of appropriate conduct shift for men in ways that complement the career development cycle. Such is not the case for women. The resultant impact on career moves and changes is part of what must be explored in this study.

A. Success Attribution and Career Development

Achievement motivation differences between men and women as a product of early gender role socialization differences were extensively studied in the 1970s (Kaufman and Richardson, 1982). Social psychological attributes such as fear of success, risk avoidance and learned helplessness were among the most frequently cited factors assumed to both constrain entry and limit the advancement aspirations of women in non-traditional career areas (Freeman, 1971; Horner, 1971). Underlying each of these contentions, however, is a more fundamental gender distinction that aids in comprehending differential career outcomes. Success attribution speaks to how individuals credit themselves or credit external forces with the successes or failures they experience. A closer look at this construct will demonstrate its relationship to career development differences among men and women.

Attribution refers to causal explanations for events. Outcomes are viewed as having resulted for some reason, i.e., they are not random or chance occurrences but are tied to some cause. What that causal explanation is determines the form of attribution the
person is applying to the situation. Attribution theory began with the work of Fritz Heider and was extended by Harold Kelley and later Edward Jones (Harvey, Weary and Harris, 1981; Jaspars, Fincham and Hewston, 1983). Work on linking these theoretical formulations with achievement was developed in the 1970s and extended to gender role socialization by several writers during the past decade (O'Leary, 1977:80-105).

Four inferences about causality within achievement oriented situations were hypothesized by prominent researchers in this area. Success or failure was explained on the basis of: 1) the person's ability on the task; 2) how much effort was expended; 3) how difficult the task was; and, 4) how much luck influenced the outcome. Properties internal to the person were ability and effort. Properties external to the person were the difficulty of the task and luck (Harvey et.al., 1981:23-24). Internal success attribution accompanied by external failure attribution would be the most personally enhancing combination. Credit for success could be taken and blame for failure could be assigned outside the self. External success attribution accompanied by internal failure attribution would be the most personally inhibiting combination. Credit for success would be given away yet responsibility for failure would be assumed. Gender role socialization teaches boys to adopt the former, self-enhancing combination and girls to adopt the latter, self-defeating combination. The impact of this distinction is profound within adult career development.

The key socialization variable linked to this process of success attribution is the extent of independence and mastery training (Freeman, 1971; Jaspars, et.al., 1983; O'Leary, 1977). Such training
deals with encouraging the child to assume initiative, to take responsibility for himself, to solve problems by himself and to minimize his dependence on others for direction (Freeman, 1971:130). The outcome of this process is that the child comes to view his world as something he can mold and have an impact upon. Boys, far more than girls, are the recipients of independence and mastery training (O'Leary, Unger and Wallston, 1985).

A range of studies points to parental behavior, especially by the father, as a crucial element in mastery training. This includes support for more exploratory behavior by sons than daughters, tolerance of more risk-taking by sons, and less rescue and comforting behavior by the parents of sons as opposed to daughters. The boy is left more to his own devices whereas the girl suffers from oversocialization, i.e., an extensive control and monitoring which inhibits her ability to act independently and master her world. She emerges from this process believing that the world molds her and that there is little relationship between what she does as an individual and what happens to her. She has learned to be helpless and this orientation evidences itself in her success and failure attributions (Kaufman and Richardson, 1982: 13).

The outcome of these early socialization differences is that boys learn to internalize success by attributing it to ability or effort whereas girls learn to externalize success by attributing it to task ease or luck. Moreover, the reverse occurs with the attribution of failure. Boys externalize failure by attributing it to task difficulty or bad luck whereas girls internalize failure by attributing
it to lack of ability or reduced effort (Jaspars, et al., 1983).

Obviously one's self-esteem is enhanced by the male pattern and reduced by the female pattern. Women, in short, learn to attribute success to external factors so they can never truly believe it was their actions that lead to attainment, while at the same time failures are theirs to own.

Moreover, of the four main causal variables, ability is the one most heavily linked to sex differences. Men use it more often to explain success whereas women use it more often to explain failure (Jaspars, et al., 1983:201). This has major implications for persisting in the face of failure. There is no point in expending further effort if the reason for failure is lack of ability. This is a stable trait which is not easily amenable to change. If you haven't got it, you haven't got it, period. However, if failure is externalized to task difficulty or bad luck, persistence in the face of failure makes sense. The next time around the task may well be easier and the luck may be going your way. Moreover, if those conditions pertain and you are successful, you internalize that success by attributing it to your ability or effort. Attribution tendencies are then self-reinforcing. You cannot lose with the self-enhancing combination and you cannot win with the self-defeating combination.

Additionally, this pattern of personal attribution is further reinforced by the attribution patterns of external evaluators. Consistent research results show that when women perform as well on a masculine task as men, their performance is attributed to luck, men's to ability. Even when the task was designated as feminine, the success
of women was attributed to effort or task ease not ability. Men, however, had their success linked to ability even when the task was labeled feminine (O'Leary, et.al., 1985). The high performance of men is then perceived by others to be an indication of his ability, which is a transferable skill, whereas the high performance of women is perceived by others to be an indication of luck or task ease, unstable traits not dependably transferable. The man's performance is universally viewed as superior (O'Leary, 1977). The only time a woman's performance was rated similarly was when the accomplishment was truly exceptional or when its worth was acknowledged by an authoritarian (male) source (O'Leary, 1977:96). Even if the woman herself is able to attribute her success to her ability, others may not be able to make the transition away from gender role stereotyped responses. She is perceived in ways that limit her options and opportunities.

Success attribution research then permits a look at the long term impact of gender role socialization. Early childhood experiences train men and women to view the world differently and to define their ability to impact upon it in different ways. One product of these differences is the tendency for men to attribute success to a stable, personal attribute, i.e., ability, and for women to attribute their success to the unstable external attributes of luck or task ease. As adults, these attributional tendencies are subject to change but not without active intervention (Jaspars, et.al., 1983:203; O'Leary, et.al., 1985:91). Left unchecked, they are likely to impact upon career development to produce differential outcomes. This is especially the case since these attributions are shared by evaluators as well. Others
who are in a position to control access and advancement have alternative
definitions of what produces success in men versus women. The process
is a tightly constructed control mechanism that facilitates career
movement for men and limits it for women.

Two occupational areas where this should be particularly
evident are in career risk-taking and in the career variables men and
women credit with assisting or hindering their movement. Risk-taking
involves a gamble on self, a willingness to step into the unknown based
upon the confidence that you can succeed. Internal success attribution
and external failure attribution support this process. Even if failure
results, self-esteem is maintained. Such is not the case in the
reverse, more commonly female, pattern where success is thought to
depend upon external factors and failure will be internalized. Risk­
taking is minimized since personal control over success is limited or
non-existent, and failure undermines self-esteem. The risk is too
great since success is assumed to be beyond individual control, i.e.,
there is no link between ability and outcome. This should result in
career outcomes which show women less willing to take the higher risk
career alternatives. Women should tend to avoid career moves such as
leaving higher education administration for a new career and moving to
a new institution more than should men. Both of these options are
more risky than staying within the institution and the field.

Women should also credit external, non-personal factors as
more instrumental in their career advancement whereas men should
credit internal, personal characteristics as key career enhancers.
This is also tied to the perceptions of outside evaluators. Women
need such external validation in order to dissociate their gender from consideration. Men can utilize the positively evaluated status characteristic to further document their appropriateness as incumbents. Once again, the reinforcement of exclusionary dynamics at different levels of analysis is evident. In this case, women can be expected to credit such external factors as advanced degrees, leadership seminars and involvement in professional associations as crucial career facilitating activities. Men would be more likely to credit their own leadership ability, ambition and skills as crucial. These differences are both evidence of a past differential attribution process and a forerunner to a continued tendency to view the world differently. The exploratory study will examine these areas in order to assess the impact of these differences on administrative career development.

B. Marriage and Family Roles as Career Constraints

Gender role socialization prepares men and women to assume different adult roles. Traditional practices have encouraged women to place primary emphasis upon the adult roles of wife and mother while men are encouraged to anchor their identities around an occupational role. The strain this produces in the lives of professional women has been the subject of study over the past decade as women entered management positions. It is clear that attitudes toward the obligations of career and marriage by the individual woman, by her evaluators, and by the society at large, represent a major barrier to career development (Osipow, 1983). A closer look at these issues will confirm the importance of exploring marriage and family roles as a career variable with differential outcomes for men and women.
Data on the marital status of career-oriented men and women repeatedly document significant gender differences. Women in academic careers tend to marry much less frequently than men. In fact, nearly all men marry but from one-third to one-half of the women do not (Gappa and Uehling, 1979:60). Of the women who do marry, many elect to remain childless. In a study by Bonnie Freeman (1977:173), she reported that nearly half the married professional women in academia were childless. These specific figures are supported by the general finding that the family patterns of high echelon administrators were marked by marital stability if that person was male. Such a pattern was not characteristic for women who tended to be single, divorced or widowed when they reached the peak of their careers (Freeman, 1977; Mark, 1981).

Unmarried women were more successful in their careers, i.e., rose to posts higher in the bureaucratic structure, than married women, although neither did as well as married men (Palley, 1978). Additionally, Palley (1978:8) found an inverse relationship between marriage and family obligations and administrative career mobility for women but not for men.

These consistent findings are the result of several factors. Women tend to place careers second to marriage. Even among highly motivated career women, there are different kinds of expectations and pressures in regard to marital roles than for men (Osipow, 1983). This is the socialization impact. Women are trained to assume responsibility for the smooth operation of interpersonal relationships. Failure within those relationships, of which marriage is the most important, is personal failure even when the outcome is not entirely
under her control (O'Leary, 1977:85). Such failure breeds guilt and
that choice is supported by cultural prescriptions that are designed
to perpetuate such role definitions (Bem and Bem, 1971). Hence, the
expectations and pressures are gender differentiated, and such differ­
ences are fundamental to career development. It is not just a matter
of who does what chore within the household, although that too is an
issue. It is more a matter of internalized normative expectations
that compel the individual woman to assume responsibility for the
quality of the relationship. For women, general work effectiveness
and satisfaction is negatively correlated with marital satisfaction
(Osipow, 1983:270). The conflict of allegiance between these two
crucial roles produces the statistics on differential marriage patterns
among men and women.

Women also retain the primary responsibility for childrearing
even though this is increasingly shared by men (Lipman-Blumen, 1984).
However, for women already in administration, the option is to have
fewer children than their male counterparts (Mark, 1981:182). Addi­
tionally, a key factor seems to be the number of dependent children
still at home. Patterson and Engelberg (1978) found that only one­
third of the women in male-dominated professions had dependent children
whereas nearly two-thirds of the men did so. Yohalem (1979) found
similar results but the critical age factor was whether the child or
children were pre-teens. The presence of young children in the home
appears to have the career inhibiting effect reflected in the
statistics for women. There is no relationship among these variables
for men.
The role strain that results from the competing demands of career and family roles is a major factor in the career development pattern of women. Childrearing remains the major factor causing women to interrupt or curtail their careers. In dual career families, the wife still assumes the bulk of the household chores. Moreover, both the husband and wife believe that such chores are the responsibility of the woman (Clark, 1976). Women, it would appear, are as constrained by their own definitions of appropriate role behavior as they are by definitions held by their husbands. The strain is evidenced in higher divorce rates, in lower marriage rates, and in decisions to limit family size. The cost to women personally and to institutions of higher education in general is high. As a society we have not developed the support structure, e.g., quality day care, to minimize these strains. Rather, individual women are left to career choices which men traditionally have not had to confront. Career lines reflect the male pattern and impose high costs upon the woman who does not follow a similar pattern.

Career line progression assumes a time sequence of movement from one position to another. Entry level posts are typically obtained during the incumbent's middle to late twenties. These are precisely the years when professional women are most likely to bear children since these women tend to postpone childbearing (Gappa and Uehling, 1979:60). To remove oneself from the workplace at this crucial point, or to have intense competing demands, tends to slow career progression at exactly the point when the foundation is getting laid for future career movement. Career pattern development should be delayed as a result. The individual woman may, as her career unfolds, wind up in
the same place as her male counterpart. However, she may enter administration later and be more of a newcomer to her present post. Certainly it is clear that other factors beyond family constraints are also operating concurrently to produce this outcome. The interactive effect again compounds the likelihood that the choice to marry and have children will hinder career development for women.

The impact of marriage and family roles will be assessed within the exploratory study. It is expected that the data for this sample will reflect the reported trends with women marrying less often than men, women choosing to be childless when married more often than men, and women choosing to have fewer children than men when child-bearing occurs. It is also expected that women will have fewer children at home than men, especially young children. Beyond these demographic differences, the impact upon career development should result in women entering administration later than men, women being more recent incumbents of their posts, especially high echelon posts, than men, and women reporting family obligations as a career constraint more often than men. Such findings would confirm the continuing importance of including variables on marriage and family participation in the study of gender differentiated career development.

C. Life Cycle Elements Within Career Progression

The concept of career development implies, as noted earlier, a reasonably systematic movement through the career stages inherent in a particular career line. Women, because of the exclusionary forces under consideration, must typically operate outside these pathways. Alternative entry routes, structural obstacles and the interactive
outcomes of their devalued status all lead to a pattern of career
development which frequently does not fit the traditional model.

A further confounding factor is that career stages move over
time in sequence with other stages of the life cycle. Assumptions
about what a person is most likely to have as focal life concerns
shift with movement through the age ranges. The content of these
assumptions is culturally specified by gender. The content of life
cycle stages for men and women is different. It is the content of
the male pattern that is interwoven with the traditional career
stages. These reinforce and support one another. The question then
becomes how the life cycle pattern for women interacts with these
career stages. Since reinforcement and support are not present, it
is assumed that problems will arise and that these will be solved in
ways that produce gender differentiated career outcomes.

The idea of the convergence of life cycle and career develop­
ment stages is now widely recognized. External events and internal
experiences combine to create parallel and permanent changes in
several life areas. A basic transposition takes place (Murphy and
Burck, 1976). Dudley and Tiedeman (1977:3) point out the need to study
career development as a complex of reciprocal relationships between
occupational activity and life style, especially as that life style
has societal support. The interaction effect is then both psycholog­
ical and sociological. Hodgkinson (1974) summarizes a number of
interactions of career and life cycle stages for academics in
particular. Moreover, he notes the male bias inherent in nearly all
the empirical work he cites. Donald T. Hall (1975) does bridge this
gap with his conclusions that pressures from home and work, as well as self, vary significantly with family stages for women. In order to explore these areas further, an examination of the content of three concurrent life cycles will be utilized.

John Maanen, Edgar Schein and Lotte Bailyn (1980) have specified three life cycles that operate simultaneously as an individual moves through the age ranges. The first is the career cycle which, as noted, involves different commitments and abilities as one moves from the apprentice to the senior sponsor stage (Dalton, et.al., 1977). The second is the family life cycle which moves through stages largely structured by childbearing and childrearing activities. Lastly, the personal cycle is marked by changing needs and abilities which are social psychological. These deal with emotional needs such as security, autonomy, and affiliation. Each of these cycles places demands upon the person at one point in time. Opportunities, vulnerabilities and constraints all interact to produce the life issues which confront the individual (Maanen, et.al., 1980:6).

If these three cycles converge, opportunities can be grasped. If the cycles are competing with one another, the same opportunities must be forsaken or grasped at great cost to the person. For example, during the career cycle, Stage I is the point where apprenticeship is teaching the newcomer the rules of the field (Dalton, et.al., 1977). This roughly corresponds to the age range, 25-35. The family life cycle is also getting established as these are major childbearing and early childrearing years. The emotional needs of the personal life cycle also coincide since this is a time when demonstrating mastery
and a readiness for Stage II career independence is at its peak. For men, the interaction of the three cycles at this point support one another and permit the individual to prepare for a stable future.

However, the content of these stages becomes different when the individual is a woman. The assumptions of the content of the career cycle remain the same. It is an intensive period of career commitment. However, as the physical childbearer and principal caretaker, the demands of the family cycle are also exceptionally intense for women. The personal life cycle experiences high stress due to these competing demands. Socialization and societal cues about the primary responsibilities of women during these years run counter to the career demands of that same period. The convergence of the three cycles which worked to the advantage of men does not do so for women. Stresses and strains result across the cycles. The impact on the career cycle may be slowed progress. The outcome, as previously noted, should be that women will be older than men at the same point in subsequent career stages.

This initial distinction however has a cumulative effect. The career development cycle is slowed but the family and personal cycle may not be similarly modified. In fact, it is because the family cycle has taken priority that the work cycle is no longer in sequence with age expectations. What looked to be a momentary pause may result in a career long attempt to "catch up" and establish convergence of the cycles. In short, once a woman gets behind at the crucial early juncture, she may stay behind for the remainder of her work cycle. This is obviously compounded by the exclusionary forces operating at the
organizational and social structural levels. With one cycle mismatched with age, strains will continue in the other two cycles so that the tension experienced in the life of an individual woman can be excessive compared to a similarly positioned man who has traversed the traditional life cycle patterns.

A closer look at the charting of administrative careers will support this conclusion. Harold Hodgkinson (1974) applied the career development stages to the particular circumstances of higher education administration. His narrative conclusions are summarized in the following chart:

Chart 1.1
Administrative Career Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Principal Thrust</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 22 - 29 | Initiation | - getting on the career line  
- locating a mentor  
- gaining experience |
| 30 - 38 | Growth  | - gaining the first line position  
- using geographic mobility as a tool  
- coming into one's own professionally |
| 39 - 43 | Midlife Transition | - scaling down original goals  
- knowing the job well  
- experiencing social isolation at the workplace |
| 44 - 50 | Restabilization | - increasing institutional loyalty  
- expanding interests  
- mentoring others |
| 51 - 60 | Stability | - delegating more tasks  
- broadening perspectives  
- focusing on particular activities due to selective negligence |
The overriding conclusion from this review is that administrative careers peak early. This is consistent with the earlier discussion of short career lines within higher education administration. There is then very little time for a woman to compensate for the different content of her family and personal cycle during the early years of career development. With these differences likely to persist to some extent over time, the impact on the career cycle can become magnified. For example, the woman who is 39-43 years old also may be in a family cycle that centers upon increasing independence for her children. Her personal cycle may match the man at this age range who is experiencing the symptoms of mid-life crisis, although the basis for that crisis and its content may be different. Yet, her career pattern may be more typical of the growth period, with its demands for achievement. These competing needs may produce conflicts that are difficult to resolve. This pattern is moreover repeated across the work cycle.

Tied to these personal issues are, once again, the expectations of others. A person of a particular age is suppose to be at a particular point in his or her career cycle. These expectations are based upon the male model. There is no complementary model for women which acknowledges the differing content of their personal and family cycles. They fit the only existing model or they are exceptions to it. Once you do not fit the career stage you should be in, issues of competency and commitment are also likely to be raised. Your "fit" along other career dimensions is questioned, allowing the power of the devalued status to set off a range of expectations that potentially limit access and advancement.
A further factor compounding these issues is the double standard of aging. Men and women do not experience age in the same way nor does the culture hold forth similar definitions of what it means to be older for men and women (Sontag, 1972). Much of the process of aging for women is linked to definitions of sexual attractiveness. Much of the process of aging for men is linked to career definitions of increased money, power and prestige. Age is linked for him with positive assumptions of competency. He grows, matures and reaches the pinnacle of his power late in life compared to the woman whose utility is innate and static, i.e., tied to her physical self not her social self. Definitions of physical attractiveness are tied to youth. There is no transition to another set of standards for women as they grow older.

In the career arena these two forces interact. The mature woman should be evaluated for positions based upon her work. However, her master and devalued status interferes. The culturally supported relationship between being older and being female combines to produce definitions of her competencies which will limit advancement. She is seen as merely old whereas a similar man is viewed as professionally mature. Since age in a woman, to use Sontag's term, is obscene, her ability to counteract these definitions is weak even though the context is moved from physical attractiveness to career development (Sontag, 1972:37). The power of what she is will override the listing of what she has accomplished. The fact that she too may share some of these definitions is a further limiting condition.
Now, if the double standard of aging effects are tied to the career and life cycle content differences, another double bind for women emerges. Women may be behind in career development activities when contrasted with men of the same age. Women in the fifty to sixty year old range may not be as likely to be seeking the stability that characterizes the career pattern of men. Women may still seek opportunities to expand, to influence institutional policy and to mentor. Their personal and family cycles may be at a point of maximum freedom to concentrate on career development. Yet, it is exactly at this point that the double standard of aging is most potent as a limitor. She may be viewed as old and therefore declining in her capacity to fulfill an administrative role. On the other hand, her male counterpart may be sought out as he is defined as being at the peak of his career pattern. For women, the best time becomes the worst time as she knows what she can do but may be limited in her ability to convince others that such is the case.

The issue of gender differences in the content of the concurrent three cycles, along with gender differences in the social definitions of aging, combine to produce the expectation of gender differentiated career outcomes. It is expected that women will be older than men at similar points in the career cycle. Women more than men should view family cycle content as a career inhibitor. Older women should be seeking career advancement more than older men; however, older men should have a more positive attainment pattern than older women. Each of these tentative hypotheses will be examined within the exploratory study. Other analyses dealing with career goal and
attainment patterns may also point toward conclusions that link life cycle elements and aging with gender differentiated career development patterns.

In summary, three broad social psychological elements have been explored. The socialization effects of success and failure attributions underscore how gender differences in these areas could produce a career orientation which would limit the advancement of women. The gender differentiated impact of marriage and family patterns on career development was also identified. These major and conflicting demands impose conditions on the career development of women which are not experienced by most men. Lastly, a case was made for the need to examine gender differences in the content of career, family and personal life cycles. All three cycles are tied to chronological age. However, chronological age is socially defined and the definitions are gender specific. The impact of these two issues was explored. In each circumstance, the social psychological element clearly interacted with social structural and organizational factors to create fundamental differences in the expectations about career moves and changes for men versus women. Several preliminary hypotheses were noted which will anchor the present exploratory study of the extent and nature of gender differentiated career development patterns within higher education administration.

V. Summary: The Potential of An Integrated Approach

Gender differentiation in career pattern development can now be seen as the result of the interaction of variables at the three levels
of analysis, structural, organizational and social psychological. The complex nature of career moves and changes has been documented. Single level analysis, which focuses upon only one set of variables such as gender role socialization, cannot grasp the interweaving of forces that leads to gender differences in outcome. At each level of analysis specific variables were identified as illustrations of the power of those elements to press upon the career choices of men and women. At several junctures the interactive potential of the differing levels was noted. The exploratory study will focus attention on specific outcomes that should flow from the factors under consideration. Confirmation of the existence of such gender differences will further support the need to retain an integrated approach.

At the social structural level, the impact of affirmative action was assessed. Access did improve during the decade after guidelines were established. However, subsequent advancement has been limited. The existence of an internal labor market within higher education administration was then introduced as a factor influencing career outcomes. In particular, it was hypothesized that non-traditional candidates from within the institution could easily be recruited into administrative posts. This would meet affirmative action mandates while posing limited risk to the institution. This would be especially likely when the career line was short, as many appear to be within higher education administration. Advancement is then structurally limited. This broad contextual view would not be evident if the analysis was restricted to only social psychological variables.
The mechanisms of exclusion are a significant career determinant at the organizational level. The circumstances of the workworld may be conditioned by social structural forces but it is at the organizational level that the individual makes contact with the representatives of that occupational sector. The immediate contextual issues influence career outcomes. The extent to which incumbents act as gatekeepers by viewing gender as a diffuse status characteristic will influence the opportunities for access and advancement by women. If gender becomes salient, stereotypical expectations are activated which must be dissociated for career development to occur. The number of women already present as well as the power exercised by those women will influence the extent of boundary maintenance activities. The location of the post within the overall bureaucratic structure interacts with these other organizational elements to further specify when the exclusionary forces should operate to the fullest. These elements are additionally influenced by the commitment to affirmative action, by labor market conditions, and by assumptions about career line progression. It becomes increasingly clear that the three levels of analysis interact to create complex career pattern development for individual men and women.

Social psychological variables are added to this evolving picture of career pattern complexity. The adult outcomes of gender role socialization are different for men than for women. These differences are evident in the very fundamental orientation to the world observed by gender differences in success and failure attribution. Internal success attribution permits an active orientation whereas external
success attribution leads to a reactive orientation. Major career differences can result. Such differences are also tied to other roles in the person's life. Marriage and family responsibilities tend to depress the career pattern development of women in ways that are not evident for men. Moreover, career and family cycles are tied to a personal cycle that links all three cycles to chronological age. Ideally, the cycles should complement one another. When one cycle is moving faster or slower, the others are affected. The content of the cycles is different for women than for men. Yet, the career cycle follows the male model. Stresses and strains result as women strive to mesh cycles which are not inherently designed to complement one another.

Within this interactive framework, the forces do not create press in the same direction. Double binds often emerge where the forces are countervailing. This was observed within levels when, for example, affirmative action mandates opened the opportunity for access but the labor market contained primarily posts with short career lines. Access was then to a post that would subsequently limit advancement. Double binds also exist between levels. The need to employ techniques of legitimation which dissociate gender from consideration of competency forces women to gather external documentation of their abilities. At the same time this reinforces the socialization process which teaches women to externalize success. Both these circumstances run counter to the likelihood of advancement along a career line. The interplay of influences then constrains the career development opportunities and
activities of women in ways that result in gender differentiated outcomes.

The potential of an integrated approach has been demonstrated by a summary of the theoretical and empirical context of career development. Specific variables within each level of analysis have been linked to career outcomes that are hypothesized to be gender specific. The exploratory study will focus upon ascertaining whether those predicted gender differences do, in fact, exist. Confirmation will support the importance of studying career development from a perspective that poses the integration of career determinants at the social structural, organizational and social psychological levels of analysis. The result will then be a more comprehensive understanding of gender differentiated career pattern development within higher education administration.
CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

I. Introduction

In the absence of systematic studies of gender influences on administrative careers within higher education, the present study was necessarily explanatory. As noted in the literature review, general studies and studies within other institutional settings suggested the likely influence of gender differences upon career entry, movement, and mobility. Thus, gender-linked effects were expected on the basis of differences found in other settings. Also, earlier studies derived conclusions from all male populations or from comparisons of women and men without regard to differences in position level within the two groups. To counteract these problems, a matched sample design was employed to insure comparability at a given point in time. Men and women were paired by institutional type and by position title. This role similarity was contrasted with differences in career development prior to incumbency. Both gender differences and underlying similarities were explored.

The study was divided into two phases. The first was an initial exploratory study conducted in the Fall of 1979. The results of this phase identified gender similarities and differences in attaining and pursuing an administrative career. This phase also pointed toward crucial variables needing further exploration within the follow-up study. The second phase, conducted in the Fall of 1984, involved an assessment of career movement patterns during the five year period, 1979-1984. This phase also involved a descriptive analysis of the
career-related activities of the subjects during that time. Career development, career stability and career mobility were then the focal concerns. The goal remained an improvement in the overall understanding of administrative careers within higher education, especially the ways in which gender differentiation was evident.

II. 1979 Exploratory Phase

A matched sample design was utilized in an attempt to achieve a basis of initial gender comparability. The sample was selected from the 1979 Directory of Administrative Personnel of a state-wide system of higher education. Each woman in the population of female administrators was paired with a male administrator who had the same or a closely similar title at an identical type of institution. \(^1\) Subjects were thus matched by position and by institutional type. Three types of institutions were employed in this pairing: university centers; Arts and Science colleges; and community colleges. Utilizing these criteria for matching, a total of 114 pairs was identified and contacted by mail questionnaire during the Fall of 1979. \(^2\)

The questionnaire requested information across four broad categories: 1) career pattern data dealing with characteristics of the subject's current position, immediately prior position and first administrative post within higher education; 2) facilitating and restricting elements within the subject's career pattern; 3) educational and professional background information including professional activities, membership in professional associations and publication records; and, 4) demographic characteristics, especially those related to marital and parental roles. Each area addressed factors identified
within the literature as gender specific elements within career development.

A replacement procedure was employed when the initial respondent did not respond after two follow-up mailings. When the non-respondent was the male member of the matched pair, he was replaced by another man who was in a similarly titled post at the appropriate institutional level. In the original selection procedure, when several men could be paired with a particular woman, attention was directed toward further elements of institutional comparability, i.e., size of the student body and urban vs. rural location. When several male subject possibilities were still available, random selection was then employed. Because men substantially outnumber women within higher education administration, replacement of male non-respondents was a straightforward procedure following these original criteria. Replacement of female non-respondents was, however, more problematic. Nearly the total population (92%) of women administrators had been employed in the original subject identification system. The only exceptions were when women outnumbered men in a particular position, e.g., Assistant to the President. In this instance, female replacement subjects were identified in the same manner as male replacements. When no woman was available for replacement, the pair was deleted from the study.

Alternative procedures were then developed in order to avoid substantial data loss. The overall individual response rate after replacement was 89.7%. Since most subjects did respond, the problem of maintaining the matched sample design was centered upon rematching. Sometimes the title of the subject's post was inaccurately published
in the Directory. Also, sometimes the subject had moved to another post and yet she or he completed the forwarded questionnaire. If the disparity was substantial, a new pair partner was identified and contacted utilizing the established selection criteria. When the subject had moved on to another position and a new pair partner could not be identified, the subject remained paired with the original pair partner. This did result in the loss of data related to the characteristics of the present post but did retain the majority of the data on the subject's career development pattern.

Overall the replacement procedures involved three general approaches: 1) direct replacement of the unusable or non-respondent pair partner; 2) identification of a new pair partner based on a position title change, followed by the established contact and replacement procedures; and, 3) pairing based upon the match of prior position of one pair partner with the present position of the other. When none of these approaches was possible, potential pairs were deleted from the analysis. In twenty-nine cases, the pair was deleted because the entire population of men or women in that particular post had already been contacted. When the pair partner did not respond after two follow-up mailings, no substitution was possible. Men could not be identified in thirteen such cases. The positions were predominantly ones traditionally held by women, e.g., posts in library management, student personnel services and the health sciences. Women could not be identified in sixteen such cases. These positions were posts traditionally held by men, e.g., Dean of Academic Affairs and Vice President of Administrative Services. Seven additional pairs had to be deleted
because there was no match for the title itself once the title was correctly identified. The remaining pairs were deleted because of non-respondent pair partners even after replacement and follow-up mailings. While these deletions did result in the loss of some data, the integrity of the matched sample design was maintained. Sixty-eight matched pairs were thus identified. The pair response rate was 58.7%.

The exploration of gender differentiated patterns depended upon the comparison of similarly positioned male and female administrators. It was thus crucial that replacement procedures remain conservative in order to assure maximum comparability.

The exploratory focus led to analyses which would uncover overall patterns of similarity or difference in the career development patterns of the men and women in the sample population. Most of the questionnaire items were open-ended in order to allow the respondent maximum latitude in responding. This resulted in primarily categorial data. Chi square analyses were employed to evaluate the emergence of significant career pattern differences, if such differences did exist. Chi square was used to test the significance of the relationship between two variables, gender and the career pattern elements, when data were expressed in terms of frequencies of joint occurrence (Welkowitz, Ewen and Cohen, 1976). Here the expected frequencies were based upon the assumption of equal numbers of men and women, given the matched sample design, demonstrating possession of the career pattern element under consideration. In short, the null hypothesis assumed independence between the two variables. This led to expected frequencies which were the same for male and female sample members since their numbers
were identical within the sample population. Higher order interval data were subjected to t-test analysis of between group differences.

The emphasis at this initial stage was then upon establishing whether the hypothesized differences in career development patterns between men and women in higher education administration did exist. The statistical techniques permitted tests of difference in career development consistent with this objective.

Two organizational properties were systematically introduced as control variables. Both had been identified within the literature as salient components of institutional press upon career development. The first variable was institutional type. The sample contained matched pairs by each of three institutional contexts: university centers, Arts and Science colleges and community colleges. As each career pattern variable was introduced, the sample was analyzed as a whole and then separated by institutional type. Contextual aspects arising from the potentially differing organizational effects of the three types of institutions were then more clearly discerned. Such an approach permitted the emergence of system elements as crucial considerations. No difficulties in assignment to the categories were encountered since the State system itself maintained sharp distinctions, i.e., separate physical plants, administrative personnel and fiscal policies, among its institutions of higher education.

The type of position, line or staff, was also employed as a control variable in the same manner. Here however the assignment procedures were more complex. No definitive method existed for identifying line or staff positions by title alone. To address this
problem, each respondent was asked to identify whether his or her position was a line or staff post. Definitions of the two types of positions were provided in order to heighten shared meaning. Subjects were also asked to state the title of the position they reported to within the bureaucratic hierarchy. Additionally, both the principal investigator and the Director of the Center for Educational Management Studies at the University of Hawaii at Manoa independently assigned the position titles to each group based upon both organizational theory and administrative experience. Consensual agreement prior to questionnaire dissemination was attained. Data collection further demonstrated an 85% level of agreement among male and female respondents. In the few situations where discrepancies were noted, assignment was made after examination of the person to whom the incumbent reported. The resulting division permitted a test of the impact of the type of position on a number of career variables. The structure of the resulting sample is presented in Table 2.1.
Table 2.1

Matched Pair Administrators by Type of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Number of Institutions Involved</th>
<th>Number of Pairs</th>
<th>Percent of Final Sample (Pairs)</th>
<th>Number of Pairs in Line Positions</th>
<th>Number of Pairs in Staff Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Centers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(54.5%)</td>
<td>(45.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Science Colleges</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(40.0%)</td>
<td>(60.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(45.9%)</td>
<td>(54.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(45.6%)</td>
<td>(54.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The exploratory phase analyses were thus designed to identify gender similarities and differences within this sample. These centered upon six areas identified within the literature as potential sources of gender differentiation: 1) demographic characteristics; 2) entry or access routes into higher education administration; 3) career pattern progression; 4) career pattern inconsistency among women but not among men; 5) career obstacle identification; and, 6) marriage and family patterns. Beyond these specific areas, general features of career pattern development were also examined. In short, the exploratory phase had focus but also permitted the emergence of new areas of gender similarity and difference. The overall goal was an improved understanding of administrative career development.
III. 1984 Follow-Up Phase

The longitudinal component was designed to trace the career development of the sample members from 1979 through 1984. It was hypothesized that men and women who were in similarly titled posts at the same type of institution would demonstrate some measure of continuing comparability if career lines are stable within higher education administration. A lack of such continuity could be tied to more fluid career lines and also tied to further gender differentiation. Outcome similarity in 1979 may then not foretell comparable career changes even over a short period of time such as five years. Gender differentiation may persist, especially if initial gender differences are linked to career variables crucial to advancement. The follow-up phase analyzed these issues.

A follow-up study of the original sample members was conducted during the Fall of 1984, at the conclusion of the five year period. This involved locating the sample members, some of whom had changed both position and institution. An initial survey was conducted by contacting the Personnel Officer at each of the institutions. He or she was asked to provide information on the status and, if needed, the forwarding address of each sample member employed by that campus in 1979. If there was no response to a second mailing, a telephone follow-up was made. At the conclusion of this process, 96% of the original sample members were traced. Of those not traceable, two members were deceased and three persons could not be located.

A questionnaire asking each subject to assess his or her career pattern development over the five year period, 1979-1984, was sent to
these 131 sample members in the Fall of 1984. A follow-up mailing was sent three weeks after the initial mailing. The response rate for the combined mailings was 84.7%. Stated another way, 81.62% of the original sample responded to the 1984 questionnaire. This subsample was then utilized in the analyses within the follow-up phase.

The 1984 questionnaire contained four sections. The first section asked questions about the subject's current employment status. Subsequent movement patterns were determined by an analyses of these results. The second section dealt with the search activities of those subjects who sought to leave during the five year period. Questions were posed about objective search activities such as the number of applications and about subjective interpretations such as the reasons for successful or unsuccessful outcomes. The third section focused upon the characteristics of the new post for those subjects who had changed positions during the five year period. These questions asked information on the type of post and the type of mobility into the post. Subject perceptions about the reasons for being hired and for being attracted to the new post were also solicited. The final section, answered by all subjects, dealt with general career information. Here subjects were asked to comment upon career planning activities, facilitating and limiting career elements, position and institutional characteristics that were advantageous or not, and career goals for the next five years. The data collected within the four sections allowed an analysis that was longitudinal. It also permitted an analysis of the content of various career elements which extended the 1979 results.
Both approaches expanded an understanding of career development within higher education administration.

A. Career Advancement

Career advancement was the first focus. Sample members were assigned to categories based upon whether or not they had experienced career mobility. Mobility was defined as upward movement which had increased the salary, power or prestige of the person. Only those subjects who had experienced such movement were viewed as advancers for this phase of the analysis. Similarly, only those subjects who remained at their same positions and who had not sought to leave those positions during the five year period were regarded as stable. This desired conceptual clarity of the dependent variable necessarily produced a smaller sample size. Nonetheless, it was important that the categories be both distinct from one another and as typologically pure as possible. Operational definitions that met these conditions thus afforded the best test of gender differentiation in advancement and in the career elements tied to such mobility. The resulting breakdown of observed frequencies for the dependent variable, career mobility, is presented in Table 2.2. These career distinctions will systematically be addressed throughout the 1984 data analysis.
Table 2.2
Dependent Variable Frequencies
by Gender and Institutional Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Movement</th>
<th>University Centers</th>
<th>Arts &amp; Science Colleges</th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Other Movement Categories

Gender similarities and differences also existed in other movement categories. An analysis of the entire process of movement undertaken by all the respondents who completed the 1984 survey was conducted. Each member was assigned to a category based upon the type of movement he or she had experienced during the five year period. Each subgroup was then analyzed in order to locate career elements which might separate the differing patterns of movement. This career movement cohort analysis focused upon identifying differences related to the career profiles of each group. The gender composition of each group was highlighted. Additionally, consistency among pair partners in cohort membership was noted. When pair partners did not share similar outcomes, the analysis attempted to discern the career elements that produced the differences. The cohort analysis then serves to isolate movement outcomes and to analyze the constellation of career
elements members of a cohort shared with each other. The complete sample breakdown into movement cohorts is presented in Table 2.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Movement</th>
<th>University Centers</th>
<th>Arts &amp; Science Colleges</th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed in the same post without seeking change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed in the same post but sought change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a somewhat different post at the same institution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to an entirely new post at the same institution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed institutions within higher education administra-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left higher education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample size within the eight cohorts is relatively small. Objective career dimensions such as career goal and attainment patterns, educational levels and demographic characteristics are examined for each group. Moreover, a qualitative impression of each group is presented. In an exploratory study this is particularly advantageous. A subjective group commonality could identify career and personal variables which interact to heighten the probability of particular movement patterns. These subjective qualities then underscore objective distinctions and identify important empirical issues for the future. Taken together, career movement within higher education administration can be more fully understood.

C. Aggregate Analysis

The 1984 follow-up study also contains an aggregate descriptive analysis. The focus in this section was twofold: 1) to trace the 1979 gender differentiated career elements through 1984; and, 2) to extend the general knowledge of factors that influence career development, regardless of gender. For example, one result from the 1979 study pointed toward the need to examine the continuing impact of utilizing the internal labor market, especially for women. The nature of the application process as a career movement tool is examined within this context. In particular, gender differences in application process techniques and outcomes are addressed as major career movement distinctions. These and other issues linked to the 1979 study are presented within the descriptive analysis.
D. Longitudinal View of Career Stability, 1979-1989

A major longitudinal component focused upon career goal stability. This analysis spanned the period, 1979-1989. Subjects in both 1979 and 1984 were asked to indicate their career goals for the next five years. Goals for 1984, attainments by 1984, and goals for 1989 were all identified. The descriptive analysis of career goal stability over time uncovered differences linked to both gender and movement outcomes. For example, the 1979 study identified a group of subjects, primarily women, who indicated sexism as their principal career obstacle. Subsequent goal setting and attainment patterns for this group in particular were analyzed for links with particular movement outcomes.

The descriptive analysis also examined the continuing impact of two other significant 1979 outcomes. The impact of age upon career development was addressed. Age and age at entry into administration were both significant 1979 gender differences. The power of life cycle elements to condition career development was examined. Lastly, the position and institutional influences upon career development were explored. In this area, variables which appeared to heavily influence career development, either enhancing or retarding the ability of the subjects to expand their professional lives, were identified. Career development was viewed as any exercised opportunity or activity which aided in the subject's self-defined professional growth. Each respondent was asked in 1984 to assess the factors that most contributed to or hindered such growth. By analyzing these responses it was possible to develop a typology of position and institutional
characteristics that appeared to operate to facilitate career development. When these system properties were combined with the professional growth activities of the sample members, a more comprehensive understanding of the elements involved in career development was evident.

The 1984 follow-up survey analysis was then divided into four categories: 1) aggregate movement pattern analysis; 2) age cohort analysis; 3) institutional and position impact analysis; and, 4) movement cohort analysis. Each of the four expanded upon the 1979 findings and pointed toward new directions for future efforts. The data remained primarily categorical. Statistical tools appropriate to this level of analysis were continued from the 1979 phase in order to increase comparability. The exploratory nature of both the 1979 study and the 1984 follow-up phase permitted a range of analysis which uncovered the differing influence of career elements on outcomes for men and women separately, and for administrators as a group.

E. Limitations of Matching and Generalizability

One methodological concern must be cited. While the use of the matched sample design did permit greater confidence in conducting initial career pattern comparisons than might otherwise be the case, it however did limit generalizability. The men in the sample cannot be assumed to be representative of the male population of administrators since they were selected on the basis of pairing with the female population. At the same time there is no claim that this population of women in 1979 was representative of female administrators in higher education in a way which would permit valid inferences to be drawn. As an exploratory study, a matched pair design allowed for an
examination of potential gender differentiation in career development patterns in order to identify the most productive research issues to be subjected to future empirical work. Promising findings can now encourage the large scale studies where generalizations might apply to administrative careers across the institution of higher education within our society.
CHAPTER 3

1979 RESULTS

I. Exploratory Findings: 1979

A. Gender Similarities

The 1979 matched sample survey identified 68 pairs of similarly positioned male and female administrators. The pair response rate was 60%. The analysis initially centered upon identifying gender similarities among the respondents. Gender differences were explored once these common characteristics were examined.

Several major demographic similarities between these men and women did exist. With 94.1% of the respondents identifying themselves as Caucasian, the variable of race was deleted from the analysis. The subjects were also similar in age at first marriage and age at the birth of the first child. Several career factors were also highly similar among the men and women in the sample. Each group had taken about the same time to complete the highest degree earned and there were no significant gender differences in the highest degree attained. Additionally, there were no significant differences in the time period a subject spent progressing from one administrative position to another when such movement did occur. In brief, when individuals progressed, men and women reflected similar time frames but women were not as likely as men to actually advance.

Gender differences in median salary were not significant for the sample as a whole or when the two control variables, type of institution and type of position, were introduced. Lastly, the sample members as a group were not professionally active. They were not
particularly active participants in regional or national professional organizations, were not involved in research or publication activities, and were not especially active in their local communities. In these areas there were some differences by the type of position with line personnel being more active than staff members. However, there were no significant gender differences in any of the categories presented on the questionnaire. Table 3.1 highlights these similarities:

Table 3.1
Gender Similarities - 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male (mean years)</th>
<th>Female (mean years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at First Marriage</td>
<td>25.40</td>
<td>25.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at First Child</td>
<td>27.54</td>
<td>26.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in Present Post</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in Prior Post</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time from First to Prior Post</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time from High School Diploma to Highest Earned Degree</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>13.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salary (mean dollars) 27,110 25,830
B. Gender Differences

1. Entry Routes

   a. Entry Routes by Gender

      Gender differences were then explored. The first analysis examined the entry routes sample members took in moving into higher education administration. A review of the last position held by a sample member before movement into his or her first administrative post provided information on entry routes. Differences among men and women as well as sharp contrasts among the types of institutions under consideration were evident. Table 3.2 summarizes these findings.
### Table 3.2

Percent Gender Difference in Entry Routes by Type of Institution - 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution of First Administrative Position</th>
<th>University Centers</th>
<th>Four Year Colleges</th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education administration only</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another type of post within education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside education</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100

(N) (11) (10) (21) (20) (20) (40) (37) (35) (72) (68) (65) (133)

\[ a_p = 0.418 \quad b_p = 0.446 \quad c_p = 0.027^* \]

\[ *p = \leq 0.05 \]
There is a significant difference among male and female administrators at the community colleges. A significant gender difference did not emerge at the university centers or at the Arts and Science colleges; however, entry route differences were discernible. For university center personnel, the major entry route, regardless of gender, was a position unrelated to education, e.g., business, private practice, social service organizations, and the military. It would seem that for these sample members directly prior experience within the educational field was unnecessary in gaining access to administrative positions. In contrast, the modal entry route for women at the Arts and Science colleges was from a faculty position. The modal entry route for men at the Arts and Science colleges was consistent with the university center finding, although not as pronounced. At the community colleges, women were most likely to enter administration from non-faculty positions inside education or from positions unrelated to education. The pattern for community college men was spread more evenly across several categories. So, the significant gender difference in entry routes at the community colleges was based upon the male pattern being more varied than the female.

b. Entry Routes by Institutional Type

The analysis also indicated that for women there was a significant difference (p=0.013) between the type of institution and the particular entry route into her first administrative post. This was not true for men (p=0.758). In fact, regardless of the type of school, men tended to be heavily recruited from positions unrelated to education. The only departure from this trend was in the community
colleges where men were recruited from the faculty, a relatively weak entry route for women despite the fact that women were more strongly represented among community college faculty than at the other two types of institutions. The women sample members clearly differed in entry routes by the type of institution. The university centers tended to recruit women from outside education, the Arts and Science colleges from faculty ranks, and the community colleges tended to recruit about equally from outside education and from non-teaching posts inside education. These preliminary results indicated that a woman's chance of gaining entry was significantly influenced by where she was previously employed. Such was not the case for men where no pattern emerged between the particular entry route and the type of school of current employment.

Sample members were then divided into three groups depending upon the number of positions the incumbent had held within higher education administration. There were no significant gender differences in entry routes between men and women who were in their first post, second post, or third or greater post in higher education administration. Line versus staff positions also did not evidence significant differences in entry routes. There were then no departures from the reported results. It appeared that there had been no major shift in entry routes since the earlier period when the more advanced group was entering higher education administration.
2. Career Pattern Progression

a. Point in Administrative Career Pattern by Gender

The location of the present position in an incumbent's overall administrative career development pattern was examined. As noted, subjects were asked to indicate whether they were in their first administrative post, or whether they had held one other administrative post immediately prior to their present position, or whether they were now in their third or more administrative position. Table 3.3 summarizes the response pattern for this variable.

Table 3.3
Percent Gender Difference in Career Pattern Progression - 1979*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point in Administrative Career Pattern</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present position is the first administrative post in higher education</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior position was the first administrative post in higher education</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first administrative post in higher education was earlier than the prior or present post</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(134)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = <0.01
Women were clearly relative newcomers to these administrative positions. In fact, close to a majority of the men in the sample were in at least their third administrative position whereas slightly more than half of the women were only in their first position. The stability of this pattern across the three types of institutions, university centers, Arts and Science colleges, and community colleges was analyzed. Table 3.4 summarizes this breakdown. The initial relationship remained significant for sample members at the community colleges, and nearly so for those at the university centers. In contrast, the Arts and Science colleges have a pattern of gender similarity rather than difference. Once again, institutional context appeared to be a salient consideration. No significant gender differences were evident among line versus staff incumbents.
Table 3.4

Percent Gender Difference in Career Pattern Progression by Type of Institution - 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Point in Administrative Career Pattern</th>
<th>University Center&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Four Year College&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Community College&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Administrative Post</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Administrative Post</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Second Administrative Post</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> <i>p = 0.06</i>  
<sup>b</sup> <i>p = 0.61</i>  
<sup>c</sup> <i>p = 0.01</i>  

<i>*p = <0.05</i>
b. Career Progression by Gender by Age

A significant gender difference, potentially related to these differences in career pattern progression, was chronological age. Women were significantly older than men. The mean age for men was 43.9 years whereas for women it was 47.3 years (p=0.035). As documented in later analyses, age impacts on career development in important ways as both men and women move through the life cycle. Differences between these men and women are attributable, in part, to this gender difference. In fact, the differences in chronological age and in administrative career pattern progression led to the suspicion that age at entry into higher education administration might also be gender differentiated. Significant gender differences emerged when an analysis of the age of sample members at the time of entry into administration was conducted. Women were, as Table 3.5 indicates, consistently older than men at the time of entry. Both age and age at entry were significantly different for these men and women. These two variables then become crucial elements of subsequent career progression. Taken together they are a potent set of factors which persist over time as career influences.
Table 3.5
Gender Differences in Mean Age at Entry into Administration - 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Center</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32.10</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Science College</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33.90</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33.39</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32.84</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Post</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33.45</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33.22</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = 0.05

Institutional context differences in age at entry were also evident. Significant gender differences emerged only at the community colleges, although the trend of women being older remained consistent throughout the data. A subsequent analysis confirmed that the variance under consideration did impact most heavily upon female line administrators at the community colleges. Here the type of position as well as the type of institution were both important considerations.
c. Career Progression by Gender by Educational Attainment

The educational attainment pattern of the subjects was then explored as another variable potentially related to career progression. Only a minority of the subjects, regardless of gender, moved directly through to their highest earned degree. Most subjects had periods when they were not enrolled in an academic program or were not progressing at a rate consistent with full-time status. While there were no overall gender differences, there were significant within gender differences for women when the institutional context was considered (p=0.02). Men at each institutional level, and women at the university centers and at the Arts and Science colleges all evidenced a pattern of minimal educational interruption (0-3 years) in movement toward the highest earned degree. For community college women, on the other hand, the interruption was extreme, with a greater than ten year span. Additionally, it was only among line community college administrators that a significant gender difference appeared (p=0.048). Male community college administrators had a pattern similar to the other sample members whereas female community college line administrators were, quite literally, in a class by themselves. These women tended to have a fifteen to twenty year gap between initial collegiate enrollment and attainment of their highest degree. Female community college staff administrators showed no gender differences from their male counterparts or from women at other institutions.

The gender difference in this career element supported the likelihood of gender differentiation in overall career pattern development. Moreover, within group differences among the women, it
will be recalled, were assumed to be more likely than among the traditional male incumbents who tended to experience a more open opportunity structure. Male administrators then evidenced more within gender similarity in career pattern development than female administrators who, it was assumed, had to find alternative career avenues in order to circumvent a blocked or less open opportunity structure.

d. Type of Position by Gender

Greater career element inconsistency for women also existed in reported mobility patterns. The pattern of mobility among men and women who were in a position other than their first administrative post was analyzed. It was evident that men tended to remain in the same type of position, i.e., staff or line, when they moved to another post, even if that movement was vertical. This pattern was not evident for women who displayed movement in all directions, including downward mobility.

This more varied pattern among women was further clarified when an analysis of movement into the subject's present position was undertaken. The type of position, line or staff, was important. Line position incumbents, regardless of gender, reported primarily vertical mobility into their present positions. Staff incumbents however demonstrated mobility differences by gender. Male staff members showed more lateral than vertical movement with only limited downward movement. In contrast, female staff members showed a varied mobility pattern with substantial movement in all directions. When these patterns were analyzed for consistency across the three types of institutions, only the community college staff personnel evidenced
significant gender differences in patterns of mobility \( p=0.047 \). At community colleges, female staff members were significantly more likely to experience unstable mobility patterns in contrast to their male counterparts, and in contrast to other women. Such was not the case for women at the university centers or the Arts and Science colleges.

These two areas of within gender differences for women are illuminating. Additionally, as previously reported, women differed among themselves in the relationship between the position held before entering administration and the type of institution of present employment. Such was not the case for men. These differences can be viewed as consistent with non-traditional status. Women who achieve incumbency may do so by circumventing traditional pathways. Their lower level of internal consistency reflects these more individualized patterns. Men, on the otherhand, are more internally consistent because they have traveled the traditional routes to incumbency. The differences then point to broader issues of institutional sexism.

3. Career Obstacles

a. Career Obstacles by Gender

The career obstacles sample members perceived as limiting their career development patterns were hypothesized to be gender differentiated. Blocks in access to initial positions, or impediments to advancement within higher education administration were both issues of concern. Each sample member was asked to review his or her career development pattern and to identify the greatest obstacle faced in arriving at his or her present point in career development. The
responses to this open-ended question were clustered. The analysis rested upon self-reported data. It does nonetheless offer a vehicle for examining the perceptions present administrators hold of the blocks that intervened in their career development. As Table 3.6 indicates, there were significant gender differences in the named career blocks.

Table 3.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Named Obstacle</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexism</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Obligations</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Credentials</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Job Market</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Conflicts</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N) (67) (64) (131)

*p = <0.001

The range of perceived obstacles was more varied for men than for women. Women perceived sexism and family obligations as the principal impediments to career development. The response pattern
for men was distributed across the categories. It is also important to note that better than a fifth of both men (23.9%) and women (21.9%) reported that they experienced no obstacles in their career development. This finding is particularly noteworthy since the open-ended question allowed maximum respondent flexibility in commenting upon such obstacles. In fact, in a limited number of cases, both men and women indicated that the ease of movement within their pattern was its most significant feature.

b. Career Obstacles by Gender by Type of Position

When the type of position variable was introduced as a control, the gender differentiated pattern was further clarified. For men and women in line positions, the general pattern of gender difference remained (p=0.002). The attribution of career obstacles was distributed across several categories for the men but for the women the attributions again clustered on the two key factors of sexism (42.9%) and family obligations (21.4%). For men and women in staff positions, the relationship was also significant (p=0.024). However, there was some variation in the identified pattern. The modal category for both men and women indicated a lack of perceived obstacles in career development (30.6% for each). For women, the next two most frequently cited obstacles were consistent with the general pattern of identifying sexism (22.2%) and family obligations (16.7%) as the principal impediments. However, for men the pattern was no longer as varied. Here the attributions clustered on the limited job market in higher education (19.4%) and the lack of needed educational credentials (13.9%). Individuals then appeared to perceive fewer overall difficulties in staff than in
line positions; however, gender differences were significant in both situations, markedly so in the line positions.

c. Career Obstacles by Gender by Type of Institution

A more varied picture emerged when attention was focused upon the type of institution as a factor in the relationship between gender and career obstacles. At the university centers, there were no significant gender differences in reported obstacles (p=0.20). Women reported no obstacles (30.0%) or sexism (30.0%) as the principal blocks whereas men reported no obstacles (27.3%) or personality conflicts (36.4%) as the chief difficulties. Consideration must also be given here to the possibility that some women who reported sexism and some men who reported personality conflicts may, in fact, be responding to similar circumstances but applying dissimilar labels. The conclusion remained that the pattern previously discussed is not evident at the university centers.

At the Arts and Science colleges, the gender differences were also not significant (p=0.082). Again, women here reported no obstacles (38.9%) or sexism (38.9%) as modal categories. Men reported no obstacles (31.6%) as the modal category with a roughly even distribution over the other categories. No sample member, male or female, in this group reported family obligations as a hindering factor. However, when line and staff members were separated at the Arts and Science colleges a significant gender difference did emerge among line personnel (p=0.01). Fully 71.4% of the women in line posts perceived sexism as their greatest career obstacle. The modal category (50.0%) for men in line posts was internal politics or other constraints.
Staff position incumbents did not evidence gender differentiation in named obstacles.

It was once again, however, at the community colleges that the pattern of gender difference most clearly emerged (p=0.003). Women viewed sexism (27.8%) and family obligations (30.6%) as the crucial factors hindering their career development. Men did not perceive these as issues but focused, when blocks occurred, on position availability (16.2%) and educational requirements (21.6%). The community college pattern was then uniformly consistent with the overall pattern. The community college pattern was also separate from the other two types of institutions, highlighting the continued importance of context as a career variable.

d. Obstacle Circumvention by Gender

The possibility of gender differentiated obstacles to career development was then supported by the analysis. It also appeared that women were more consistent in their identification of particular career obstacles than were men who identified a range of obstacles. This was an anticipated outcome given the "outsider" status and the shared definitions regarding the underlying dynamics of that status. The two obstacles women tended to report most frequently were gender-linked, i.e., sexism and family obligations. Beyond this, it also appeared that the type of position and the type of institution were related to the identification of particular obstacles. Line positions more strongly reflected the overall pattern. And, it was at the community colleges as opposed to the other two institutional contexts that the pattern was most heavily represented.
Obstacles to career advancement can however be mitigated when individuals are able to provide to the prospective employer a measure of proof of competence. This proof can assure the employer of the capacity of the person to fulfill both formal and informal role demands. Women in higher education administration need this evidence in order to be viewed as viable candidates. Subjects were asked to address such techniques in the questionnaire. Varied forms of legitimation through experience were viewed as powerful means of validating competence. Three techniques were: 1) whether the incumbent occupied the position in an acting capacity before assuming the permanent role; 2) whether the incumbent had been an internal candidate for the position, i.e., he or she was already employed by the institution at the time he or she moved into the present post; and, 3) whether the incumbent had been an internal candidate from within the State system. Utilization of the first technique automatically assumed the second and third also applied. And, utilization of the second assured the third. For these reasons, the analysis involved a gender comparison of each technique. Once a subject had been identified as a user of the first technique, he or she was not included in subsequent analyses.

The results of the analysis showed no gender differences among the respondents in the use of the acting position as a technique of legitimation. In fact, the number of incumbents in this category was so small (8) that it was eliminated from further analysis. Significant gender differences did emerge from the analysis of internal candidacy within the particular institution or within the State system. Gender differences in institutional candidacy occurred for line
personnel at the university centers and for staff and line personnel at the Arts and Science colleges. In each of these instances women were more likely to be institutional candidates than men. A reversal of this trend was evident for university center staff personnel where men were more likely to be the institutional candidates. Lastly, at the community colleges there was a higher proportion of internal candidates, whether male or female, for both line and staff positions, than at the other two institutional levels. There were, however, no significant gender differences at the community colleges.

An interesting longitudinal trend also emerged. When men and women who were in at least their third administrative position sought their first post, only about a third were internal candidates within the State system. Moreover, very few women (5.3%) and less than a fifth (17.9%) of the men were internal candidates within the particular institution. Contrasted with these findings are those for men and women at more recent points in their administrative career patterns. Here the strong majority of men (70.0%), and nearly all women (91.7%) were hired from within the State system when they sought their first administrative post. Moreover, about one-third of the men (35.0%) versus a full two-thirds of the women (66.7%) were internal institutional applicants. When the advanced group was analyzed for the movement pattern into their present positions, a pattern similar to the one for more recent arrivals emerged. There thus appeared to have been a change in access routes during the past decade. This affected both men and women but a greater proportion of women did evidence the pattern. The possibility exists that shifts in labor market forces have occurred
which underscore structural changes within higher education. The expansion or contraction of the internal labor market then appears especially salient as an exploratory focus.

4. Marriage and Family Patterns

a. Marital Status by Gender

Marriage and family patterns were examined in order to assess gender differences in the impact of these variables upon career development. Sharp differences did exist. The literature review had already identified these patterns as one of the most consistent differences uncovered among men and women in administrative and executive positions. Moreover, in this study, women identified family obligations as a career obstacle but men did not. It is then not surprising that the analysis showed that women more often than men tended to never marry, or to be divorced or widowed as their careers developed. Additionally, women also tended to remain childless more than their male counterparts or to have fewer children if they were parents.

A significant gender difference in the marital status of these subjects was evident (p=0.0001). A substantial majority of the men (88.1%) were presently married whereas slightly less than a majority (48.5%) of women were married. A third of the women had never married (32.4%) whereas only a fraction (7.4%) of the men were in this category. These results remained intact when both the type of institution and the type of position were considered. The marital pattern was then differentiated by gender. It was also consistent with previously noted studies which discuss the difficulties women seem to encounter in being both married and career-oriented.
b. Childrearing by Gender

Parenthood patterns for these men and women were also gender differentiated (p=0.058). The mean number of children for male sample members was 3.29 whereas the mean number of children for female sample members was 2.76. This trend for married women to have fewer children than married men remained constant across institutional types and among both line and staff positions. Again, these findings were consistent with earlier studies. Another area of parental responsibility which evidenced significant gender differences was the number of children still at home for those sample members who were parents (p=0.017). This difference is presented in Table 3.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children at Home</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(88)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = 0.017
It was evident that women who are parents had significantly fewer children remaining at home than did the men who are parents. This may be due in part to the already noted significant age difference between these men and women. An examination of differences within the types of positions and across the types of institutions further clarified these parenthood differences.

c. Childrearing by Gender by Type of Position and Institution

There were no significant gender differences when the type of institution was considered. However, when the type of position was considered, a significant difference did emerge for men and women in line positions \((p=0.04)\). The difference was not significant for sample members in staff positions \((p=0.11)\). Female line administrators have an average of 1.6 children whereas male line administrators have an average of 2.98 children. Moreover, when the number of children who remained at home was analyzed, the gender differences were even stronger \((p=0.006)\). Women in this group, quite simply, no longer had major childrearing responsibilities. Only one woman had more than one child at home. Half the women had no children remaining at home. Men, on the other hand, have a varied pattern of childrearing. Women in line positions then tended not to combine these two demanding roles even though they may have elected to hold both over time. Men were more likely to be concurrent incumbents.

There was a significant gender difference, by institutional type, when the number of children remaining at home was examined. The institutional context differences once again centered upon the
community colleges. Here the number of children remaining at home was significantly different for men versus women (p=0.026). More than three-quarters of the women versus only a third of the men had one or no children at home. Women who were community college administrators were once again significantly different from their male counterparts. This was not true for women and men at the university centers (p=0.913) or the Arts and Science colleges (p=0.105).

The differences in marriage and family patterns among these men and women were then uniformly in the expected directions. Women tended to be single, either never marrying or divorced, more than men, the vast majority of whom were married. Of the women who did marry, a greater proportion were childless. Even when there were children, the trend was for women to have smaller families than men. Moreover, women tended to phase over time their family and career roles more than did men. The interaction effects of age and age at entry into administration with these limited childrearing responsibilities represent, for these women, a potentially significant set of career determinants. These gender differences within marriage and family patterns are likely to result in pressures which differentially impact upon subsequent career development.

5. Conclusions on Gender Differences

This overall exploratory analysis resulted in several significant findings which separated the career patterns of these men and women. The principal areas of significant gender difference were: 1) the entry routes into higher education administration; 2) career pattern progression, i.e., movement and mobility; 3) chronological age
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II. Future Directions: Focal Issues for the Five Year Follow-Up Study

A. Introduction

The five year follow-up study is designed to trace the movement patterns of these subjects from 1979 through 1984. The principal findings from the 1979 analyses were utilized as focal points for the 1984 study. These findings did support the conclusion that gender differentiation does exist within the career patterns of these administrators. Male and female incumbents were significantly different from one another on several career variables within the matched sample design. The 1984 study analyzes the subsequent gender differences among these subjects as career development continues. The impact of the significant gender differences over time is examined. Additional variables also are explored within the analysis. These new factors identify career elements which operate once access has occurred. As a result, the overall picture of administrative career development is clearer.

B. Access Linked to Career Goals and Future Patterns of Movement

The first major 1979 finding involved the entry routes these men and women took to attain their first administrative post. Gender differences in entry routes did emerge, with significant differences
occurring at the community colleges. The finding for women that type of previous employment was related to access to a particular type of institution was especially noteworthy. Moreover, the patterns discerned appeared to reflect gender differentiation which had persisted over the previous decade since no further gender differences emerged when the longitudinal point at entry into administration was considered. These findings then supported the existence of gender differentiated career elements which did operate to impose limitations on one gender which were not imposed upon the other.

Between 1979 and 1984, advancement, i.e., upward mobility, is of particular analytic importance. If access does not result in advancement for those who desire mobility, then the opportunity structure remains closed, with access creating only the illusion of openness. The initial 1984 analysis explores whether gender differentiation exists in the patterns of movement from 1979 to 1984. Movement is also tied to the process of application. Differences in advancement could be a product of differences in search procedures. For this reason, a sub-analysis of the application process is conducted. Gender differences in either procedure or outcome could uncover explanations for differences in career movement.

Patterns of movement are also influenced by the desire for such movement on the part of the incumbent. Thus career goal stability is analyzed. Gender differences may exist in the desire for upward mobility which would then explain outcome differences. However, gender similarity in goal setting, followed by gender differentiation in goal attainment would point toward an alternative set of gender specific
circumstances influencing career movement. Changes in goal setting are also examined. Goal and attainment patterns are analyzed over a ten year period from 1979 to 1989. Gender differentiation in the focus of career goals over time would further clarify the variables impacting on administrative career development.

C. Career Pattern Progression Linked to Interactive Levels of Analysis

The extent of prior administrative experience was another significant gender difference in 1979. Women were overwhelmingly newcomers to administration. These differences in the location of the incumbent's present position in his or her overall career development pattern may also reflect a relatively recent increase in access on the part of women to positions within higher education administration. The significant age and age at entry differences for these men and women, coupled with the similarity in the period of present incumbency, support the possibility that factors are at work which have permitted women recent access into administrative posts. An extra-institutional factor which might account for these findings is the range of affirmative action endeavors of the past decade. Federal interventions, judicial and administrative, may have served as major contravening forces in directing institutions to establish mechanisms for compensating for past discrimination and underutilization of classes of individuals, women included.

Moreover, the fact that these gender distinctions exist, even in high echelon positions, points toward the existence of career lines which are fluid and flexible. Entry without substantial prior
experience in administration was clearly evident in 1979. The issue now is what happens once such entry is attained. The lack of extensive prior experience may limit advancement or may produce patterns of movement which are gender differentiated. The finding that such entry differences were not uniform across the three types of institutions may point toward institutional dynamics interacting with these other career elements. How these factors, taken together, influence career movement and especially advancement is unknown. To the extent that experience is often considered to be a crucial factor in career development, this more recent entry of women, further highlighted by the older age of women when they enter administration, may pose limitations on the opportunities for advancement within administration. The longitudinal design is useful in ascertaining the outcome of these interactive forces.

D. Internal Inconsistency for Women Linked to Type of Position and Type of Institution

The greater internal inconsistency within the career patterns of women as opposed to men was another significant 1979 finding. While common elements did exist in the career patterns of women, the extent of such homogeneity was not as extensive as in the career patterns of male administrators who could utilize the more institutionalized career determinants. In fact, the common features within the career patterns of women centered upon career obstacles and other elements of the exclusionary forces that appeared to impact upon women as a class. Two important areas of within gender inconsistency for women, for example, were the unstable mobility patterns within staff positions at the
community colleges, and the previously discussed within gender differences in entry routes by institutional type. In each of these instances, the pattern for men was one of within group consistency. The institutional context and the location of the post within the bureaucratic hierarchy need further analysis. The particular type of institution of present employment is, for women, related to each of the areas under consideration. This is especially true within the community college milieu where factors appeared to operate to separate the experiences of female administrators from both similarly position male administrators and from women at the other two types of institutions. Additional empirical support related to the impact of the type of institution is needed.

It is also crucial that the pattern of movement for subjects at each institutional type is explored. The impact of institutional context was potent in the 1979 study. In each area of major findings, when this system property was introduced as an analytic variable, the underlying career dynamics were more clearly discerned. This was also the case for the distinction between line and staff positions. The five year movement pattern for these men and women is explored in terms of these two variables. Again, the issue is whether or not initial gender differentiation persists over time. If the type of institution and the type of position continue to influence movement, then it is not possible to speak about higher education administration as an entity. Rather, any career pattern analysis must explore context and location as separating elements with a differing impact upon men versus women.
E. Sexism as a Career Obstacle Linked to Subsequent Advancement

Identification of career obstacles was another significant gender difference in 1979. Women tended to view sexism and family obligations as the principal impediments to career development. Men responded across a number of categories with rare identification of sexism and family obligations as blocks to advancement. It appeared then that men and women confronted dissimilar obstacles in pursuit of career advancement. Also, the factors limiting a particular man were more determined by his unique characteristics and experience. The factors limiting a woman were more likely to be tied to her membership in a class of persons where there are cultural assumptions as to appropriate roles, and where those assumptions are not consistent with career development within higher education administration. In short, men tended to view the obstacles as externally imposed in the form of such factors as position requirements or availability whereas women focused upon obstacles which reflect what they are, i.e., women, wives, mothers, or what it is culturally assumed they should be.

Institutional context, once again, emerged as a factor in the identification of career obstacles in 1979. Furthermore, it was at the community colleges that the findings were highly significant. Regardless of the type of position, community college women perceived sexism and family obligations as career obstacles. In contrast, there were no significant gender differences identified at the university centers or among staff personnel at the Arts and Science colleges. Line personnel at the Arts and Science colleges did evidence significant gender
differentiation. This tendency for female line personnel to identify gender-based obstacles once again underscored the importance of the type of position.

In attempting to sort out these dynamics, a subsample of subjects are identified within the 1984 analysis. There were twenty-two subjects in 1979 who stated sexism as the principal limit on their career advancement. The subsequent movement pattern of these twenty women and two men is analyzed separately. It is important to note whether advancement occurs, and whether other career variables also appear to impact on movement. Additionally, the ways these subjects differ from the other sample members needs examination. Such differences could point toward unique elements of career development which are tied to the perception of discrimination. Age, for example, may be such a variable. Older women who were in the work force before the advent of affirmative action may indicate more perceived sexism than younger women who were more likely beneficiaries of the opening of opportunities over the past decade. This analysis focuses on the career development patterns of this subsample of administrators.

F. Career Development Factors Linked Over Time, 1979-1984

A major gender difference in 1979 centered upon the use of internal candidacy to gain incumbency. Women were much more likely than men to utilize this access route. These findings were also more true for line personnel than staff members, again highlighting this as an important analytic distinction. The existence of an internal labor market within higher education administration may have continuing effects on the careers of these men and women. One issue is whether
this route could be utilized once again in order to advance. A broader focus is centered upon the movement pattern of these internal candidates. Constraining influences which bind an individual to a particular institution may limit subsequent movement. And, even more broadly, the extent to which the internal labor market remains an actively utilized and gender differentiated avenue of movement is assessed.

While the internal labor market is one influence on career development, many other factors also determine career outcomes. The 1984 survey addresses these factors by asking respondents to comment upon positive and negative career influences. Additional questions deal with institutional and position influences. These variables emerged as significant when they were objectively defined in the 1979 study. The subjective institutional milieu and position content now needs examination. With these data it may be possible to understand not only what variables impact on career movement but also how they operate to produce differences in outcome, both in general and for men versus women in particular.

To uncover further elements of career pattern development, each 1984 movement cohort is separately analyzed. Movement outcomes are the overall focus of the 1984 follow-up study. Once these outcomes are evident, the principal characteristics of each cohort are identified. The question here is whether there are unique features common to members of the sample who share movement outcomes. Confirmation of the aggregate findings is sought. New factors related to career development may also emerge. Within the cohort analysis, the matched pair outcomes are also analyzed. Men and women who were matched by position title
and type of institution in 1979, may track the same career lines over the ensuing five years. Whether the outcomes are similar or different will greatly expand the understanding of career patterns within higher education administration.

G. Marriage and Family Patterns Linked to Career Advancement

The last area of significant gender differences in 1979 was in the marriage and family patterns of these sample members. Women tended to marry less, and if married, to have smaller families. Moreover, women were more likely than men to separate career and family obligations by deferring career pattern development until major childrearing activities were completed. These findings were also consistent with the reported career obstacles. Women stated family obligations as an impediment much more often than did men. It appeared that women, especially those in line positions, deferred career development until their children were grown whereas the men did not. These findings were also consistent with the later age at entry for women and with the gender differences in point in career pattern, with women significantly more likely than men to be in their first administrative post. In fact, the entire issue of age and age at entry is explored in the 1984 analysis. These two significant gender differences have appeared as interactive variables at several points in the analysis. The impact of age was most evident in the issue of childrearing differences, especially the number of children still at home. Life cycle phases do indeed impact on career development. Because the content of those phases may be gender specific, it is likely that career outcomes will be gender differentiated. The 1984 study examines the age variable
directly. For this sample it appears to be a significant gender difference that transcends several aspects of career pattern development.

H. Summary

Several future directions for the five year follow-up study are now identified. Each rests upon the gender differentiated results from the 1979 study. The overriding issue is whether these initial gender differences persist over time. The 1984 data are analyzed within four major categories: 1) movement pattern analysis; 2) age cohort analysis; 3) institutional and position impact analysis; and, 4) movement cohort analysis. Each of these analyses links the 1979 results to the 1984 outcomes. An improved understanding of the nature of career pattern development within higher education administration then emerges.
CHAPTER 4

1984 DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSES

I. Introduction

The response rate for the five year follow-up survey conducted in the Fall of 1984 was 81.6%. Of the original 136 sample members, 111 responded. As Table 4.1 indicates, this 1984 sample contains a nearly equal number of men and women. Gender differentiation in some movement patterns appears evident. The type of institution also appears related to the type of movement experienced by some subjects. These 1984 outcome differences are examined within the following descriptive analyses.
Table 4.1

Movement Pattern Frequencies by Gender and Type of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Movement</th>
<th>University Centers</th>
<th>Arts and Science Colleges</th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed in the same post without seeking change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed in the same post but sought change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to a somewhat different post at the same institution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to an entirely new post at the same institution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed institutions within higher education administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left higher education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1984 respondents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1979 respondents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The patterns of movement are analyzed first. Movement patterns into the 1979 posts were gender differentiated. Subsequent career changes are traced in order to learn whether these differences persist. In 1979, the existence of an internal labor market provided a major entry route into administration for women. The impact of this access route upon future career development is the initial focus of the movement analysis. Tied to this analysis is an examination of the process of application. The 1984 survey included a number of questions on search activities. The focus here was upon what activities people undertake in an attempt to move from one position to another. Since this area had not been examined in 1979, the nature of the process, potential gender differences, and differences between successful versus unsuccessful seekers are evaluated.

Two other factors impacting upon movement also are analyzed: career goal stability and perceived discrimination. In 1979, subjects were asked to indicate what position or activity they hoped to be involved in by 1984. This was interpreted to be their five-year goal. The question was repeated in the 1984 survey. It is thus possible to examine whether goals remain stable over the entire ten year period. The issue is whether the person desires the same outcome for 1989 as he or she wanted for 1984, and whether his or her activities between 1979 and 1984 indicate progression toward that goal. The links between goal setting and movement patterns for these men and women are identified. Additionally, a small group of subjects (N=22) indicated in 1979 that their careers had been constrained by gender discrimination. The movement patterns for this group over the five-year period, 1979 to 1984,
might evidence differences from the sample as a whole. These persons may also, as a group, reveal characteristics that aid in understanding the forces that limit career development. Taken together, an analysis of these sub-categories within the movement pattern analysis should clarify the process of access and advancement within higher education administration.

Chronological age and age at entry into administration were significantly different for these men and women in 1979. Women were older than men and had come to their administrative roles later than men. Since life cycle transitions interact with career development patterns, the issue here is whether the older age and later entry of the women will have a continuing impact on career movement. Career differences between men and women in the same age cohort need examination. Further, within sex differences are explored. The impact of age may result in differences among the women themselves which, if separate from the internal differences among men, could point toward gender differentiation in career development over the life cycle.

The age cohort analysis centers upon the division of the sample members into four groupings, beginning with the youngest cohort, those 25-34 years old, and moving in ten year increments to the oldest cohort, those 55-64 years old. All sample members are within these four categories. Moreover, the division reflects developmental decades which traditionally have been oriented toward different career achievements, i.e., establishing a career, developing a career, extending the developed career base, and maintaining a matured career as retirement approaches. Gender differentiation in movement, and especially
advancement, during these years would support a conclusion that the
career patterns for women are indeed influenced by the initial differ­
ences in age and age at entry. If that is the case, the traditional
view of career development activities within each decade of the life
cycle may need to be gender specific. The age cohort analysis examines
each of these issues.

The last major focus is the institutional and position impact
analysis. The 1979 study indicated that institutional context and
position characteristics are crucial elements in career pattern develop­
ment. The importance of institutional type, especially the differences
between the four year schools and the community colleges, is examined
again for indications that these milieu considerations persist as
influences governing career movement. The location of the position
within the bureaucratic organization merits similar analysis. Addi­
tionally, the 1984 survey provides subjects with an extended opportunity
to discuss the more subjective position and institutional features they
believe assist or hinder their professional growth. All three of these
areas are fully examined. Gender differences are one focus. However,
the principal thrust is upon discerning how organizational and milieu
considerations influence career development for any administrative
incumbent.

In summary, three aggregate descriptive analyses of the 1984 survey
data are presented: 1) the movement pattern analysis; 2) the age cohort
analysis; and, 3) the institutional and position impact analysis. Each
points toward uncovering the nature of specific elements of career
pattern development. These areas, added to the base of knowledge gained
from the 1979 data, can extend the emerging picture of career pattern development among men and women within higher education administration.

II. Movement Pattern Analyses

A. Introduction

The movement dynamics during the five year period, 1979 to 1984, are the most crucial dimension in this study of career development. The factors that influence career movement, and the extent to which these factors are gender-linked, remain the principal empirical focus. The parameters for this analysis are two-fold: career advancement and career movement. Career advancement denotes upward mobility, i.e., movement that carries with it an increase in money, power and prestige. Career movement denotes change that results from any shift in position, regardless of the direction of that shift. An open opportunity structure provides both access and advancement. The 1979 study identified gender differences in routes of entry. The 1984 movement patterns identify whether gender differences also exist in advancement and change for this group of administrators.

Two groups of subjects are identified within the movement analysis. The first group involves subjects who have advanced during the five year period and subjects who have elected to remain in the same post during that period. The conceptual clarity afforded by these two smaller groups, representing the sharpest dichotomy, should aid in the definition of gender differences in advancement. The second and larger group contains all the 1984 respondents. This will permit an examination of potential gender differences across all six movement
categories: upward, downward, lateral, remained by choice, sought unsuccessfully to leave and retired.

B. Internal Labor Market Impact

The issue of institutional candidacy is the focus of the first analysis. In the 1979 study, the internal labor market was heavily utilized by women. This area of significant gender difference must be reassessed within the 1984 sample. The initial test, utilizing the smaller group of subjects, showed no significant gender differences in advancement versus stability for those men and women who were either external or internal candidates into their 1979 posts. However, when all categories of movement were utilized as the dependent variable and then crosstabulated with internal or external candidacy into the 1979 post, a significant difference did emerge (p=<0.01). Moreover, when gender was introduced, there were no significant gender differences between men and women who were not institutional candidates in 1979, but there were such gender differences between men and women who were institutional candidates in 1979. Table 4.2 summarizes these differences.
Table 4.2

Percent Gender Difference in Patterns of Movement for Institutional Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern of Movement</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayer</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL               | 100.0  | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| (N)                 | 22     | 25    | 47    |

Chi square = 16.32
df = 5
p = 0.006

It is apparent that the gender differences are related to what happens to those men and women who do not advance or stay by choice. It is the remaining four categories of movement that specify the gender differentiation. In these instances, men tend to move laterally or downward in terms of money, power and prestige. Women, in contrast, tend to unsuccessfully seek to leave their 1979 posts or they retire. These differences are especially graphic since no women are present in the former categories, and no men in the latter.

An additional analysis of external and internal candidate differences was conducted to learn if any within gender differences
exist for these men and women. This was the case for both sexes. For men, the external candidates into their 1979 posts were significantly more likely to have moved up, to have sought movement, and to have moved in ways that were not easily assessable, i.e., left higher education administration entirely, than were the men who were institutional candidates. For women, the external candidates showed a significantly different, and more varied, pattern of movement, i.e., up, down, and lateral, than did the women who were institutional candidates into their 1979 posts. In short, the 1979 external candidates appear to be more mobile than their internal counterparts, and this is the case for both men and women.

In summary, the impact of initial institutional candidacy does appear to persist. The differences are gender differentiated by the type of movement. However, for both men and women, the movement is not related to advancement. This finding is further supported by the within gender differences evident in the two groups, external versus internal candidates. Initial internal candidacy appears to depress subsequent career advancement for both men and women but does so in ways that produce differing outcomes for each gender. Women retire or they remain while seeking a new post. Men move laterally or downward. For both men and women, internal institutional candidacy tends to produce access but not advancement.

C. Application Process Analysis

Movement is of course tied to the techniques a potential candidate employs during the search process. In 1979 there were significant gender differences in the routes of entry into higher
education administration. Dynamics of the search process were not examined. In the 1984 survey however, each subject was asked to assess the search activities he or she had initiated during the five-year period, 1979 to 1984. Thirty-six subjects, or 32.4% of the total respondents, indicated that they had submitted at least one application for a new position during that time. This group included individuals who sought to move but who were unsuccessful in doing so as well as those who actually changed positions. No significant differences emerged between these two groups in regard to their search activities. As such, they will be analyzed as one group of searchers. Seven subjects who did change position were recruited, or reassigned to a new post, or became self-employed. They did not participate in a search process and were not included in this analysis. The resulting sub-sample contained 23 men and 13 women, a roughly 2:1 gender disparity. This gender difference was further highlighted by the fact that only 24.1% of the women in the entire 1984 sample were searchers whereas 40.1% of the men were searchers. Women in this subsample were also an average of six years older than men. The high rate of chosen stability and retirement within the overall sample, especially for women, contributed to this limited number of searchers. The gender composition and the outcome of the application process for these 36 subjects is summarized in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3

Percent Application Process Outcome by Gender and Type of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION PROCESS OUTCOME</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th></th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th></th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNIVERSITY CENTER</td>
<td>ARTS AND SCIENCE COLLEGE</td>
<td>COMMUNITY COLLEGE</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessfully sought a new post</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifted internally to a related post</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed internally to a new post</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved externally within higher education administration</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left higher education administration</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to men outnumbering women in this subsample, Table 4.3 also shows that the community colleges are overrepresented in contrast to the Arts and Science colleges, and especially the university centers. Moreover, it is graphically demonstrated that the outcome of the application process is gender differentiated by institutional type. In fact, no woman at an Arts and Science college or university center who indicated she had initiated search activities was successful in her application process. Gender and institutional type once again appear to be important elements in tracing career pattern development.

Another important gender difference is evident in the modal movement category for the men versus the women. Nearly a third of the men who were involved in a search process did conclude that process successfully by moving to a new administrative post at another institution. In contrast, the modal category for women, with 38.4% of this group, was unsuccessfully seeking to move to another post. Since nearly all subjects who moved to another institution experienced career advancement, this is indeed a difference which speaks to overall career development. Since, as will be noted, no major gender differences emerged in the structure of the search activities, the explanation for these differences in outcome must come from factors other than the search procedure itself.

In mounting a search, an initial concern is to locate sources of position information. Each subject was asked to indicate his or her most frequently used source. The modal source for both men and women was personal contacts. A third of the men and nearly half the
women named this as their principal source of position information. For men the next most frequently used source was local and regional newspapers, followed by The Chronicle of Higher Education. For women the next most frequently used sources were the State-wide system Newsletter and The Chronicle.

It is clear that both men and women make extensive use of personal contacts in their search activities, with this being somewhat more true for women than men. While gender similarity appeared in the use of The Chronicle of Higher Education, differences emerged in the other two major sources. Women appeared to use the internally published Newsletter more than men. Men were more likely than women to use area newspapers. Overall, women were more likely than men to utilize sources that were personal or internal. Men tended to explore a wider, more external range, and this may be linked to their greater tendency to move to a new institution or to leave higher education administration completely.

As noted earlier, a large number of sample members were internal applicants into their 1979 post. The movement pattern of those individuals has already been discussed. It is now important to assess whether the tendency to use the internal labor market persisted regardless of how the subject attained his or her 1979 post. Of the 36 subjects in this subsample, 38.8% had indeed submitted at least one application to his or her home institution. Also, 44.4% had submitted at least one application to another institution within the State system. In both cases, men were more likely than women to submit internal applications. At the home institutions, men comprised 52.7% of those
who had applied internally. At the State level, men comprised 68.7% of those who had submitted such applications. Overall, there has been both a decline in the extent to which internal applications are made, and a gender shift in who is making them.

Furthermore, the success rate for these internal applicants was not very high. For men applying at their home institutions, only 33.3% were successful in shifting or changing positions. Women were even less successful, with only 16.7% gaining incumbency. This is in sharp contrast to the 1979 figures where fully 90% of the women in their first administrative post were internal applicants. Within the State system, excluding the home institution, the figures are similar. For the men, the success rate was 36.4%, and for the women it was 33.3%. So, in addition to the other changes, there also appears to be a decline in the successful use of internal applications. This avenue of movement has thus undergone change during the period under consideration. Additionally, these results also raise the possibility that internal candidacy is an entry route but not an advancement route once that first administrative post has been attained.

A further aspect of the search process dealt with the rate of application. These subjects were not high volume applicants. The average number of applications submitted within the period was only 5.1 per person. When the two men who submitted over one hundred applications are not included, the figure drops to 3.7 applications per person. Of these subjects, 76.3% submitted five or fewer applications. This low number is linked nonetheless to a success rate of 63.9% in attaining a new post. No woman submitted more than 6 applications. Only 6 men
submitted more than 10 applications. The two outcome groups with the highest rate of application were those who moved to a new administrative post at another institution (7.1) and those who shifted to a somewhat different post at their home institutions (6.7). All the women in these two categories were at the community colleges.

This limited rate of application is even more interesting when coupled with the fact that all the subjects who responded to this section indicated that they were seeking to move to a post with greater power and prestige, or seeking to leave higher education entirely. The small number of applications per subject is then not a product of limited aspirations. Additionally, of those subjects who were successful in their search, 56.7% did secure a post that increased their reported power and prestige, while 24.3% reported that the change could not be compared because it was a move out of administration. The two gender patterns are similar. The overall perception that position changes in the present marketplace require a concerted and massive effort is clearly not supported by the search activities of this group.

Subjects were also asked to indicate the reasons they undertook a search for a new post. The majority of these responses were positive. People were seeking advancement, challenge and opportunity. Only 13.9% of these subjects were seeking to move away from a negative context. This overall result is consistent with the already mentioned desire for advancement. These subjects were interested in upward mobility and their reasons for searching reflect this career goal. This finding is further confirmed when those subjects who were
successful were asked to indicate their reasons for accepting the offer to move. The majority of responses could be summarized in two categories: 1) the position afforded an opportunity to develop a program that was new and exciting to the applicant; or, 2) the position afforded an opportunity for individual professional growth.

To summarize, gender differences in the procedures subjects employed in seeking new posts were not evident. Gender differences did however exist in the proportion of female sample members who conducted a search. This may be an outcome of the significant gender difference in age, and age at entry into administration. Additionally, gender differences did emerge in the outcome of the search process. These differences appear to be linked to institutional type. Men were much more successful than women in securing a new post, dramatically so at the four-year institutions. The use of the internal labor market has also undergone a change. Men are more frequent users, and are more successful users, although the overall utilization of this market by both men and women has declined. Lastly, gender similarity exists in the rate of application, the use of personal contacts and the reasons for seeking movement. These similarities make the gender disparities all the more significant and point toward the possibility that advancement for women remains constrained despite the greater access to first positions.

D. Career Goal Stability

In addition to the impact of institutional candidacy and the dynamics of the search process, career movement is also influenced by the stability of career goals over time. Such employment objectives
serve as guidelines which support current efforts and point the individual in a particular direction. The stability of career goals for the 111 subjects who responded to the 1984 questionnaire can be assessed for the ten year period, 1979 to 1989. Each subject was asked in 1979 and in 1984 to indicate what position or activity he or she hoped to be involved in when five years had passed.

There is a highly significant relationship (p=<0.0001) when the stated five-year goal in 1979 is used as a predictor of the stated five-year goal in 1984. For the sample as a whole there is a strong tendency for goals to remain stable. This predictive ability remained significant when gender was introduced. For both men and women the patterns were consistent with those for the sample as a whole. Yet, when age was introduced as a control variable, the only age cohort to evidence a significant ability for the first goal to predict the second was for subjects who were 35-44 years old. This result depended upon the stability of two goals: 1) the desire to remain in the same post; and, 2) the desire to advance. Gender differences were not evident within these findings.

When gender and age were examined together, gender differences did emerge for the age cohort, 45-54 years. For women there was a significant relationship between the first five-year goal and the second (p=0.044). For men this was dramatically the opposite (p=0.949). Retirement was the modal male response in 1984, drawing from all the 1979 goal categories. Over the ten-year period the men went from a modal response of seeking advancement to planning retirement. For women it was a desire for position stability that produced the goal
consistency over the same period. A desire to remain in the same post was the modal response in both 1979 and 1984. These gender differences may again be linked to the significantly later age at entry into administration for women than men. Women may desire to pursue career-related activities longer than men in the same cohort since such activities were not undertaken until a later age.

Career goal stability can be further examined by reviewing the extent to which subjects who did move actually achieved their goals. Three movement cohorts experienced a change of position during the five year period, 1979 to 1984: 1) those who changed institutions within higher education administration; 2) those who changed positions at their home institution; and, 3) those who left higher education for other full-time employment. The subjects who moved to another institution within higher education administration had the most focused attainment pattern. Fully 58.3% of these movers achieved their stated goal of advancement whereas the other two groups had an attainment rate of 44.4% and 42.9%, respectively. The first group was then the most successful of all the movement cohorts in achieving its desired 1979 goal. This was true for both men and women although men outnumbered women in this cohort by a 2:1 margin.

It is also evident from this attainment analysis that people often move in unanticipated directions. More than half of the subjects who left higher education, or who moved internally, changed to positions unrelated to their stated 1979 career goals. Gender differences were not evident. For most of these individuals it appeared that unforeseen opportunities arose during the five year period which prompted the
person to shift his or her career focus away from the stated goal. Most of the subjects who made such shifts reported satisfaction with the move in that their career goals for the period 1984 to 1989, were marked by position stability or the desire for advancement in the new area. Moreover, even when the move was not related to the stated goal, it nonetheless was viewed by the person, in nearly all cases, as a career advancement. These leavers and changers then evidence a willingness to change position in order to advance even if it is in a direction they had not envisioned when stating career goals five years previously.

Overall, the entire sample did show a strong tendency to retain stated career goals over the ten-year period. This was true for both men and women. However age did have an influence on this pattern of goal setting. Relatively older women were least like their male cohorts in that these women retained career-related goals even though they were approaching traditional retirement age. Despite the goal stability of the sample members, the actual attainment of the stated goal by 1984 was not particularly high. This was so even for the group which stated a desire for stability between 1979 and 1984. Those who had desired stability often moved, and for subjects who remained in their posts, less than half had stated that as a desired outcome in 1979. The sample members with the strongest attainment pattern were those who moved to new institutions, pursuing a fairly traditional pattern of mobility. Thus, while goals are important in guiding career movement, it also seems that flexibility and a willingness to grasp unanticipated opportunities is also a crucial element in overall career
development. The difference between the stability of goal setting on the one hand, and the actual goal attainment pattern on the other, appears to indicate that career lines are not well established within higher education administration. Having a stable career goal may then assist in advancement but it is clearly not a required element of administrative career moves and changes.

E. Perceived Discrimination

The extent of perceived sexism was analyzed as a career-related variable in 1979. At that time 31.3% of the women reported sexism as a career obstacle whereas only 3.0% of the men did so. In fact, sexism was the modal category for the women. These results were influenced by the type of position and by the type of institution. Women in line positions reported sexism as a career obstacle nearly twice as often as women in staff positions. Gender differences were significant in both cases. When institutional type was introduced as a control, the results showed that the perception of sexism as a career obstacle was most pronounced in line positions at the Arts and Science colleges. Fully 71.4% of the women at this institutional level reported such obstacles. It is thus this group of women who perceive themselves to be most severely impacted by gender discrimination.

It is now possible to examine the movement pattern from 1979 to 1984 for these subjects who indicated sexism as a career obstacle. The group contained twenty-two subjects, two men and twenty women. Their movement pattern is presented in Table 4.4.
Table 4.4

Five Year Movement Pattern For Respondents Who Indicated Sexism As A Career Obstacle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Movement</th>
<th>Percent of Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stayed</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sought to Leave</td>
<td>18.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifted Internally</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed Internally</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved Externally</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Administration</td>
<td>4.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*one male in this category

The largest categories, comprising 68.2% of the group, contain individuals who did not experience movement to a new or nearly new post during the five-year period. In this sample, 22.7%, all women, retired. An examination of the ages of these subjects shows that 63.6% of the women were over 45 years old in 1979. The two men in the sample are, however, in the youngest age group, 25-34 years. It is then older women, who established their careers before the advent of affirmative action, who most perceive sexism as an obstacle. Conversely, it is younger men, who may perceive themselves as the victims of these same forces, i.e., reverse discrimination, who also name sexism as a career obstacle.
Fully half of the positions in this subsample were in the instructional area rather than the other principal administrative units. Since the academic area has highly institutionalized career lines, it is here that perceived sexism would indeed most likely occur. No line or staff differences emerged among the patterns of movement, although institutional differences were again evident. The Arts and Science colleges were overrepresented in the categories of curtailed advancement. This finding is consistent with the 1979 results. Interestingly, the majority of these subjects were not in an entry post in 1979. Fully 72.7% were in their second or more advanced administrative post. This is supported by the older age of the subjects as a group, and by the fact that 63.6% had been in their 1979 post less than five years. So, these women are different from the women in the entire sample, most of whom were in their first post in 1979. Moreover, these subjects had experienced advancement despite the perception of sexism, although that advancement appears to have come to a halt during the 1979 to 1984 period.

Lastly, the results of the 1984 survey show these subjects to be professionally active, to have experienced and reported many positive aspects of their positions, and to also speak positively about their institutions. They may be frustrated but they are clearly not embittered. In fact, for the most part these are people who quite legitimately had an expectation of advancement between 1979 and 1984. Their careers to that point led them to believe such movement would occur. While they perceived gender discrimination as an obstacle in 1979, it was not one they felt was insurmountable. However, their lack of
advancement does again raise the issue of how gender, age and institutional type may interact in ways that constrain career development, especially for older women at the Arts and Science colleges. When these career movement results are tied to the subsequent descriptive analyses, the nature of administrative career development becomes increasingly clear.

III. Age Cohort Analysis

A. Age and Career Movement Patterns

Age and age at entry into higher education administration were both significantly different for men versus women in 1979. Women were older and entered administration later. They then confront career development forces at a later point in the traditional work and life cycle. The movement analyses have already pointed toward age and age at entry as factors which persist as determinants of career development even after access has been attained. The impact of these significant gender differences over the subsequent five year period, 1979 to 1984, is reported here.

The 1984 sample is divided into four age cohorts. These cohorts represent strategic points in traditional career pattern development. Significant gender differences remain. Fully 63.3% of the women are in the two older cohorts whereas only 41.2% of the men are in these two groups. The movement pattern, as Table 4.5 indicates, is significantly related to the age of the subjects.
Table 4.5
Percent Pattern of Movement by Age Cohort
for 1984 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern of Movement</th>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed in post</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessfully sought a new post</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifted Internally</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed Internally</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved Externally</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Administration</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Sample</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 46.06
\( df = 18 \)
\( p = 0.002 \)

The youngest cohort, those persons 25-34 years old, is the most mobile. This cohort has the same proportion of men and women, and 86.7% moved or sought to move during the five year period. Establishing a career line, the traditional concern for this age cohort, is evidenced by these sample members, regardless of gender.

In the two middle cohorts, those where subjects are 35-44 and 45-54 years old, the overwhelming tendency is to remain at the same institution, even if some internal movement has occurred. Nearly all
subjects, 86.1%, in the 45-54 year old cohort have this pattern of institutional stability. It is also heavily evident in the 35-44 year old cohort where 73.5% are stable. Finally, in the oldest cohort, those sample members 55-64, retirement is the modal category. Overall, it appears that these subjects move or seek movement early in their careers, remain stable in the middle years, and retire in their early sixties.

No significant gender differences emerge when movement patterns for each cohort are examined. Gender similarity is the rule even though women are overrepresented in the retirement category in the oldest cohort. Significant within gender differences do emerge for women as a group. This is not true for men as a group. The pattern of movement previously described is uniformly consistent for the women but not for the men. Furthermore, these within gender differences clearly demonstrate that it is the mobility, not just movement, pattern of the women that produces significant differences by age. As Table 4.6 highlights, even when the retirement category is deleted, the previously established pattern persists. Women significantly differ from each other in their upward mobility or stability depending upon their age cohort. Men do not. Age may be a more powerful variable in the career pattern of women, separating them from one another, than in the pattern of men, where internal gender differences are not significant for either movement or mobility patterns.
Table 4.6

Percent Mobility by Age Cohort for Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moved Up</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 7.94  
df = 3  
p = 0.047

B. Age and Career Goal Patterns

The stated five-year goals in 1979 also show significant differences by age cohort. The desire for mobility is greatest among the youngest cohort, declining consistently over the age ranges. Conversely, the desire for stability consistently increases across the age ranges. No gender differences are evident. However, once again within gender differences do emerge. In this analysis of career goals, it is the men who separate from one another not the women. For men, the stated goal in 1979 is differentiated by age in that members of the two younger cohorts are more likely to desire upward mobility. The oldest cohort is more likely to seek stability. The remaining 45-54 year old cohort reflects a varied goal pattern, underscoring this age range as a potentially pivotal one in career development for men. For women, on the otherhand, the desire for upward mobility remains stable.
across the age cohorts. Certainly retirement and stability are major goals for the older cohorts. But, this does not occur with enough power to overcome the cross-cohort similarity within the other movement categories, especially in the desire for advancement.

Moreover, when only those subjects who expressed a desire for advancement are compared with those who desire stability, further age-based gender differences become evident. For men, the impact of age upon the stated goal is strongest for those subjects who desire upward mobility. Fully 82.6% of these subjects are in the two younger cohorts. The proportion of men who desire stability is, however, about equally divided between the two younger and the two older cohorts. This circumstance is reversed for the women. The difference is strongest by age for those who desired stability. Over ninety percent of these subjects are in the two older cohorts. The proportion of women who desire advancement is about equally divided between the younger two cohorts and the older two cohorts. Thus, the age-based differences among the women are related to the group of women who desire stability whereas the age-based differences among the men are related to the group of men who desire mobility. Stated conversely, age does not separate women who wish to advance and age does not separate men who wish to remain. For women, the desire to advance is evident in all age cohorts. This is not true for men where the desire to advance is tied to being younger.

When this goal pattern is contrasted with the actual attainment pattern, i.e., who did or did not advance during the five year period, further gender differences emerge. In looking at the actual
incidences of advancement, men do not differ by age whereas women clearly do. Age then does not separate women who desire advancement but does separate women who achieve advancement. And, while most of the men who desire mobility are in the younger two cohorts, the men who actually achieve advancement are from the older cohorts where stability is the principal stated goal. Table 4.7 summarizes these findings. Younger men are actually slightly more likely to stay than older men. For older women, the pattern is one of limited mobility in contrast to the younger women.

Table 4.7
Mobility Pattern Frequencies By Age For Men And Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility Pattern</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 45</td>
<td>&gt; 45</td>
<td>&lt; 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 0.122  p = 0.727
Chi square = 4.550  p = 0.033

Therefore, although women state a slightly greater desire for advancement, it is men who show a greater tendency to actually advance. In the younger cohorts, 58.8% of those who advance are men and in the older cohorts the figure is even higher at 71.4%. These gender
differences are instructive since they show a pattern of advancement which is different from the stated aspirations of these men and women, especially for the women. It appears that older women and, to some extent younger men, have difficulty achieving a stated desire for advancement.

On the 1984 questionnaire, respondents were once again asked to indicate their desired career goal for the next five years, ending in 1989. The analysis, identical to the one on the 1979 data, again shows significant goal differences by age cohort (p<0.001). Gender differences are not evident. However, as Table 4.8 indicates, other important trends are apparent.
### Table 4.8

Percent 1984 Career Goals by Age Cohort for Men and Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Goal</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>G E N D E R</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age Cohort</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>45-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassessable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Goal</th>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassessable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| N     | 9     | 24    | 16    | 8     | 57    | 6     | 11    | 20    | 17    |

Chi square = 33.06  
df = 18  
p = 0.016

Chi square = 42.68  
df = 18  
p = <0.001
Keeping in mind that these subjects are now five years older, the impact of age is even more pronounced. The desire for stability has intensified. Nearly all the desire for advancement is now clustered in the younger cohorts. Retirement is the predominant goal of the oldest cohort for both men and women. The interesting category is the unassessable one. Upon inspection of the questionnaires, older subjects in this category tend to desire a return to faculty status at their home institutions more than any other goal. Younger subjects in this group tend to state a desire to leave higher education entirely, mostly to seek self-employment. Here again is a further confirmation of the power of age as a determining variable in career pattern development.

C. Age and Career Pattern Progression

The post progression of an individual within his or her administrative career, i.e., whether he or she is in his or her first, second, third or more administrative post, is another typically age-related career variable. It is assumed that the further along one is in the number of posts held, the older one will be since time is required for each move. This, however, is not the case for these subjects. When the impact of age on the point in administrative career pattern is analyzed, the differences are not statistically significant. This is even more evident when it is noted that 60.79% of those in the oldest cohort are in their first administrative post. Additionally, 47.4% of the subjects in the youngest cohort are in their third or more administrative post. This finding corresponds with the significant difference by age in the number of years a person had spent in the position he or she held in 1979. Younger cohorts are more mobile than
older cohorts. Moreover, people who move are likely to be movers, evidencing a subsequent pattern of multiple moves. People who are stayers tend to be in the post for many years. This tendency is pronounced for the younger cohorts so that it is likely that multiple moves are made by age thirty-five. There are no significant gender differences in these movement patterns.

However, as the 1979 data show, there is a significant gender difference in the overall point in career progression, with women being relative newcomers. When this gender difference is examined for each age cohort, significant differences remain for only the 35-44 year old cohort, and for the 55-64 year old cohort. These differences are summarized in Table 4.9.

**Table 4.9**

Percent Administrative Post Progression by Gender for Critical Age Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
<th>POST</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>POST</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third or More</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>Third or More</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 6.33  
$df = 2$  
$p = 0.042$  

Chi square = 6.17  
$df = 2$  
$p = 0.046$
In both these instances, the findings are in the already identified directions. This is most evident for older women who are overwhelmingly in their first administrative post, with 77.8% in this grouping. Women in this oldest cohort also tend to be internal candidates into their first posts more than do men. In fact, this is the only age cohort where there is a significant gender difference in this regard. Fully 58.8% of the women are internal candidates whereas no man is. The same general pattern of recent movement into administration is also evident for the women in the 35-44 year old cohort. The internal candidate distinction among the men and women is not evident for this group. The other two cohorts show gender similarity rather than difference in the point the subjects are in within their administrative careers. The gender differences then are not evenly spread across the age cohorts, but are centered upon the next to the youngest and the oldest cohorts, where women more than men are being recruited into their first administrative posts.

An additional variable often associated with career movement is the level of formal education the person possesses. No gender differences were evident for this variable in the 1979 analysis. Age, however, was significantly related to degree level ($p=0.04$). Moreover, the two cohorts with the highest percent of doctoral degrees were the next to youngest cohort, with 39.1%, and the oldest cohort, with 37.0%. This is an especially pointed result since it is the same two groups which show gender differences in the point incumbents are in within their administrative careers. Men and women in these two groups evidence no gender differences in educational attainment, including
possession of the Ph.D., yet do evidence significant gender differences in post progression within their administrative careers. These two findings then point toward important gender differentiation in the recent recruitment process of women into administrative ranks.

D. Age and Career Ladder Attainment

The subject's indication in 1984 of where he or she was on his or her self-defined career ladder is also significantly different by age cohort (p=0.01). These differences are in the expected direction with the older cohort members being more likely to be at the top of their defined ladders than at an intermediate level. An interesting result is that no subject defines himself or herself as being in a beginning post on his or her career ladder, although several subjects indicate they are in their first administrative post. Clearly, for these subjects, career development involves more than higher education administration. Gender differences are not significant.

For this career ladder variable, significant within gender differences are evident for women but not for men. The differences are in the predicted direction with the younger women in intermediate posts and the older women in top positions. Fully 63.2% of the women in the 45-54 year old cohort state that they are in their top position. While this is also the modal category for the men, with 40.7%, a third of the men in the 35-44 year old cohort also indicate that they are in their top post. With the five year age increment within each cohort by 1984, it appears that men in their forties as well as men in their fifties indicate that they are at the top of their self-defined career ladder. However, women who responded in this way are more likely to be in their
fifties. This is then another reflection of the initial gender differences in overall age and age at entry into administration for this sample.

Mobility patterns by type of school also emerge as an age-linked variable. Both men and women at the Arts and Science colleges demonstrate significant differences in mobility by age cohorts. This is not true for the university centers or the community colleges. At the Arts and Science colleges, 82.4% of the men are clustered within the two middle age cohorts. These two cohorts are differentiated by stability for the 45-54 year old group and a highly varied mobility pattern for the 35-44 year old group. The younger men are moving about evenly across all the movement categories except downward mobility and retirement. The women are again clustered in the same middle two cohorts with 70.6% of the Arts and Science college women in these groups. Here, however, the more varied pattern is in the older cohort. In the older group, women are moving up, or are seeking to move about equally with the desire for stability. The younger group is much more oriented toward stability. The older women are then more similar to the men in the younger cohort. Once again, it would appear that age and gender are interacting in ways that influence career development. Additionally, this tendency for the Arts and Science colleges to evidence a differentiated pattern of mobility by age may be the result of the extreme clustering of subjects into the two middle cohorts. This clustering does not occur at the other two types of institutions where the age cohorts are much more evenly represented. Again, the issue of
the recruitment patterns within higher education administration appears to be important.

E. Age and Childrearing Responsibilities

Age also has a dramatic effect upon the analysis of the impact of childrearing on career mobility. It is important to recall that significant gender differences did exist in 1979, in whether there were children at home. Fully two-thirds of the male respondents had at least one child still at home in 1979. However, only a quarter of the women who had children still had a child at home in 1979. This outcome also reflects the finding that more women than men were childless, and that women as a group were older than men, thus more likely to have grown children who no longer live at home.

A significant relationship does emerge when the variable of children at home is crosstabulated with all the categories of movement. Sample members with children at home are much more likely to move laterally or to be seeking movement than those without children at home. These subjects are much more likely to retire. The interaction of age and childrearing as part of the life cycle pattern is clearly the principal element in this finding. Women are known to be significantly older than men in this sample. For those subjects with children at home, there are no significant gender differences. Gender differences are however significant for those subjects who had no children at home. Women in this group are less mobile than men. This is largely the result of the greater tendency of women to retire or to remain in the same post without seeking movement. This is a pattern which is also age-related. The high percentage of women versus men in
the retirement category, along with the prior analysis of the impact of age on mobility, especially for older women, confirms the importance of age in any analysis of career development patterns.

Within gender differences are also explored. Interestingly, there are significant differences in movement patterns among men who had children at home versus those who did not. Advancement and stability are the movement categories with the highest frequencies for both groups. However, for men with children at home, the most common categories after those two are lateral movement and seeking a new post. For men without children at home, the additional categories are leaving higher education administration, retirement, or downward mobility. In short, the financially higher risk categories are more likely for men who do not have children at home.

Women also evidence significant differences between those with and without children at home. Here the retirement issue is the crucial separating factor. Better than ninety percent of those retiring no longer have children at home. Stability is nonetheless the modal category for both groups of women. For those with children at home, the next most frequent categories are equally distributed across advancement, lateral movement, and seeking a new post. Hence, women with children still at home are mobile, and more so than the women who do not have children at home. Age however is the decisive variable in this analysis. The existence of children at home does not appear to adversely affect movement patterns for these women. Women who have children at home evidence both a pattern of advancement and a pattern of overall movement similar to men who have children at home. This is
true for both the sample as a whole, and for the sample members who specifically stated a desire for advancement in 1979. Significant within gender differences are evident for both men and women, although the reasons for men differing from one another are different from the reasons women differ from one another. Children at home do not have the depressing effect on mobility that was suspected. In this analysis it seems that age itself is more likely to influence movement for these women. The confirmation of this pattern as a particularly crucial one in career development is an important conclusion.

In summary, this analysis reveals several important career elements that appear to be differentiated by age. The importance of the original gender differences in age and age at entry into higher education administration cannot be overestimated. These differences persist over time and influence further career pattern development. There are important gender differences linked to these issues. Yet, the overriding finding is that age often separates these subjects more effectively than gender. The within gender differences that emerge further support this conclusion. The separation of the sample members into age cohorts does aid in the identification of several crucial junctures in career development which are different for these men and women. All of these findings taken together point toward conclusions regarding life cycle features of career development patterns that when fully explored will aid in our understanding of the nature of mobility and movement within higher education administration.
IV. Institutional and Position Impact Analysis

A. Career Development Factors

A major goal of the five year follow-up phase is an assessment of what each sample member believes to be the factors most responsible for his or her overall career development. This information can then provide additional insight into the variables which influence movement, especially advancement.

Each sample member was asked to assess five aspects of career development: 1) factors that made the greatest contribution to his or her career development; 2) factors responsible for retarding career development; 3) positive and negative position characteristics which impacted most heavily upon career development; 4) positive and negative institution characteristics which impacted most heavily upon career development; and, 5) factors that contributed to career development and were also the result of conscious planning and effort, i.e., were undertaken with the specific goal of enhancing career development.

The first analysis evaluates differences in patterns of movement based upon factors reported as heavily and positively contributing to career development. The responses to the open-ended questions on these positive career influences clustered into four principal categories: 1) activities within regional and national professional associations; 2) activities related to a broadening of position responsibilities; 3) activities related to traditional avenues of professional development, e.g., advanced degrees, publications and sabbaticals; and, 4) factors related to the personality of the individual, such as motivation, perseverance and interpersonal skill
development. A significant difference \( p=0.004 \) emerged when these four categories were utilized in a crosstabulation with whether or not the individual moved or stayed during the five year period, 1979 to 1984.

The source of the significant difference became readily apparent when an examination of the internal cells of the crosstabulation was made. For those who stay, a major influence is the variable associated with activities within professional organizations. Nearly a third, 30.5\%, of these subjects list this as the most important factor in their career development. In sharp contrast, no person who moved states this variable as an important factor. Among those who move, 26.7\% name personality variables as the most important contributor. Only a fraction, 2.8\%, of those who stay do so. Even though the modal category for both groups is professional development activities, these sharp differences in the secondary categories point toward underlying distinctions influencing career movement.

Potential gender differences are explored within this examination. There is a significant difference for men in the contributing factors among those who stay and those who move. This difference is not significant for women. Men follow the previously indicated pattern exactly. Women retain the link between professional association activities and stability. However, 51.6\% of the women who move indicate that professional development activities are crucial. Only 9.7\% indicate personality variables as important. This tendency for men who are mobile to attribute their own personality traits as positive contributors to career development is an important gender distinction. As
previously noted, the gender role socialization literature discusses differences in success attribution as an outcome of differential independence and mastery training among males and females. Men are socialized to view success as a result of their own personal characteristics, i.e., to internalize success, whereas women are socialized to view success as a product of factors beyond the self, i.e., to externalize success. The present analysis appears consistent with these gender distinctions.

Each subject was also asked to indicate which of the three factors he or she named as the most important to his or her career development had been deliberately planned and implemented as career enhancement techniques. The results are informative. The modal response for subjects who remain indicates that none of the activities named was undertaken with the goal of enhancing career development. The modal response for those who change positions is that two of the three activities were planned to enhance career development. Interestingly, no woman who moved to another school responded that she had done no career planning whereas some men who had no planning activities did move. Men however are more likely than women to report that all three of the activities they name were planned. It does then appear that subjects who move are more likely to be involved in conscious activities oriented toward career enhancement than those who stay, regardless of gender.

Career blocks reported by the respondents are also analyzed here. The variables that appear to be most heavily linked to retarding career development are: 1) lack of administrative support; 2) budgetary
limitations; 3) credential problems; and, 4) geographic and familial commitments. It is noteworthy that 14% of the subjects commented that they had experienced no blocks to career development even though the question was worded in a way that encouraged the naming of such factors. Interesting and significant differences emerge when the response pattern is crosstabulated with whether or not the person moved (p < 0.001). The modal response for individuals who remain is a lack of administrative support. The second most frequently named career block for this group is a lack of credentials, most often referring to an advanced or terminal degree in the field. More broadly what emerges is a picture of people who stay but who are frustrated by their inability to develop or expand programs in an era of budget constraint, often blamed, rightly or wrongly, on the priorities of the top management team. In contrast, people who move to a new institution never name lack of administrative support as a variable. The two modal responses for this group are credential problems, despite the fact that movement occurred, and the lack of any significant career blocks. Here then are differences which appear to be consistent. People who stay view a factor related to the institution as important in blocking career movement. People who move, perhaps as an outgrowth of their ability to do so, often report no career blocks. Gender differences are not evident.

Each subject was also asked to focus upon position characteristics he or she recalled as important in promoting or limiting career movement. Certain position characteristics such as the range of responsibilities, the extent of involvement with policy formation,
the ability to develop specialized knowledge could be different for those who stay as opposed to those who do not. However, no significant differences emerge for the sample as a whole, or for men and women separately. What does emerge is a clear picture of what a position should offer if it is to promote career development. It should provide for a variety of tasks and responsibilities so that an element of newness and difference is maintained. It should encourage innovation so that new ideas and programs are developed and implemented in an environment where failure, if it occurs, is viewed as an acceptable alternative to the stagnation that results when innovation is discouraged. Lastly, the position should allow the incumbent to develop leadership abilities, both in terms of program development and personnel supervision. Whether people move or stay, they repeatedly name these position features as crucial to their own career advancement.

When subjects were asked to name what they believe is the most negative position characteristic they encountered in their own careers, they tend to name the opposite of what was just cited. The four most frequently mentioned negative position characteristics are: 1) demanding yet repetitive tasks; 2) dead end positions in terms of mobility; 3) limited power over both programs and personnel; and, 4) no opportunity for personal professional growth. There again are no significant gender differences or differences by the pattern of movement. Interestingly, only 30 people indicated that they are now in posts which have at least one of these negative features whereas 77 saw themselves as incumbents of posts having at least one of the positive features noted above.
Respondents were further asked to reply to a similar question about broader institutional factors that contributed to or limited their career development. There were no significant differences among those who stay versus those who move, and there were no significant gender differences. However, once again, a clear picture of which institutional characteristics subjects found valuable in career development is evident. The four most frequently cited characteristics are: 1) supportive leadership; 2) a commitment to quality; 3) the existence of positive relationships between faculty and administration; and, 4) size. There does not appear to be an optimal size for maximizing career development. Some subjects view small size as positive whereas others say large size is a facilitator of career development. This tendency is not gender-related. Overall, what emerges is the naming of institutional traits which promote high morale, a sense of community and a commitment to excellence. The more intangible, subjective qualities that make any worksite a productive and pleasant place to be employed are the contextual features that matter most in facilitating career development.

One interesting gender difference is evident. Larger size is an important and positive institutional variable for men who are stable. Supportive leadership is the most frequently cited variable for women who are stable. This difference is consistent with the idea that non-traditional group members are likely to be more sensitive to a supportive leadership environment than traditional incumbents. The results clearly indicate that such an environment is sought by all; but perhaps it is even more crucial to the non-traditional incumbent.
When subjects are asked to name the institutional characteristics which they regard as having the most negative impact on their career development, they again list features that basically represent the opposite of the positive traits. These results are significantly different for those who stay versus those who move. People who stay are more likely to name poor leadership and fiscal limitations as the two most negative institutional characteristics. Those subjects who move are more likely to report the lack of innovation and the limited opportunity for staff development and promotion as the most negative factors. An entirely different focus on the part of the two movement groups is evident. People who move are more likely to focus on reasons that would limit their growth as individuals or leaders, or would limit their ability to maintain enthusiasm for what they are doing via the implementing of new ideas. People who stay are more likely to name factors external to themselves, i.e., budgetary constraints, as institutional limitations upon their professional lives.

In summary, this examination of the impact of institutional and position characteristics upon movement and development suggests some important findings. Subjects are consistent and pointed in their description of positive as well as negative position and institutional features that facilitate or retard career development. Moreover, the identification of career planning activities and key elements of career development results in a more focused view of what factors may be related to movement and stability. These results can now be added to the emerging picture of career development within higher education administration.
B. Type of Institution Influences

The type of institution was a significant analytic variable within the 1979 study. Whether an administrator was employed by a community college, an Arts and Science college or a university center influenced his or her career development. The community college milieu in particular appeared linked to career variables in ways that differed from the other two contexts, and in ways that were more constraining for women than for men. Gender differences emerged at the community colleges whereas gender similarity was the rule at the Arts and Science colleges and the university centers. The present analysis assesses the influence of the type of institution upon the pattern of career movement during the five-year period, 1979 to 1984.

No significant differences emerge from the preliminary analysis. Patterns of mobility as opposed to stability are not influenced by the type of institution. The same outcome results when all the movement categories are utilized in the analysis. No gender differences are evident. Patterns of movement and mobility do not seem tied to institutional type. The factors that were related to institutional type in 1979 do not appear to interact and influence subsequent movement patterns over the next five years.

However, an examination of a subsample supports strong institutional effects in the 1984 follow-up for those individuals who had expressed a desire for mobility in 1979. It seems likely that those who desire upward movement might have a mobility pattern different from those who do not. This is indeed the case. There is a significant difference in the incidence of advancement between those subjects who
desire such mobility versus those who do not state that preference. This is true for both men and women.

An additional significant relationship emerges when the type of institution variable is introduced into the movement analysis for this subsample. This result is gender specific. For women there is a significant relationship between the type of institution and the pattern of overall movement. This is not the case for men in the subsample. The findings, as Table 4.10 indicates, are noteworthy since this group of women did express a desire to advance in 1979.

Table 4.10
Percent Movement Pattern by Type of Institution for Women Who Desired Advancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOVEMENT PATTERN</th>
<th>University Center</th>
<th>Arts &amp; Science College</th>
<th>Community College</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upward</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 19.32
df = 5
p = 0.036
For women at the Arts and Science colleges, the picture is especially bleak. Fully 75% tried to change posts but were unsuccessful in doing so. No woman at this institutional level advanced as she had hoped.

It is at the community colleges that women are most successful in attaining their stated goal of mobility, with 36.4% advancing. Perhaps the most telling overall result is that only 26.2% of these women are successful in attaining their stated goal of advancement regardless of institutional type. That figure is 39.1% for the men in the subsample.

The pattern of movement for women who indicate a desire for advancement is then influenced by institutional type. However, it is the community college context which is the most heavily associated with upward mobility. This is in sharp contrast to the 1979 results which showed the community college context as the most constraining for women. It is now the Arts and Science colleges that appear to be the most limiting. The distinctions between the influences of institutional type upon access on the one hand, and advancement on the other are particularly salient considerations. The impact of institutional type on career development then persists over the five year period. Its influence is however dynamic rather than static. A more complex picture of administrative careers is supported by these findings.

C. Type of Position Influences

The line versus staff dichotomy utilized in the 1979 analysis produced significant differences based upon this bureaucratic distinction among positions. When this variable is examined in 1984, significant differences in career outcomes are not evident. However, closer inspection of the data indicate that differences might emerge
from a further sub-division of the two types of positions. When both line and staff designations are divided so that four categories exist, significant differences in the patterns of movement do emerge ($p=0.001$). The four categories are: lower staff, upper staff, lower line and upper line positions.

The two groups which demonstrate the greatest similarity are upper staff and lower line posts, i.e., middle management positions. This combined grouping contains 65% of the subjects who remained in the same post and did not seek movement during the five year period. Moreover, when movement does occur it is more likely to be downward mobility or unsuccessfully seeking to leave than is the case for the other two type of position categories. Those sample members in these middle management posts then have a much more restricted pattern of movement, especially advancement, than sample members at either end of the bureaucratic hierarchy.

When gender differences are explored, a significant difference in movement patterns emerges when the four categories are utilized as control variables. Men and women in upper line posts have significantly different movement patterns during the five year period. As Table 4.11 illustrates, female upper line personnel experience limited advancement when contrasted with their male counterparts. As previous analyses have indicated, this is not a result of limited desire. A majority of the women who retire do so because they become frustrated by their inability to advance. Men either stay because they elect to do so or they advance, a very different career pattern.
Table 4.11  
Percent Gender Difference in Movement Patterns  
for Upper-Line Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern of Movement</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeker</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 11.49  
df = 4  
p = 0.02

Nearly significant gender differences also emerge for lower staff personnel. Here, however, women have the more upwardly mobile pattern. Men who move are more likely to move laterally or to leave higher education administration entirely. This tendency is a reversal of the trend at the other end of the bureaucratic structure. Once again, the two middle management categories resemble one another. Gender differences are not evident. It is clear that location in the bureaucratic hierarchy is influencing career movement for these subjects, and doing so in ways that indicate important gender differentiation.
There also are significant within gender differences for these men and women. Men in upper staff and lower line posts, i.e., the middle management level, are likely to stay in the same post for the five year period. If movement is attempted, the most likely outcomes are unsuccessful seeking or downward mobility. Men in upper line posts are the most likely to advance when movement occurs. Women in the mid-management level are highly stable. Three quarters of the women stay in this grouping. The modal category for lower staff women is advancement. The modal category for upper line women is retirement. Once again, men and women differ among themselves but do so in ways that are gender specific. This is particularly evident when the pattern of advancement is examined. Women who advance are twice as likely to be in a lower staff than an upper line post. Advancement for men is heavily centered in the upper line posts with only a fraction of the men who advance coming from lower staff posts. Hence, the incidences of advancement are reversed. Moreover, age is obviously also affecting these outcomes, reemphasizing the significance of the older age and later age at entry into administration for the women in this sample. It appears that older women in upper line posts and, to some extent, younger men in lower staff posts have the most difficulty in attaining upward mobility.

When the subsample of people who indicated a desire for advancement in 1979 is analyzed, the significant gender differences among lower staff and upper line personnel remain. All the upper line men are in the categories of upward movement or stability. All the upper line women are in the seeking or retired categories. These men
and women who specifically desire mobility, evidence a sharply differentiated outcome pattern. The gender differences in the lower staff posts are also instructive. As noted for the main sample, the modal category for men is lateral movement, with the second most frequent category being movement out of higher education administration. The modal categories for women are upward movement and stability. Again the pattern among the men and women at this entry level is quite different. Men now have the more varied pattern and women have the more stable or upwardly mobile pattern.

The results of this analysis point toward important gender differences. Women in upper line posts appear to have a pattern of movement significantly different from men in upper line posts. In this instance, men have the more traditional advancement pattern. At the other end of the bureaucratic hierarchy, women in lower staff posts, i.e., entry positions, also appear to have a pattern of movement significantly different from men in lower staff posts. Yet, in this instance, it is the women who have the more traditionally upward advancement pattern. Between these two extremes, at the middle management level, men and women evidence gender similarity in their patterns of movement. This hierarchical sequence of gender differentiation has major implications for individual career development, and major implications for recruitment and retention within higher education administration.
CHAPTER 5
MATCHED PAIR MOVEMENT COHORT ANALYSIS

I. Introduction

The 1979 sample contained 68 matched pairs. A man and a woman were matched by the title of their position and by the type of institution, university center, Arts and Science college or community college. The five year follow-up survey yielded a response rate of 81.6%. There are 47 pairs in this group, resulting in a pair response rate of 69.1%. Table 5.1 summarizes this pair response rate by type of institution and type of position.

Table 5.1
1984 Pair Response Rate by Type of Institution and Type of Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Number of 1979 Pairs</th>
<th>Number of 1984 Pairs</th>
<th>Percent Response Rate</th>
<th>Percent Response Rate for Line Positions</th>
<th>Percent Response Rate for Staff Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Centers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Science Colleges</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The response rate for the university centers is substantially less than the rate for the other two sites. This is reflected in the matched pair rate, markedly so for the line positions where only a third of the pairs remain in tact.

The present analysis is designed to assess the movement patterns experienced by these pairs during the five year period, 1979 to 1984. The empirical question is whether similarity would persist over time, i.e., would patterns of movement subsequent to 1979 lead to similar outcomes in 1984? If not, what are the variables which influenced the differential outcomes? Gender differences are a major but not exclusive consideration. As Table 5.2 illustrates, gender similarity is evident in patterns of institutional stability while gender differences pertain in patterns of movement and retirement.

Table 5.2

Percent Gender Difference in Movement Patterns, 1979-1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1984 Outcome</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same post as 1979</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different post at the same institution</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved to a new institution</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondent</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These aggregate results indicate that the number of matched pairs where both partners experience the same type of movement over the five year period is relatively small. Only 10 of the 47 respondent pairs, 21.3% are in this circumstance. Fully 80% of these subjects remained in the same post during the period, 1979 to 1984. In order to expand these results, the Personnel Office data on the movement patterns of the non-respondents are included. This adds 6 more pairs to the number with identical outcomes. Thus, only 23.5% of the total sample consists of subjects with paired outcomes. Moreover, 68.8% of these people are subjects who remained in the same post. It is clear that patterns of movement by paired subjects do not result in paired outcomes in 1984.

This movement pattern variation lead to a decision to anchor the analysis of pair outcomes within the particular type of movement of one of the partners. Each movement cohort is thus analyzed separately. Within each analysis, the movement outcomes for the pair partners of the cohort members are also identified. The variables that relate to a particular type of movement are then more easily identified. Movement patterns of individual pair partners as well as movement patterns of the pair partners of entire cohorts are identified. A broad range of movement patterns is needed in order to facilitate these objectives. The movement categories utilized in this analysis include eight cohorts. The population of each cohort is presented in Table 2.3. The results of the matched pair analysis are then presented for each of these cohorts.
II. Subjects Who Left Higher Education (Leavers)

Seven subjects from the 1984 sample of 111 people reported leaving higher education for careers in other fields. This group is overwhelmingly male. Six of the seven subjects are men. The mean age of the group was 42.0 years in 1979, indicating a relatively young group, below the median for the sample as a whole. The 1979 position composition was roughly equal with four persons in staff positions and three persons in line positions. Nearly all of the subjects, six of seven, are from the community colleges. The remaining person is from an Arts and Science college. No respondent at a university center left higher education.

The goal profile for these seven people shows that only two individuals planned in 1979 to leave higher education by 1984. Four of the remaining five persons planned to advance within higher education administration. The other person planned to retire. A complete goal and attainment profile for this group is presented in Chart 5.1.
Chart 5.1

Ten Year Goal and Attainment Profile for Subjects Who Left Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Self-employment</td>
<td>Self-employment</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>Back into Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Self-employment</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>Public Education</td>
<td>Retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>President or Top Government Official</td>
<td>Top Government Official</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, private sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The level of assumed satisfaction these people are now experiencing with their career change is the most compelling feature within the profile. In 1979, no one wanted to remain in the same post for the next five years. After movement to the new career, the desired goal for 1989 is stability for the majority of these subjects. Only one subject expressed a desire to return to higher education administration.

The pair partners of these subjects demonstrate a much stronger tendency to stay within higher education administration. The mean age of this group was 40.1 years in 1979. Only one person is in her first administrative post. The goal and attainment profile for these seven pair partners indicates a career investment within higher education administration. Every person in this group of six women and one man expressed a desire for career advancement by 1984. However, at the end of the five year period only one person, a woman, had actually experienced upward mobility. Two of the three people who are still in the same post retained the same goals for the next five years. Only one person had actually applied for positions at other schools in line with her stated goal in 1979. Overall, these individuals are still looking for advancement. They do not present the picture of satisfaction with their 1984 posts that their partners who left higher education project for the next five years. All six who responded indicate a desire to be elsewhere by 1989.

The decision by this cohort to leave higher education is now examined. The extent of formal education and the particular discipline area of the highest earned degree could be crucial factors. It is hypothesized that those who left might have educational backgrounds
that are also appropriate to other careers. This would make the career change transition easier. This factor is also examined for the pair partners. The people who left are slightly better educated than their pair partners but not dramatically so. The majority of those who left possess degrees appropriate to their posts within higher education administration. Moreover, the degree level and area appear conducive to advancement within administration. In fact, a comparison of the two groups shows that the group one would expect to leave would be the group of people who stayed.

Another career factor potentially related to the decision to leave is the point the person is at within his or her administrative career. Someone who recently came into administration from the private sector might decide to leave and could do so more easily than someone with a more advanced career pattern within higher education administration. Both groups are examined for the number of years each subject spent in his or her post and how many administrative posts she or he held previously. Those who are in their first post and those who came to the post from outside higher education are indeed more likely to leave. With the exception of one person, every individual who came from outside higher education returned to his or her prior occupational sector, even if it took a number of years to accomplish. This is an important result for the management of higher education, especially at the community colleges, since one of the 1979 survey findings dealt with the increasing tendency of institutions to recruit from the outside.

The final analysis of the group who left higher education centers on another aspect of their decision to leave. The search process
involved in that decision is also examined. The reasons these indi-
viduals left represent a telling commentary on higher education adminis-
tration. They include: "my work was done and higher education had
changed in ways that left me bored and stale"; "there was a lack of
permission to be creative"; "I did not believe that I could work with
the new administration"; "there was a lack of rewards related to
accomplishments"; and, "financially I could do better elsewhere." The
remaining people left for more personal reasons, i.e., a "calling" to
the pastorate; a position more suited to individual needs; and, an
opportunity to work closely with a respected friend. No one in this
group made more than a single position application. In short, it
appears that these individuals did indeed want to leave higher educa-
tion. They also had cultivated the ability to do so by training,
contacts, or accumulated resources.

As a summary, this group of people appears to be risk-takers.
They make career shifts that often bear no relationship to their admin-
istrative responsibilities. They gamble on themselves, on their
abilities and skills, in pursuit of challenge and adventure. Their
reasons for leaving confirm this. They do not report negative institu-
tion and position characteristics per se but rather the ways that
institutions or positions do not permit them independence, creativity
and growth. The conclusion is that they all believed they had to leave
higher education administration to find those traits. One man who
wrote extensively about his career changes captures the dynamic nature
of this group. He said,
I am now, full-time, a self-employed investor in securities and commercial and residential real estate. I also own a full-time new car dealership, am in the oil business on a small scale part-time, and manage commercial and residential properties. I am...self-employed......and I self-direct rather well. Each day I realize how little I know relative to others who are brighter and more perceptive so I am not usually tempted to take foolish long-shot chances.

III. Subjects Who Moved to Other Institutions

Within Higher Education (Movers)

Twelve of the 111 follow-up study respondents moved to another institution within higher education administration during the five year period. There are eight men and four women in this group. The mean age in 1979 was 38.9 years, the youngest mean age of any of the movement cohorts. There is one matched pair within this group. Proportionally more subjects from the university centers, 13.6%, are in this group than from the Arts and Science colleges, 7.5%, or the community colleges, 8.1%. This group is also well educated. Eight members hold the doctoral degree, and the remaining four tend to be in areas where the doctorate is not a traditional prerequisite to movement, e.g., a Registrar.

The 1979 pair partners of these movers represent a quite different picture. The mean age of this group in 1979 was 49.3 years. The average number of years in the 1979 post was 5.6. It was only 3.3 years for the subjects who moved to new institutions. The paired group is also not as well educated. Five members hold the doctorate and two possess Master's degrees. However, one has a baccalaureate degree and two have only a two-year technical degree or certificate. These differences are further reflected in the extent of stability for this group.
Seven of the ten subjects are at the same institution. In fact, five are in the same post and two more hold the same title with expanded responsibilities. The remaining three include one retiree, one who left higher education for public education, and one who left to start his own business.

The goal and attainment pattern for the movers is marked by achievement. Ten of the twelve members experienced upward mobility with the move. The remaining two made a lateral move and returned to faculty status. The desire for further upward mobility is however not as pronounced when the 1984 to 1989 goal pattern is examined. Less than half the group clearly aspires to move upward within higher education administration during this period. Chart 5.2 summarizes this trend.
**Chart 5.2**

**Ten Year Goal and Attainment Profile for Subjects Who Moved to a Different Institution**

**Within Higher Education Administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Affairs</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to the President*</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Assistant to the President (lateral move)</td>
<td>Retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to the President*</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Assistant to the President at a larger school</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Vice President or President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Director or Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Director in an expanded position</td>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Policy-level Post</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Executive Post</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Same Position at a Larger School</td>
<td>Same Position at a Larger School</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These two individuals are pair partners*
Interestingly, the pair partners of this group have a fairly similar pattern of aspiration for the 1979 to 1984 period. It is the attainment and future goal pattern which is markedly different. Most of these subjects did want to advance in 1979. However, the reality after five years is heavily marked by stability. The stated goals for the next five year period, 1984 to 1989, are however much more oriented toward stability than advancement. Fundamental shifts occurred within this group. Such changes may be attributable to age since this group will be in their late fifties in 1989.7

The two groups are further examined for career variable distinctions. The limited educational attainment of some pair partners raises the possibility of internal candidacy. Yet, a slightly higher percentage of movers was actually internal candidates into their 1979 posts. It is further assumed that the younger group of movers would be at earlier points in their administrative careers than their older pair partners. This is not the case. The movers have more position experience than the pair partners. Lastly, the older pair partners are assumed to be nearer the top of their career ladders than the younger movers. This is the case and may account for their limited mobility even though advancement was desired in 1979. Age appears to interact once again with other elements of administrative career pattern development in ways that produce alternative outcomes for the two groups under consideration.

The movement activities of the principal group raise several interesting points. This is a highly geographically mobile group. Ten of the twelve subjects moved to new locations. Only half remained
within the State system. The other five subjects not only left the State system but left the State as well. This move was more often to a distant state than a contiguous one. While a majority stayed at the same level of institution, four people did shift institutional type. These subjects are indeed movers in the complete sense.

The two pair partners in this group evidence major differences. The man is in his final post before retirement. At 55, he is the oldest member of the cohort. He made a lateral move within the State system to return to a part of the State that had previously been his home. The woman, in contrast, at 29, is the youngest member of this cohort. She moved into a similarly titled post at a larger, more prestigious, private university in another area of the country. These two pair partners, although in the same movement cohort, could not be more dissimilar along several other major career variables. In fact, they more typically reflect the overall differences between this group of movers and their more stable pair partners. A similar outcome then does not reflect a similar set of career elements.

The process of movement for this group is also examined. These subjects did not submit a large number of applications in order to attain their new posts. The average number of applications was 7.3 if the one man who submitted "about 100" applications is not included. It is clear that this group was seeking new opportunities and challenges. About half mention the specific positive characteristics of the institution they moved to as a reason for changing. This is a further indication of the importance of institutional features in the assessment of career movements. Most subjects left to go toward a new
experience rather than away from an old one. Nearly all name their experience as the key element in their successfully obtaining their new post. As one man put it, "The reasons were the five C's: competence, commitment, character, chemistry and cumulative experience." These people uniformly report positive institutional and position experiences over the course of their careers.

In summary, this is a group of dynamic, mobile and professionally committed people. All who advanced had deliberately planned career enhancement activities. This group is fundamentally different from those individuals who were their pair partners in 1979. Internal gender similarity is the norm for both groups. For comparison purposes, it is not their pair partners who are most like this group. It is rather the group who left higher education entirely that compares most closely with this group that moved externally but remained within higher education. In short, there may be a constellation of characteristics tied to a willingness to undertake the risks and rewards of movement that is shared by these two groups. A willingness to work hard, to believe in one's self, and a readiness to relocate, if needed, appear to be crucial features. As one man stated, the key to his success is:

Work, work, and work...read, read and more reading.... a willingness to remain a learner (student) even as President.

IV. Subjects Who Changed Posts at the Same Institution (Changers)

The existence of an internal labor market within higher education administration was an important element in the 1979 study. It was hypothesized that women more than men might utilize institutional candidacy in order to enter higher education administration. This entry
route was, as the 1979 data showed, heavily traveled by these subjects in attaining incumbency. Now, five years later, only nine of the 111 respondents had made an internal institutional move that placed them in an entirely new position. Only three subjects, two men and one woman, had been internal candidates into both their 1979 and their 1984 posts. There were five men and four women in this cohort. Their mean age in 1979 was 46.7 years. All three institutional types are represented. Both the university centers and the Arts and Science colleges are represented by one man and one woman. The remaining three men and two women are from the community colleges. The pair partners of these subjects are a highly comparable group. Their mean age in 1979 was 46.2 years. The changers are somewhat better educated, i.e., the majority hold doctoral degrees, than their pair partners but not dramatically so.

The goal and attainment profile for the main subjects shows a varied pattern of aspiration and accomplishment. Only three of the nine subjects clearly had an upwardly mobile career goal for the period 1979 to 1984. Two of these three subjects did attain the position they sought. The other person made a lateral move. Four of the nine subjects returned to faculty status. Two of these four subjects strongly viewed this move as an advancement. Of the remaining two people, one made a lateral move due to reorganization, and the other was reassigned to a lesser position at his institution. Chart 5.3 summarizes the profile for this group.
### Chart 5.3

**Ten Year Goal and Attainment Profile for Subjects Who Changed Positions at the Same Institution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Co-ordinator</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Associate in</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Assistant to the</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The goal and attainment profile for the pair partners is heavily marked by stability. Five of the nine pair partners expected to be in the same post in 1984 as they were in 1979. Only one woman clearly had advancement aspirations. By 1984, the movement pattern shows only two outcomes: stability and retirement. Two subjects had experienced a broadening of position responsibilities although their titles are the same. Four subjects had retired despite only one person having that outcome as a goal in 1979. The final subject, a non-respondent, left his institution with no indication of his current employment. In short, no pair partner who responded had advanced or moved to a different post or institution. This is a highly stable group. In that sense, the two groups are comparable.

When the main subjects were asked to assess the location of the new post on their self-defined career ladder, four of the nine answered that the post could not be evaluated in this manner because they do not have a career ladder conceptualization for their employment histories. Two people, younger members of this cohort, are in intermediate posts. The remaining three people are now faculty members. Each of these three, two men and a woman, commented on the opportunity to return to their discipline for teaching, writing and research as an advancement that put them at the top of their career ladder. No one then in this group views himself or herself as being at the top of his or her administrative career ladder. This lack of administrative career commitment is also reflected in the goals these subjects have for the next five years. Only one woman has an upwardly mobile, administrative career move as her goal. These subjects then may spend much of their professional
lives within higher education administration; however, as a group, they are not career administrators in the progressive mobility sense. As such, they are sharply different from the subjects who moved externally to new administrative posts at different institutions.

This career orientation is further underscored by the subjects' responses when they were asked to name their reasons for remaining at the same institution. Only two subjects mention a career-based reason, that is, challenge and program impact. Three of the others name the geographic area, one lists "comfort," another "enjoyment with teaching," and two give no response. Additionally, six of the nine never submitted an external application for another post. Those who stayed in administration name their experience and knowledge of the college itself as the reasons for attaining their new posts. For those who moved to faculty status, the retention of tenure during their administrative careers is named as the vehicle which provided them with this freedom of choice.

Additionally, other career elements make it evident that these individuals are more attentive to the affective or "people" aspect of their positions than to the instrumental or task aspects. When asked to comment on career development factors, these subjects focus upon the following elements:

Interaction with people
Understanding and supportive President
Support of faculty
Appreciative colleagues--departmental and administrative
Loneliness of the office
Open communication
While there are comments that deal with position responsibilities and institutional features, the overall sense of the group is this orientation toward the feeling-level characteristics of the workplace. These subjects appear to have found a site which has the social environment that is an important contextual feature of their professional lives. While they move within that circumstance, they do not seek to leave the location. In short, the group appears to be satisfied with their careers, institutions and geographic areas, i.e., their lives, in ways that encourage stability. Dissatisfactions center upon limited time, fiscal resources and staff. These are perennial concerns for nearly all professionals, regardless of the particular institution.

In summary, this group of internal changers appears to be highly stable. They move because an opportunity becomes available at the institution, or because they are able, due to tenure, to return to faculty status without leaving the institution. It seems evident that otherwise they would not have sought their new posts. Their commitment is anchored to the lifestyle they have created at that institution, in that geographic area. In this sense, they are stayers as opposed to movers even though they changed posts. This is further confirmed by their similarity to their pair partners who are more stable. More than any other set, these two groups are, indeed, matched pairs. A final comment by one of the men highlights the affective orientation of this group, a feature which also separates it from the other movement cohorts.

Having been (in three top echelon posts) within a few years I got a remarkably compact view of what an administrative career promised and how I feel about it. I was lucky to
have the experience so that my choice (and my view of fate) could be intelligent and practical rather than hypothetical. (In five years) I think I'll be happy doing what I'm doing, but who knows? (my emphasis)

V. Subjects Who Changed to a Somewhat Different Post at the Same Institution (Shifters)

Eighteen of the 111 respondents indicated that they had shifted positions within the institution to a post that was somewhat different but nonetheless related to the one they held in 1979. In most cases, the change was a result of expanded responsibilities or bureaucratic reorganization. This group has an equal number of men and women. Its mean age in 1979 was 43.6 years. Two-thirds of the group are from the community colleges, with 22.2% from the university centers, and the remaining 11.1% from the Arts and Science colleges. The community colleges are thus overrepresented in this movement cohort while the Arts and Science colleges are underrepresented.

The pair partners of this group also show a pattern heavily marked by institutional stability. Fully 61.1% are at the same site. Additionally, 72.7% of these subjects are in the same post as in 1979. The mean age of this group in 1979 was 46.3 years.

The goal and attainment profile for the main group shows, as Table 5.3 illustrates, that half these subjects aspired to upward mobility in 1979. Yet, 22.2% had no stated goal in 1979. By 1984, 44.4% had advanced within their institutions. Another third had moved laterally into posts where their responsibilities were somewhat different than in 1979. Their 1984 goal pattern indicates that by 1989, 55.5% expect to leave higher education administration, either for
retirement or for employment elsewhere. Only 27.8% of the subjects indicate a desire for advancement during this second five year period. The pair partners of these subjects also have a pattern heavily marked by stability. This is true for both goal and attainment profiles. Even though both groups tend to remain at their home institutions, the people who do shift positions are more interested in mobility than their pair partners. When an internal opportunity arises, these individuals change posts in line with their career goal of advancement.10

Table 5.3

Percent Goal and Attainment Pattern for Subjects Who Shifted Positions Internally and Their Pair Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Movement</th>
<th>1979 Goal</th>
<th>1984 Position</th>
<th>1984 Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Pair Partner</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassessable</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The movement profile for these subjects identifies several interesting findings. It was hypothesized that these individuals might also have been internal candidates into their 1979 posts. This is not the case. Only four of the eighteen subjects experienced a second internal move. Of the remaining fourteen people, six came from other State-system institutions, and eight came from outside the State-system in 1979. The pattern of 1984 mobility is also examined across the three institutional types. Here, as Table 5.4 shows, dramatic differences emerge.

Table 5.4
Percent Mobility Pattern for Subjects Who Shifted Positions Internally by Gender and Institutional Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Mobility</th>
<th>University Center</th>
<th>Arts and Science College</th>
<th>Community College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not only are the community colleges overrepresented in this cohort, but it is only at the community colleges that these subjects experience advancement. Moreover, any downward movement at the four year schools is experienced by women. Two of these women are retained by the institution but their roles are restricted, a result of reported disagreements with higher echelon administrators. The other woman had given
birth to three children in the five year period and returned to an Assistant Director post she previously held. Institutional type then appears to be related to the type of mobility these particular internal shifters experience.

When these subjects are asked to indicate where they are on their self-defined career ladder, 44.4% indicate that they are in an intermediate post. It is also these subjects who experience the highest rate of advancement, with two-thirds indicating such mobility. Within this cohort, 27.8% state that they are in their top positions. The remaining five people, including the three women who experienced downward movement, indicate that the career ladder concept is not appropriate to their current post. Educational attainment is not linked to movement in the expected manner. Fully 75.0% of those with only baccalaureate degrees advanced. This is in contrast to 50.0% of those with Master's degrees, and only 16.7% of those with doctoral degrees. Two-thirds of the subjects with the doctorate experienced only lateral mobility. Taking all of these findings together what emerges is a fairly idiosyncratic movement profile. It appears that these internal candidates are selected on the basis of proven competence or "fit" with the institution. In short, movement is more anchored in personal than career attributes.

This conclusion is further supported when an examination of the search process and career planning activities of these subjects is undertaken. Two-thirds of the subjects had not applied for a position outside their home institution. Three of the six who applied externally had turned down an offer in order to stay at their institutions.
For two of these three persons, this was a direct result of the internal promotional shift that was offered and accepted. The reasons subjects stayed are heavily related to age, salary, geography and family. Only 37.5% mentioned the position responsibilities as crucial. Two-thirds of the subjects did indicate that they had planned specific career enhancement activities. However, many of these activities were internal to the institution, e.g., serving on major committees. Such activities were planned in order to gain wider visibility and experience and did not necessarily indicate a commitment to external movement or broadly-based professional development.

Interestingly, these subjects list many negative institutional features which impacted on their career development. Even those who had experienced advancement in their movement made comments such as:

- Too frequent leadership changes
- Political aspects of government
- Unclear direction from above
- Budgetary constraints
- Perceived second class status of my area

This is not however true for comments on the impact of their positions. Here the subjects are nearly unanimous in reporting positive characteristics and outcomes for their own career development. Their satisfaction is then at this positional level more than at the institutional level.

Within this group there is one pair where both people shifted positions internally. They are especially interesting because of other similarities: they were exactly the same age, 38, in 1979; they both had been in their post for less than a year; both entered the post from elsewhere within the State system; and, both had doctoral degrees in
higher education administration by the time of their movement to their 1984 post. However, the woman advanced in her movement into her 1984 post while movement for the man was lateral. The woman regards her President as a mentor and is highly positive in her assessment of the institution and her position. The man has an entirely different orientation. He lists "burnout" as his reason for hoping to leave higher education administration and move into an "allied and growing" field by 1989. Hence, while their pasts are similar, their present satisfactions and future goals are quite different. This difference may be explained by the disparity in the number of prior posts held within higher education administration. In 1979 the man was in his third administrative post, the woman was in her first. Once again, age at entry into administration appears to be an explanatory variable, even moreso given the extensive areas of similarity within this matched pair.

In summary, subjects who shifted positions at their institutions make up a diverse group. They do not particularly resemble one another, nor do they have a lot in common with their pair partners. They do not seem to be as career oriented, i.e., actively pursuing advancement, as other movement cohorts. They, more than others, appear to have been, as one subject said, "In the right place at the right time." Those who advance provide an indication of the process of internal promotion at the community colleges. In this sense, the cohort is an important one beyond its own features. It speaks to both institutional type differences and to employment practices of one particular type. The community colleges have already been identified, in 1979, as separate from the
other two types of four year schools. These findings support a continued need to examine the type of institution as a variable in the study of career development in higher education administration.

VI. Subjects Who Unsuccessfully Sought to Leave (Seekers)

There were 50 subjects, 26 men and 24 women who remained in the same position from 1979 to 1984. Of these 50, ten had unsuccessfully sought to leave their 1979 post. The gender composition of this smaller group is evenly divided. One man and one woman are from the university centers; three men and three women are from the Arts and Science colleges; and, one man and one woman are from the community colleges. The Arts and Science colleges are then overrepresented in this group. The mean age of the group in 1979 was 45.1 years. The mean age of their pair partners in 1979 was 48.4 years. Educationally these two groups hold the fewest doctoral degrees and the most baccalaureate degrees of any paired group. The fact that these are groups which do not have a high number of advanced degree recipients may account for some of the lack of movement for both those who sought to leave and for their pair partners.

The main cohort indicated a clear desire for advancement in its goal profile for the period 1979 to 1984. For those who still plan to be employed in 1989, the goal profile for the period, 1984 to 1989, is also oriented toward change and advancement. Overall, as Chart 5.4 illustrates, these are people who wanted to move, tried to move, and still desire movement. No person in this group, for either of the five year goal periods, indicates a desire to remain in the same post.
Chart 5.4

Ten Year Goal and Attainment Profile for Subjects Who Unsuccessfully Sought to Move

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dean</td>
<td>Staff or Faculty Position</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Professor or part-time retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Director</td>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assistant to the</td>
<td>Vice President or President</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Similar position at a larger</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Similar position at a larger campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school or Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Director</td>
<td>Similar position at a major</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. President</td>
<td>President at a private college</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or in industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Director</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Director</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Private business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Director</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Retirement or a position in the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Director</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>No Answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The goal and attainment profile for the pair partners shows a strong pattern of stability. Only two of the ten people indicated a definite desire for movement between 1979 and 1984. Five planned to remain in the same post. The remaining three were uncertain about their five year goals. By 1984, six subjects were still in the same post. Only one person had advanced within higher education administration. This general trend is repeated for the period 1984 to 1989. This group is highly stable. If change occurs, it is not likely to be a change associated with advancement within higher education administration. The 1984 outcome for the two groups is then quite similar. However, as noted, the goal profiles are not. The main group of seekers desires mobility whereas their pair partners do not.

The search process for these seekers is now examined. Every subject was, at one time during the five year period, actively seeking to leave his or her 1979 post. Their desire for advancement was further confirmed when subjects were asked to name the position title most frequently sought. These individuals were either applying for posts that were career ladder advancements or for posts which they defined as more prestigious, e.g., the same title at a larger university. Only one woman applied internally to her home institution. No other person submitted an internal application and only three of the remaining nine subjects applied to an institution within the State system. These seekers were then looking to leave both their institutions and the State system. Yet, the mean number of applications was only 3.0, with the highest being 6.0. It would appear that these subjects were selective in their search process even though their desire to move was
strong. The modal sources of information on position vacancies were evenly divided between the Chronicle of Higher Education and personal contacts.

Subjects were also asked to indicate whether they had been offered a post at any time during their search. Four of the ten subjects had rejected an offer from another institution. The reasons for rejecting were: 1) lack of freedom and poor salary or benefits; 2) unattractive organization and attachment to the current one; 3) a felt obligation to stay through the process of staff reduction; and, 4) poor salary and the delay in State approval. For the subjects who were not offered a post, the reasons they believed this occurred fell into three categories: lack of experience; lack of credentials; and, lack of personal connections. In both circumstances the reasons appear to be commonplace ones related to the process of movement for any group of administrators.

The one area where these subjects appear to be different from their pair partners, and different from the other movement cohorts, is in the extent to which they experienced negative position and institutional characteristics. Fully half of the subjects spoke about exclusively negative traits when asked about their positions and institutions. Only two people had more positive than negative experiences. Comments underscoring these negative experiences include:

- institutional lack of understanding of the field
- exceedingly demanding tasks in an environment that does not believe these tasks should be necessary
- resistance to change
- economic and budget problems in the system
- insufficient commitment to career development concept
lack of interest of President and Vice President for my operation
lack of rewards and recognition

Once again it is evident that position and institutional characteristics are an important element in career development. It is not clear how these experiences might have contributed to the inability of these people to move to new positions. What is clear is that most of these people are attempting to move away from their old institutions as much as toward a new experience. The lack of internal applications also supports this conclusion.

This group of seekers does not have a process of application different from the group who successfully moved to new institutions. It is, however, a group with more limited educational attainment than those who are successful. Also, the average period of time in their post in 1979 was 6.3 years, the median for the entire sample. Successful movers were in their 1979 posts only 3.3 years. Many seekers are in an intermediate post on their career ladder. Fully 40% are in this category. Another 40% are however in their top post. And, the remaining 20% are not on a career ladder. Movers are more likely to be in an intermediate post. However, the key distinction between the movers and seekers is in the experience of positive or negative position and institutional characteristics. The movers consistently speak about positive features whereas the seekers are discussing negative features. Another difference is in the extent of planned career enhancement activities. Four of the ten people in the seekers group indicate no planning whereas no one in the movers group does so. Seekers who plan activities are more oriented toward locally-based ones such as
on-campus or in the community. The movers on the otherhand are more wide-reaching in their planned activities. These two distinctions may then shed light on the differences in outcome between these two groups.

In summary, the group of people who sought to leave may have been unsuccessful due to a combination of formal credential problems, lack of career planning activities, and exposure to more negative than positive position and institutional characteristics. The lack of successful attainment is thus more understandable, especially when coupled with the small number of applications. Despite this outcome, the group does not convey a sense of bitterness and oppression. As one subject said in closing,

All [positions] have renewed my respect for higher education generally and my determination to stay in higher education rather than moving to another field.

VII. Subjects Who Remained and Did Not Seek Movement (Stayers)

The largest group of respondents to the 1984 survey is comprised of subjects who stayed in the same post and did not attempt to move during the five year period. Forty of the 111 respondents, 21 men and 19 women, are in this cohort. Their mean age in 1979 was 46.5 years. Seven pairs are in this group. A total of 26 subjects, with a mean age in 1979 of 44.2 years, are then in the contrasting group of pair partners. The distribution between line and staff positions is roughly even. However, when institutional type and gender are considered, differences do emerge. The university centers are underrepresented with only 10.0% of these subjects whereas the Arts and Science colleges have 32.5% and the community colleges, 57.5%. Women are substantially underrepresented in the line positions, with only 27.7% of the line
administrators being female. This is especially the case at the Arts and Science colleges where no woman is in a line position. Hence, even though the general composition is evenly distributed by institutional type, gender differences in the type of positions held at those institutions are significant.

The goal and attainment profile for this cohort does indeed reflect their desire for stability. As Table 5.5 highlights, the modal category for each segment of the ten year profile analysis is the desire to remain in the same position. Of these subjects, 47.5% indicated stability as their career goal in 1979. The projected goal for 1989 still shows 32.5% of the subjects desiring stability. Retirement is the 1989 goal for 25.0% of these subjects. This pattern contrasts with the group of pair partners. Advancement is the modal outcome for this group during the period 1979 to 1984. In fact, very few of the pair partners actually sought stability. The group of subjects who stay and do not seek movement then do so by design, i.e., the outcome is consistent with the goal, and consistent in a manner which separates these subjects from their pair partners. This is the case even though age and educational attainment are roughly equal for the two groups.
Table 5.5
Percent Ten Year Goal and Attainment Profile for Subjects Who Did Not Seek Movement and Their Pair Partners

| Type of Movement | Stayers | | | Pair Partners of Stayers | | |
| | Goal Position Goal | Goal | Goal Position Goal | Goal |
| Upward | 20.0 | 0.0 | 15.0 | 46.2 | 19.2 | 19.2 |
| Lateral | 5.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 0.0 |
| Stable | 47.5 | 100.0 | 32.5 | 7.7 | 34.6 | 7.7 |
| Retired | 10.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 11.5 | 15.4 | 26.9 |
| Unassessable | 10.0 | 0.0 | 17.5 | 26.9 | 15.4 | 15.4 |
| Don't Know | 7.5 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 30.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| N | 40 | 40 | 40 | 26 | 26 | 26 |

*Category comprised of 87.5% non-respondents to the 1984 survey*

The high incidence of desired stability among these subjects leads to the assumption that the group might differ from their pair partners on several crucial variables related to career development. This is the case when the number of years these subjects had been in their 1979 post is examined. The average number of years is 7.65 for the main subjects whereas for the pair partners it is 5.92. The second consideration is that these subjects might be more advanced in their administrative careers than their pair partners. This is dramatically evident. Fully 72.5% of the stayers indicate that they are in the top position on their career ladder. Only 15.4% of the pair partners are in their top post. The modal category for the pair partners is an intermediate
post. The similarity in average age for the two groups is then not reflected in these aspects of career development.

The extent of internal candidacy into the 1979 post experienced by the two groups is also examined. A full 52.5% of the stayers had been internal applicants into their posts whereas only 26.9% of their pair partners took this route to incumbency. A further difference emerges when the number of consciously planned career advancement activities is examined. Again, 50.0% of the stayers either did not name a single planned activity or did not answer the question. Activities that are mentioned tend to be within the institution itself, such as serving on major committees. The activities for the pair partners, although often not consciously planned, tend to be more external, principally within national or regional professional associations. These differences support the aggregate differences in goal and attainment profiles among these stayers and their pair partners. The stayers appear to be people who are indeed committed to remain where they are, and reflect this in several aspects of their career patterns.

Each stayer was asked to state his or her reasons for remaining in the same post. Of the total responses, 47.2% deal with some aspect of job satisfaction. Another 20.8% center upon a commitment to family stability or a desire to remain within the same geographic area. The decision to remain is then an affirmative one. Subjects employ terms such as, "enjoyment of my position," "stimulating and challenging responsibilities," and "freedom of action," to describe their positions. A picture emerges of people who stay by true choice.
Subjects were also asked to assess the factors they believe hindered their career development. The most frequent response is a lack of support from the administration. This is both in personal terms and in terms of budget, staffing and related resources. Several subjects mention the lack of a doctorate as a crucial element. Only 27.5% of this group holds the doctoral degree. Fully 55.0% hold the Master's degree. Another frequent response is, as one subject notes, "the effect of the 'Settling Down Syndrome' taking over." This is also the only group to name the impact of sexism. Three women and one man cite this as a reason for career limitations. The one man is in a post traditionally held by women. He believes his superiors continue to view the post as suitable "for a little old lady." Additional responses are more idiosyncratic. Overall the answers focus on institutional or personal characteristics. The position itself is not mentioned here as it was earlier when career enhancement was the issue.

The extent of positive and negative institutional and position characteristics these subjects experienced during their careers is also analyzed. The most frequently cited positive institutional feature is the existence of an environment that is open, flexible and informal. These subjects focus upon milieu considerations rather than the opportunity structure or bureaucratic organization. It is context per se that these stayers find most attractive about their institutions. Positive position characteristics reinforce the features named as reasons for staying: challenge, opportunity, diversity and independence. Nearly every subject addresses at least one positive element of his or her post. These results further confirm that these subjects
stay because they have found a position which is satisfying to
them.

Very few subjects indicate any negative position characteristics.
The comments made deal with ambiguous responsibilities, repetitive
tasks and frustrating contacts with superiors. The lack of professional
development opportunities, dead-end positions and limited interaction
with professional colleagues are also mentioned. This listing exhausts
the negative position features. This is not the case with the negative
institutional features. Subjects are much more likely to discuss the
difficulties their institutions impose through poor leadership, limited
fiscal resources, autocratic structure and over-involvement of the Board
of Trustees. It is clear that the negative institutional character-
istics are those which bear directly upon the ability of the subject to
exercise control, and to thereby experience the positive features of his
or her position. The post itself remains the crucial career variable
for these subjects.

The seven pair partners within this cohort are one of its unique
features. Three of the seven pairs are employed in library-based
positions. Five of these six subjects plan to retire during the period
1984-1989. The remaining subject, a man in his forties, hopes to attain
a graduate faculty appointment by 1989. All six held prior library
posts; all six earned their Master of Library Science degree in the
1950s or 1960s; and, all six are in their top administrative post. The
average time in that post in 1984 was ten years, with one woman having
held her post for twenty years. These pairs are indeed partners.
Their careers are very similar. However, their careers reflect a career
profile within the library area more than within higher education administration overall. Throughout this subsample, the subjects mention the separate nature of career patterns in this field. Most also state that this separateness is a liability for administrative career advancement.

The remaining four pair partners are divided between the student services area and the Office of the President. The four subjects in the student services area are in identically titled positions at the same institutional level. These four can be viewed as a paired group. Three of the four are in their middle thirties. The fourth, a man, is in his middle fifties. Both men, despite the age disparity, are in the top post within their career pattern. The older man has held his post for seventeen years whereas the younger man has been in his post for only five years. The latter hopes to move into the private sector by 1989. The older man plans to remain in a post he continues to find challenging and rewarding. Both women are currently enrolled in doctoral programs and hope to advance to a Deanship by 1989. All three younger people are in their third administrative post within the student services area. The men report extremely positive position and institutional experiences. The older man is probably the most positive of any subject in the entire sample. In contrast, the women are more negative about the limits the institution imposes on career development and advancement. They do however positively evaluate their posts. These four subjects then are not so much well matched pairs as they are similar by gender, i.e., the women and the men resemble each other more than their pair partners. The women are actively pursuing advancement
within higher education administration. In fact, the two profiles reverse the traditional gender expectations regarding career development techniques and practices.

One of the two remaining pairs provides an excellent match. Both are about fifty years old; both are internal candidates into their posts; both have held the post for seven years; both hold Master's degrees; both married the same year; and, both now have no children at home. They are highly comparable with one exception: the close to ten thousand dollar disparity in salary at highly comparable institutions, i.e., the same level of institution and the same geographic area. The similarity persists over the five year period in an especially interesting manner. Both people report strongly negative institutional and position characteristics. Both speak of the dead-end nature of the posts and the lack of support from higher echelon administrators. By 1989, the man hopes to be self-employed after retirement. The woman recognizes there will be no change due to geographic and family constraints. These two people then represent a truly matched pair, both on objective career variables and on subjective definitions of their present situations.

The final pair is also quite interesting. The woman is eight years older yet she has been in her post only two years as contrasted to his twelve. She holds only a baccalaureate degree while he has a doctorate. Interestingly, both had been employed, with overlapping years, by the same private sector employer in the middle 1960s. The man moved directly from that post to his current one. The woman however had a break in full-time employment when she married and had her first child
at age forty. She returned to full-time employment when that child was five and moved to her current post two years later. Both plan to remain in their posts over the next five years and both report highly positive institutional and position experiences. They now appear to be well matched in their orientation toward their current posts despite the different content of their middle career years.

In summary, this subsample of stayers represents a composite view of the factors that promote stability within careers. The identification of positive position characteristics underscores what institutions need to offer incumbents in order to retain them. Gender differences are not evident. The assumption that women are more stable due to family and geographic constraints is not supported. In fact, more men than women mention this limitation on mobility. The average age of this group is at the sample median. The assumption that stability is heavily related to nearing retirement is not supported. What does emerge is a picture of people who have found their niche and who are able to recognize that they have done so. As one man said,

In my [long] tenure at the College I have had the unique experience of taking a_____ program from its inception to one of national prominence. This required and I have continually received from the College, a commitment to the_____ program as an integral part of the_____ College experience. I am happy, productive and challenged in my current role and am planning on the same status five years from now.

VIII. Subjects Who Retired (Retirees)

In the five year period, 1979 to 1984, fifteen of the 111 respondents retired. Twelve of these retirees are women. This pronounced gender difference is a direct result of the original significant age
difference among these men and women. The mean age of the retirees in 1979 was 61.7 years. The mean age of the women, at 60.9 years, is somewhat younger than the mean age of the men, at 64.7 years. These gender disparities are explained by the combined effect of the overall gender difference in age coupled with the tendency for women to retire at a younger age. The Arts and Science colleges have the largest percent of their subjects retiring, with 15.0%. This is followed by the community colleges at 10.8%, and the university centers at 4.5%. There are no differences in the rate of retirement from line versus staff positions.

There is one set of pair partners in this cohort.

Each sample member was paired in 1979 with a similarly positioned person of the opposite sex. Age and current activities are, as expected, markedly different for these pair partners of the retirees. Their mean age was 42.0 years in 1979. This substantial age difference supports the developing conclusion that career lines within higher education administration are not rigidly established. People can be matched on the basis of type of school and title of position and still be at quite different points in the life cycle. Even in top echelon line posts, pair partners are clearly not approaching retirement age. The pattern of movement for the pair partners is predominated by stability, with 38.5% of the group, or by advancement, at 30.7%. There is also one lateral mover, two who are now faculty members, and one who left higher education in the pair partner group.

The goal and attainment profile for these two groups shows striking similarities in 1979 goals. This is so despite the fact that the five
year period resulted in quite different outcomes. Table 5.6 summarizes this pattern.

Table 5.6
Percent Goal and Attainment Pattern for Retirees
and Their Pair Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Mobility</th>
<th>Retirees</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Pair Partners of Retirees</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upward</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassessable</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four retirees who aspired to upward mobility in 1979 are a particularly interesting group. All four are women. Two of the four, both in high echelon positions, were asked to leave when a new President was hired. The third woman also retired when a new President was selected. No comment was made regarding her reasons. The fourth woman, a Director, went into business for herself and did not comment on her reasons for this combination of retirement and career change.

The four men paired with these women did not state such upwardly mobile aspirations in 1979. Two indicated a desire to remain in their
1979 posts. One wanted to leave higher education in anticipation of retirement, and the last man did want to advance but outside education. Only in the latter case is the 1979 goal a predictor of the 1984 outcome. Three of the four did achieve upward mobility even if, in two cases, that was not their stated goal. The men then are able to either achieve or exceed the goals they stated in 1979. The women clearly are not. The women are old enough to elect retirement and choose that option when confronted with alternative circumstances.

The two women and one man who planned to stay for the five year period but who retired during that time, are all in their sixties. The man already regarded his post as a semi-retirement one, i.e., "down from the 100 hour weeks of self-employment." He elected full-time retirement when his staff was reduced. The two women were both long term employees who had been internal candidates into their posts fifteen or more years earlier. Neither indicated a reason for the decision to retire sooner than planned.

The pair partners of these three people are substantially younger, with a mean age of 37.0 years. Once again there appears to be no relationship between age and incumbency in some administrative posts. All are still at the same institutions. Two are in the same post and the third person chose to return to faculty status. Both people who remain in the same post had indicated a 1979 desire to broaden their responsibilities. One person reinforced this by seeking, unsuccessfully, a new post at larger schools. He retains the same goal for the 1984 to 1989 period. The other person is uncertain about her goals due to increasing 'paper work' and limited staff. However, she is not
seeking alternative employment and states satisfaction with the service-oriented component of her post as the reason.

Four of the retirees indeed did plan to retire by 1984. Two of these four are pair partners. Both of these individuals had been in their posts for five years, and both were 61 years old in 1979. The man had moved from private industry to college administration, a downward movement, for his last years of full-time employment. The woman had advanced internally into the top post in her career pattern after earning her baccalaureate degree in 1975. He had earned his in 1941, following it with a law degree in 1950. This pair is especially noteworthy because their similarities and differences reflect the aggregate gender disparities identified in the earlier analyses on the interaction of age and career pattern development.

The remaining retirees include two who planned to retire; three with no stated 1979 goals; and, one who wanted, in 1979, to leave higher education for a community position. They are paired with six people who are substantially younger, with a mean age of 40.3 years. Five of these six, all men, are still at the same institution. The sixth person, a woman, left higher education. The people paired with these retirees then present a pattern heavily marked by institutional stability between 1979 and 1984. No additional identifying features are evident.

Finally, when the retirees chose to comment on their current activities, a picture of active people emerges. They are working in their fields part-time; starting new ventures; taking courses, traveling; and, in general, as one subject states, ".....happily and actively
"This is true even for the people who wanted to advance or to remain but had not done so. There is, in some cases, regret over the method of termination but not with the result. The subjects experienced positive institutional settings and position responsibilities. A sense of satisfaction with their work is evident. Four of the twelve women commented specifically on the role of affirmative action legislation in assisting them in the later years of their careers. Perhaps the best summary of administrative careers is made by one woman in this group. On a concluding note she writes:

In sum: For most of us, our strengths are our weaknesses, and the luck is to find situations where the positive side of the characteristic has maximum play and the negative side either doesn't matter or can be masked.

IX. Subjects Who Did Not Respond to the 1984 Survey (Non-Respondents)

Twenty-five of the original 136 subjects did not respond to the 1984 survey. The Personnel Office telephone follow-up identified two of these non-respondents as deceased. There are slightly more women, at 56.0%, than men in the group. The average age in 1979 was 43.8 years. The type of position and the location of the post within the bureaucratic structure are evenly distributed across the categories. However, men at the university centers and women at the community colleges are overrepresented among these non-respondents. Better than a third, 36.3%, of the university center men and about a quarter, 24.3%, of the community college women did not respond. This is in contrast to a non-response rate of 18.1% for university center women and an even lower 10.8% rate for community college men. University center personnel are then overrepresented among the non-respondents, with 27.3% declining
to participate in the follow-up survey. These figures are substantially less at the community colleges, 17.6%, and the Arts and Science colleges, 15.0%. At the Arts and Science colleges men and women have the same rate of non-response at 15.0%. Overall, 16.2% of the men and 20.6% of the women in the sample did not respond, netting a non-response rate of 18.4% of the original 136 subjects. However, the gender distribution by institutional type is uneven. When only the subsample of non-respondents is considered, the men are fairly evenly distributed across the three institutional types; however, the majority of the women, 64.3%, are from the community colleges.

Despite the fact that these subjects did not respond to the 1984 survey, some information is known about their movement patterns from the Personnel Office survey. The modal movement category for this group is stability. Nearly half, 48.0%, of the non-respondents are still employed by the same institution. Another 36.0% had left their 1979 institutions. The remaining subjects are retired or deceased. Stability is also the modal category for the group of pair partners. Fully 82.4% are still at the same institution. Both these groups then have a strong tendency to remain at the same institution during the five year period.

One set of pair partners within this subsample is especially interesting. Enough information became available to further support the prior findings on age-related differences among men and women within the total sample. In this pair, the man was thirty-five years old and the woman was fifty-four years old in 1979. Both were however in their first administrative post, a Directorship. The man holds a doctorate
and had work experience outside education. He is committed to career advancement. The woman, in sharp contrast, had been out of the workplace for many years. She attained her post as a product of twenty years of volunteer work in her community. In 1979, she desired advancement only within her present area. By 1984, the man had moved to a Directorship at a private university. The woman was in the same post. These two people then represent another example of the gender differences uncovered within the earlier analyses. A relatively older woman enters higher education administration at a later point in her life cycle. She is then paired by position with a younger, upwardly mobile man. The similarity of position belies a fundamental gender difference. These examples also support the finding that career lines within higher education administration are fluid and flexible.

In summary, this group is similar to the overall sample and does not possess any characteristics that would explain the pattern of non-response. Overall, the group appears to be a subset of the sample on several variables. This is true despite the overrepresentation of university center men and community college women. Extensive information is, of course, unavailable. However, one pair within the subsample does underscore a major difference in the career pattern development of these men and women. These non-respondents then do not appear to bias the analyses when conclusions regarding the original sample and the 1984 sample are drawn.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSIONS

I. Summary of Results

A. Introduction

The data analyses identified several gender differentiated career development elements. Distinctions among male and female administrators are evident at the individual level in age, age at entry and the subjective orientation of the individual toward success attribution. At the organizational level, differences exist by type of institution and by location within the bureaucratic hierarchy. Moreover, institutional and position characteristics which facilitate or limit career movement for both men and women are identified. At the broader structural level, the differential impact of affirmative action legislation and the internal labor market demonstrate modifications to the opportunity structure within higher education administration. The original premise that career development is dependent upon the interactive effect of differing levels of analysis is thus supported. The importance of retaining this analytic perspective is documented by each category of conclusions.

B. Age-Related Conclusions

Gender differences in chronological age and age at entry into higher education administration are the most crucial set of findings. Women are significantly older than men. This finding is augmented by women entering administration at a significantly later age than men. As the literature indicates, career pattern development is tied to
individual life cycle elements. The career goals and objectives of a worker vary as he or she matures. As importantly, the expectations of the employer for particular employees are also partly linked to age. The dual impact of being older and being relative newcomers to administration appears to be especially potent for this group of women.

Another gender difference is that age and mobility are related for women, especially older women, in ways that are not evident for men. Older women are more often in their first administrative post and have more often been internally recruited from another non-administrative post than any other age and gender grouping. Because of this, these women are the least like men of their age cohort. Such men have a more traditional career pattern. Additionally, these women have aspirations of administrative advancement but have difficulty moving beyond their first administrative post. Men in this age cohort move even when they do not indicate a desire for such mobility. For men the desire to move is age-related but linked to the traditional career-building years of the life cycle. For women the desire to move does not separate age cohorts. It is rather the desire to stay which is age-linked. Women in the middle cohorts evidence a greater desire to stay than women in either the older or younger groups. It appears that women desire mobility at the beginning and at the end of the career cycle rather than primarily in the earlier years, as is the more traditional pattern. This finding is especially noteworthy when other life cycle elements are introduced. Major childrearing responsibilities also occurred during the middle years when these women sought stability. Such responsibilities may constrain
career movement in years when such mobility has for men been traditionally the principal career concern. Two separate gender profiles of career development then emerge within this study.

Age is also related to several areas of gender similarity and to within gender differences in ways which add further support to the foregoing statements. This is most evident when the pattern of career goals is examined. In 1979 and 1984, an analysis of the stated five year career goal evidences significant differences by age cohort but not by gender. Overall, age overrides gender as a determining factor. Within gender differences do however emerge for the men. Younger men tend to desire mobility whereas older men tend to desire stability. No such within gender differences are evident for women, where the desire for mobility is present across the age ranges, markedly so in the youngest and oldest cohorts. By 1984, the goal pattern is even more heavily linked to age. The desire for stability or retirement has intensified for both men and women in the older cohorts.

The actual pattern of movement for the entire sample shows significant age-linked features but few gender differences. However, this pattern does indicate within gender differences for women but not for men. Women are separated from each other by age whereas men are not. Men are more easily able to move whereas women, even when they desire to do so, are not successful. Most pointedly, the modal movement cohort category for older women is unsuccessful seeking of a new post. This is the case even though the content of the application process is similar for both men and women. It is the outcome of the process that shows gender differentiation. The picture is now more
complete. Age impacts upon the careers of both men and women. At crucial junctures such influences may not be gender differentiated.

This appears to be true for the youngest cohort where both men and women desire mobility. However, as the life cycle unfolds, substantial gender differences emerge. Men differ from one another by age along traditional career development avenues. Younger men desire mobility and that characteristic declines over the age ranges. Women present a pattern different from these men. These differences are most evident in the oldest cohort. Again, it is apparent that traditional career development expectations cannot be routinely applied to the women within this sample.

Moreover, another possibility is that the perception of competence by an employer may also be differentiated by gender, especially in the older cohorts. This double standard of aging would operate to facilitate movement for men even without the desire for movement. This is so because men in this age range are assumed to be at the peak of their knowledge base and have typically had extensive administrative experience. Women in this age range, on the other hand, may well be viewed as merely old. Moreover, women are relative newcomers without the base of knowledge and experience. This combination may pose perceived risks the employer is unwilling to assume. These perceptual differences in aging for men and women need to be explored within the context of career development.

The exploration of age as both an independent and interactive determinant of gender differentiated career development patterns was productive. Areas of gender similarity in patterns of movement by age
support the crucial nature of life cycle elements for all. Yet, gender differences in age and age at entry appear to heavily influence the subsequent career development experiences of women in ways which are different from the experiences of men. Moreover, the analysis of gender similarities and within sex differences lends support to the likelihood that age-related variables are more powerful in the career advancement patterns of women than men. This may be tied to both the differential content of other aspects of each life cycle stage and to the perceptions others hold regarding the aging process of men and women.

It is evident that traditional assumptions regarding the impact of life cycle elements on career development are based upon the male model. This analysis indicates that the application of that model to the careers of women is not wholly appropriate. Life cycle elements, especially as they may be linked to childbearing and child-rearing, may be different for women and men. So too may the assumptions and perceptions of employers about the career capabilities of older women be different from those for older men. In short, when these women started later in their administrative careers, this factor then impacted throughout their careers. They were often stopped earlier, despite their own desires, by what may be another facet of the double standard of aging. Hence, the conceptualization of gender differentiated career pattern development is both supported and clearly age-linked. Further empirical work is needed in order to fully assess these effects and to ascertain whether these differences
will persist over time as younger women choose to enter administrative careers at earlier points in the life cycle.

C. Attribution-Related Conclusions

Personal attribution and the associated dynamic of risk-taking are also gender differentiated. Attribution addresses the issue of perceived power and control over life chances, i.e., to what extent does the individual perceive himself or herself as the predominant force in his or her own life, and thus in control of his or her career opportunities? An internal attribution characterizes individuals who have a sense of empowerment whereas an external attribution characterizes those individuals who credit forces outside themselves with determining outcomes. Gender role socialization, for reasons addressed in the review of the literature, prepares women for external attribution and men for internal attribution. These tendencies are supported within the present study.

The study of factors the subjects believe made the greatest contribution to their career development is one area of differentiated attribution. Men are more likely than women to identify personality variables, i.e., leadership skills, ambition, and interpersonal effectiveness as key elements in career advancement. Women, on the other hand, are more likely to name professional development activities such as association memberships, advanced degrees, and training seminars. Men, especially men who advance, view success as a product of their personalities. Women, even women who advance, view their success as more related to the possession of externally validating criteria. This distinction is the essence of the difference between
external and internal attribution. Moreover, this distinction is also
the essence of attempts to cope with a devalued status characteristic.
Men, who do not need to document their "fit" with the institution or
position by dissociating themselves from stereotypical gender assump­
tions, have greater freedom to focus on what they are as individuals.
Women, who must be more aware of the impact of their devalued group
status, must concentrate on providing evidence that they have "fit"
despite what they are assumed to be. Here then is an exceptionally
clear view of the way early gender role socialization is later
supported by institutional sexism in order to create gender differ­
entiated career opportunities.

Subjects were also asked to identify the principal reason
they left their prior posts. Men are more likely to indicate that the
impetus for leaving centered upon the lack of opportunity for profes­
sional growth. Women are more likely to cite reasons associated with
an inability to fulfill position responsibilities due to staff and
budget constraints. Again there is an internal (self) orientation for
men and an external (beyond self) orientation for women. When subjects
were asked to identify the position characteristics which were most
beneficial to career development, the priority ordering is different
for men than women. The priority order for men is: 1) variety of
tasks; 2) opportunity to innovate; and 3) opportunity to develop
leadership abilities. For women, the priority order is: 1) oppor­
tunity to develop leadership abilities; 2) variety of tasks; and 3)
opportunity to innovate. This different ordering may be a reflection
of the underlying internal versus external difference in orientation.
Men focus on gaining breath of experience within a context of risk-taking whereas women are interested in developing leadership traits in a context where these can be exercised across a range of responsibilities. Women may be more sensitive to the need for a post to directly provide leadership growth, given that leadership abilities represent an area of concern when the position incumbent is female. Women may also recognize that this is a crucial element of career advancement. Men do not tend to focus as directly upon this since it is more commonly assumed that men possess such abilities to lead. Women may also be less interested in innovation. They may be sensitive to the broader implication of failure, i.e., when a women fails in a non-traditional post, she fails for all women whereas a man's failure is his own.

In summary, the focus of women may be more present-oriented and more external. What is viewed as important in positions is tied to being perceived as competent at that time. Men may be more internal and future-oriented. Success in the responsibilities of the here and now is used as personal preparation for the future. Again, the more external and present-time focus is adopted by the newcomer who must continue to provide evidence that inclusion is appropriate. The interaction of this orientation toward self with the demands of newcomer status combines to create a gender differentiated definition of the situation. This definition supports a broader career focus for men and a narrower position focus for women. The implications of this distinction over the course of an individual's career are exceedingly powerful in determining moves and changes.
Personal risk-taking is also an issue within these attribution differences. The extent to which the person is willing to gamble on himself or herself when making a career move is the salient element. A person with a sense of internal attribution can take greater risk because he or she perceives that the power to succeed is vested in self. Leadership skills, ambition and interpersonal effectiveness, i.e., those traits named by men as crucial to their success, are highly portable and personally specific. Conversely, a person with a sense of external attribution is fearful of abandoning the known for the unknown because the power to succeed is vested outside the self in circumstances that may turn out to be less advantageous than those that are known, albeit constricting. Professional development activities, advanced degrees and training seminars, i.e., those traits named by women as crucial to their success, are contextual. In short, their value is more anchored by time and place. They tend to be specific to particular career lines. Movement then becomes more problematic. Here again is a double bind wherein one set of circumstances interacts with another to limit overall career development.

The outcome of these differences is perhaps most evident in the analysis of the two most dynamic movement cohorts: 1) those who left higher education administration entirely; and, 2) those who moved to new positions at other institutions. In the former case, 85% are men. In the latter case, 66.7% are men. The descriptive responses indicate that the issue is indeed at this individual level. These men, and also the women in these groups, are confident and challenged by risk and change. Age and marital status are not decisive variables.
It is a personal outlook on life and self that is crucial. The importance of this social psychological variable is then underscored. Gender differences in attribution are important distinctions when examining career pattern development.

D. Context-Related Conclusions

The impact of organizational features and bureaucratic structure on career development was a focal point of this study. The power of these intermediary structures is supported by findings that point toward broad gender similarity. Nonetheless, particular pockets of gender difference also appear. In short, the impact of overall context does affect both men and women; however, certain features carry gender differentiated impact.

Both men and women identify the same set of position and institutional characteristics as facilitating or hindering career advancement. Institutions where leadership is supportive and where there is a commitment to quality are identified as places that facilitate career development. Conversely, institutions where innovation is lacking, where there is limited opportunity for staff development, and where fiscal constraints are viewed as oppressive are seen by both men and women as hindering career movement. Likewise, both men and women find positions hindering career development when such posts have demanding yet repetitive tasks, have low or no mobility potential, have limited power, and have no opportunity for professional development. Advantageous posts are those which allow for innovation, personal growth in leadership ability, and demand a variety of tasks. Career development for these subjects is indeed tied to position and
institutional characteristics. This is so regardless of gender.
Context and content then do influence career development in identifiable ways.

Gender differences are however also evident. One area of difference is by the type of institution: university center, Arts and Science college or community college. It is clearly evident from the 1979 results, that institutional type is an important career determinant. Both gender differences and within gender differences for women are related to the community college milieu in ways that are not evident for the other two institutional types. In 1984, the community colleges again show a pattern not evident at the other sites. Among those subjects who shift positions at their home institutions, it is only at the community colleges that women in this movement cohort demonstrate any advancement. At the other institutions women who shift do so laterally or downward while men are able to advance. This is a noteworthy reversal of the 1979 finding where the community college context appeared to be the most restrictive for women, especially line personnel.

The community colleges also have the greatest number of people who leave higher education entirely. Fully 85% of those who left exited from community college posts. Of these subjects, 83% are men. No subject at a university center left higher education. The interaction of gender with institutional type appears to link the community colleges again with a pattern that is unique to this context. The differential impact now appears to support women who are already there and to not support men who are administrative incumbents. The factors
that men cite as reasons for leaving center upon the need for challenge and innovation. It will be important to trace the career pattern development of women over time in order to learn if a similar outcome occurs as women have more extensive experience within higher education administration. At present, many women are newcomers who are experiencing challenge within their current environments. The interaction of milieu with career pattern development is then a dynamic one, shifting over time as well as place.

Two differential patterns emerge at the Arts and Science colleges. The finding that older women aspire to advance from initial administrative posts but are unable to do so is most pronounced at this level. No woman in this circumstance was able to advance. This situation is not true for men overall, or for women at the other sites. In 1979, moreover, women at the Arts and Science colleges were recruited into administration from faculty posts more than from any other source, and more than at any other institutional type. Additionally, it is at the Arts and Science colleges that the subjects are almost exclusively clustered in the middle two age cohorts, 35-54 years old. It may be that mobility, especially for women, is limited when age and prior faculty status are combined. Access is possible since internal candidacy is often utilized. External movement to another institution may then be particularly constrained by the lack of extensive administrative experience needed to overcome employer resistance to the risk-taking involved in hiring a non-traditional and older person. What emerges then is a more static or conservative picture of administrative homogeneity at the Arts and Science colleges. It is
now at this level that women are finding greater career limitations in contrast to men and in contrast to women at other types of institutions.

Gender differences in movement patterns are also evident at the two most extreme levels of the bureaucratic structure: entry-level staff posts and high-echelon line posts. In contrast, positions at the middle management level evidence gender similarity in patterns of movement. Men in high-echelon line posts have traditional patterns of movement. They are stable at the top of their careers or they are successfully advancing. Women in these same posts are seeking movement, as yet unsuccessfully, or are electing retirement. This pattern reverses itself at the other end of the administrative hierarchy. Men are predominantly lateral movers or exiting higher education administration. Women are advancing or remaining by choice. The type and location of the position within the bureaucratic structure appear then to differentially effect the movement patterns of these men and women.

This pattern may be linked to other findings that point toward a picture of transition within higher education administration. The study of career pattern progression shows that younger respondents are likely to already be in their second or third administrative post. Moreover, the career profiles of younger men and women show greater gender similarity than for the older cohorts. These trends appear to be linked with the advent of the career administrator, i.e., the trained manager. In this context, younger women are finding both access to opportunity and the potential for career advancement. Moreover, these women, perhaps as a result of affirmative action, are
advancing more rapidly than younger men. These women now appear able to traverse traditional career pathways. Moreover, they are able to do so more successfully than their male contemporaries, and much more successfully than older women who entered administration through alternative routes and at a later point in the life cycle. These outcomes force a recognition that significant changes have occurred within higher education administration during the five year period, 1979 to 1984.

E. Career Pattern Effects

Systematic changes within higher education administration become more evident when particular career pattern effects are identified within the movement cohort analysis. There is a distinct shift in the utilization of the internal labor market. In 1979, this entry route was heavily employed by women. By 1984, for those who changed positions, the tendency to desire or to actually use the internal labor market is reduced substantially. Moreover, it is men not women who are the most frequent internal applicants when this option is exercised. This shift may well be tied to the overall changes in opportunity structure for younger versus older women, and women versus men.

The extent of stability and reported satisfaction within higher education administration is another major finding. The largest cohort is those individuals who stay and do not seek movement. Many of these respondents are expressly supportive of their positions and institutions. Additionally, market conditions for those who choose to move are positive. Subjects achieve mobility with only a limited number of applications. The only exception to this trend is for the
cohort of older women. Personal recruitment, especially for men exiting higher education administration, is a common search factor. The use of personal networks remains a more typically male alternative despite the recommendations within the mentoring literature that women increase their utilization of this technique (Welch, 1980; Wilson, 1977).

The movement cohort analysis shows no consistency among matched pairs. The profiles of similarly positioned administrators in 1979 could not predict any similarity of outcome in 1984. It appears from this sample that there is no uniform career ladder within higher education administration. Individual career pattern progression is not systematic from one post to another. In short, people in 1979 were in similar posts via different routes and continued to evidence this difference over the next five years. These findings have major implications for the recruitment and functioning of higher education administration. The changes in market conditions, the range of affirmative action commitments, and the impact of individual life cycle elements combine with this career line fluidity to create an image of an occupational sector which is both changing and idiosyncratic. This does hold the potential for expanding the opportunity structure. However, the lack of rationalization also poses problems of examination and implementation.

It is evident from the movement cohort analysis that like people make like movements. In other words, individuals with similar career and personal profiles make similar shifts, regardless of the particular post they occupy within the bureaucratic structure. This is especially true for the two most professionally dynamic cohorts,
those who moved to new institutions and those who left higher education administration. It is also true for the retirees who tend to enter administration later and retire earlier. This is especially true for older women who often retire in the face of an inability to advance as they desire. Moreover, a core of contented and committed people who retain their posts by choice is clearly evident. Individuals who move internally resemble these stayers. They do not share profile characteristics with the more dynamic movers. A willingness to leave the institution then appears to be a key ingredient in seeking career mobility.

This conclusion is further supported by the finding that those subjects who sought to move but who were unsuccessful are more like the successful movers than they are like the stayers. The unsuccessful seekers are not stayers but rather see themselves as movers and do indeed share characteristics with successful movers. These findings then support the idea that a clustering of individual and career attributes combines with structural changes within higher education administration to produce a pattern of movement which cannot be comprehended unless both levels of analysis are taken into account. This contention is further confirmed by the similarity of responses from the stayers versus the leavers when respondents are asked about position and organizational features that promote or retard career mobility. Leavers are more focused on issues of personal professional growth whereas stayers are more linked to general professional development activities. These features have already been identified as gender-based within the internal versus external attribution discussion. The
interactive effect of different levels of analysis in painting a picture of gender differentiated career development is apparent once again.

These individual and organizational factors are also housed within a broader societal context. Higher education responds to these social structural variables by a series of accommodations which obviously impact upon the career development of administrative incumbents. The opening of the opportunity structure facilitated by affirmative action mandates during the past ten years is one such variable. Several older women specifically commented upon affirmative action as a crucial element in attaining their 1979 post. Access however is not always followed by advancement. This is especially so for these subjects. A closer examination of these trends does indeed point toward problem areas in fulfilling the promise of full equality of opportunity.

The 1979 patterns of entry into higher education administration show a high percentage of women in their first administrative posts. Many of these women are in the two older cohorts and have been recruited from within the institution. Again, this is the group of women who are most dissimilar to their male cohorts in the same age range. These women are known by the institution and are therefore safe risks. The timing of their initial appointments supports the possibility that they were recruited in order to meet initial affirmative action mandates. Once in the initial post, these women, based upon the promotion itself, held expectations that further advancement was possible. However, when subsequent applications were made, advancement
was not achieved. One conclusion is that the institutions utilized these subjects to meet externally imposed requirements. However, the full spirit of those requirements, which is an open opportunity structure enabling career advancement over time, was not forthcoming.

This blocked opportunity structure is also evident within the application process. The structure of the application process, i.e., the number of applications submitted and the techniques employed by the applicants, shows no gender differences. However, the outcome is different. Men who search are more likely to be successful. In fact, the modal category for women who seek to change positions is unsuccessful seeking. It is then not the process which is gender differentiated but the outcome. Several of these unsuccessful seekers then choose retirement, a reflection, clearly stated by two subjects, of unfulfilled aspirations. The loss of developing talent within higher education administration is a crucial issue within this finding.

At the other end of the age range, most younger women who aspire to advance are able to do so. In fact, members of the youngest female cohort are pursuing traditional career pathways even more actively than their male counterparts. For these women the opening of the opportunity structure is facilitating true career mobility. These women have professionally come of age at the crucial moment: affirmative action opened opportunities; younger women are viewed by employers as more career oriented than in the past; and, the women themselves are the beneficiaries of a decade of women's rights activism. A review of the next five year goal pattern for these women indicates a continuing commitment and expectation of career mobility within higher education
administration. Men in the same age range also anticipate career mobility but often outside higher education administration. Given these patterns, recruitment and advancement within higher education administration over the next decade may evidence an increased participation of women moving into high-echelon line positions. This outcome is consistent with the traditional pattern established by the career development of men. Once again age is interacting in powerful ways with these broad cultural elements to constrain or facilitate career mobility.

F. Summary

Five major categories of results have been identified:
1) the interaction of age and gender as a determinant of career pattern development; 2) social psychological gender differences in the subjective orientation toward risk-taking and the attribution of success; 3) gender similarity and difference in the impact of organizational and bureaucratic structures on career mobility; 4) career effects as linked to the homogeneity of movement cohort findings; and, 5) the implications of these results for gender and age differentiation within the opportunity structure of higher education administration. These results now lead to a series of conclusions which have broad implications for both gender differentiated career patterns, and for the functioning of higher education over the next decade.
II. Conclusions: The Broad Implications

A. Introduction

The results summary supports the conclusion that gender differentiated career development patterns exist within higher education administration. While gender remains significant, the main effect of age also emerges as a crucial career determinant. The interactive effect of age and gender clarifies several trends related to career moves and changes. Other variables such as institutional type and attribution orientation are also important elements in comprehending movement. These findings then confirm the need to employ multiple levels of analysis in any study of career pattern development.

The results also point toward broader implications for administrative career mobility and for higher education as an institution. These general interpretations create a bridge between former expectations and future explorations. By examining each of these areas, the salient assumptions which anchor this study are identified. Other assumptions are noted which were not supported by the data. New constructs enter the emerging picture of career movement within administration. With these areas in mind, promising directions are charted so that future empirical efforts can augment this present understanding of career development patterns.

Several broad conclusions are particularly important to establishing the linkage between prior assumptions, current findings and future research. These assumptions organize the results by focusing attention upon three overall issues: 1) gender; 2) time; and, 3) context. The interweaving of social structural, organizational and
social psychological perspectives within these issues confirms again the importance of this integrated approach to studying career moves and changes.

B. Gender Considerations

1. Gender and Age: The power of the interactive effect of these two variables is the single most compelling conclusion from the present study. The premise of the entire project was that gender differentiation existed in administrative career development. The research goal was to uncover the dynamics of such differentiation so that the literature on career movement would no longer rest exclusively on the male model. Model construction would then be possible with the knowledge that divergent, i.e., dual, components exist in some areas of career development. Uniform components, or areas of gender similarity, would pertain in other model constructs. The paradigm would then reflect both gender differences and gender similarities.

Age is identified within the literature as an important career pattern variable. Focal career issues shift as an individual moves through the life cycle. The constraints on career movement in particular change over time as does the intensity of each competing life cycle factor. It was anticipated that certain factors, such as those related to marriage and childrearing, would interact with career movement in a gender-specific manner. While this was indeed supported by the findings, the overall power of age to influence career development, especially for women, was unanticipated.

Entering administration at a later age and being older to begin with are significant gender differences which have a lasting
impact upon career movement for women. In short, once women come to administration at both an older age and a later point in their career patterns, age is the central determinant of subsequent career development. It appears from the results that gender influences access but age influences advancement. This is especially so for women in the oldest cohort.

Several of the results then point toward age-related conclusions that must be both taken into account and tested in future empirical efforts. The main effect of age appears to have a differential impact on career development for men and women. The link between age and a particular career focus for women must be explored. Career elements for men and women in the same cohort must be compared and examined. Within gender differences for both men and women must also be identified. This more comprehensive treatment would permit the full impact of age-based differences to be delineated. It would also prevent the erroneous assumption that gender alone explains differential career outcomes. Gender is crucial. However, it is the interaction of gender and age which must be charted. Age is not experienced in the same way by men and women. Nor, is age viewed in the same way by external evaluators. The outcome of these distinctions is reflected in the differential career patterns identified in this study.

2. Gender Similarities and Within Gender Differences: The results also document the need to appreciate that gender similarities do exist and that within gender differences may be more compelling than differences between men and women. It was anticipated that
certain career elements would have a similar impact on movement regardless of gender. Most of these centered upon objective variables such as market conditions, type of institution and location within the bureaucratic structure. This assumption is not supported by the data. Gender differences are more often the outcome when these variables are examined. Gender similarity does however emerge within the subjective areas, such as the definitions of career enhancing position and institutional characteristics. It is in these areas that men and women share perceptions of what facilitates or interferes with career movement.

Gender similarity is also evident at the middle management level, both in terms of goal setting and career movement. Such findings underscore the complexity of studying gender as a career determinant. The effects do not persist, as expected, over time. Gender differences are evident in access, gender similarity at middle management levels, and then gender differences emerge again in top-echelon posts.

There is also dramatic gender similarity in many movement cohorts. Like people appear to make like moves regardless of gender. This is especially the case for the stable cohorts, those who stay by choice or who move internally. The constellation of common characteristics that bind these cohort members transcends gender. An assumption that career pattern development is so heavily influenced by gender that two separate models are needed is not supported by these findings. Further research is needed in order to ferret out the areas of difference and the areas of similarity so that a model is produced which incorporates both facets.
Any such model must also take into account the range of within gender differences uncovered by the present study. Age is of course a crucial explanatory variable for these differences. The dynamic nature of higher education as an institution also creates within gender differences based on longevity within administration. Younger women appear to be facing a changed opportunity structure as compared to older women. The perception of discriminatory practices is shifting. So too is the range of differences between younger men and women. Many gender differences do not persist from 1979 into 1984. Once entry is attained, gender similarities among career variables are often evident. Frequently the within gender differences for women are more graphic than the gender differences between men and women in similar age or movement cohorts. Career-related variables appear then to impact differentially upon women in different phases of the life cycle and in the long-term opening of the opportunity structure. Such differences separate women from one another more than from men. A recognition of the range of gender similarity and within gender differences must be addressed directly within subsequent research designs. In this study such findings emerge only within an exploratory context. Specific testing must occur before the full ramifications upon career development can be assessed.

3. The Impact of Gender Role Socialization: Gender role socialization is widely regarded in the literature as the most comprehensive explanation for differential career outcomes between men and women. A motivating premise for this project was to expand that narrow focus to also include social structural and bureaucratic elements in
the understanding of career development patterns. That goal was attained since several factors at these other two levels of analysis were shown to be crucial to comprehending gender differentiation in career moves and changes. It was also assumed that the different levels of analysis would have an interactive effect, although there were few signposts to guide the search for hypothesizing the direction of such outcomes.

The socialization process has, as the literature documents, a gender differentiated impact upon the attribution of success and failure by men and women. Independence and mastery training teaches boys to externalize failure and internalize success. Oversocialization of females tends to teach girls the opposite. The legacy of this training persists into adulthood and impacts upon the career development activities of men and women. Such linkages have traditionally been the basis of research in this area. The present study extends this analysis by merging the impact of these findings with dynamics at the bureaucratic level. The result is an illustration of how individual socialization patterns interact with organizational features to create a double bind which results in the continuation of institutional sexism.

The possession of a devalued status characteristic by each woman in an administrative role forces each incumbent to focus on attaining career components which offer external validation of her ability to do the job, i.e., each woman must prove she does not possess the negatively evaluated traits associated with being female. This condition is coupled with the impact of newcomer status and the
boundary maintenance activities which are activated by the arrival of a non-traditional incumbent. The premium is upon demonstrating competence each day in order to avoid the labeling process and to heighten the potential for inclusion. The focus for each woman, because of the nature of these organizational dynamics, must be upon the present and upon managing the impressions external evaluators make about her competencies.

This particular focus reinforces the limitations of the way women typically make success or failure attributions. Success is, realistically, largely determined by factors that are external, i.e., the possession of validating credentials and the dynamics of outsider status. Failure is also seen as personal since it is tightly linked to gender identity, i.e., at the most fundamental level, what you are is working against you. The likelihood that a woman in this circumstance could gain experiences which would encourage her to adopt the attribution process more associated with upward mobility is indeed slim.

Here then the interactive power of the levels of analysis is substantiated. This is the direction future research must explore. Enough has been done to document the influence of each separate level. Further efforts must focus upon the types of double bind effects that have just been discussed. Such effects create the perpetuation of gender differences in the opportunity for advancement. A web is woven which combines early gender role socialization with subsequent organizational dynamics to promote institutional sexism. Such forces constrain alternative efforts to open the opportunity structure. Such conflicting forces must be discerned in future studies. The three
levels of analysis then contain elements which work at cross purposes. Without clarifying these countervailing forces, the full nature of gender differentiation within career development patterns will remain obscured.

C. Time Considerations

1. Time and Career Pattern Progression: One assumption within the career development literature is that movement along a career line is anchored by time. Individuals move progressively from one post to another as they build career skills and experience. Movement along a career branch contains an underlying assumption that entry posts will tend to be staffed by younger incumbents, while positions at the top will almost always be staffed by older individuals. This is the classic model for career pattern progression. It was assumed that this model operated to a large extent within higher education administration. The current project clearly demonstrates that this is not the case. Systematic career line progression is not evident.

This conclusion is confirmed by several findings. Many subjects are recruited into middle to upper management posts from outside higher education. This is true for both men and women. It appears that prior experience within higher education administration is not a prerequisite to these posts. Moreover, women are often internal applicants into posts which bear little resemblance to their prior positions. Younger people are as likely as older subjects to be in their third or more administrative post and to report being at the top of their self-defined career ladders. All of these findings support the conclusion
that the traditional model of career pattern progression is not operating for these subjects.

Career lines and career pattern progression within higher education administration then appear to be very fluid, if they exist at all. Future research needs to concentrate on these issues. Studying career pattern development in a context where career lines are ambiguous poses concerns about the reliability of findings and subsequent conclusions. It also makes focusing upon opening the opportunity structure more problematic since stable processes of access and advancement do not exist.

This conclusion is also supported by the analysis of movement by matched pairs. It was anticipated that men and women who were matched by institutional type and by position title would show similar patterns of movement over the five year period. This was rarely the case. Career information gathered in 1979 could not predict 1984 outcomes. Matched pairs went in separate directions during the five year period. It was also evident that people who were matched often had divergent backgrounds. Yet, even if the backgrounds were divergent, once both incumbents were in a similar post on a career line, similar movement would be predicted if career progression was tied to a stable structure. Since this did not occur, the conclusion remains that higher education administration does not appear to have such a stable structure. Individuals come to posts with different backgrounds and then move in different directions. There are no threads of continuity that run through these analyses. Future research needs to confirm and
specify these tentative indicators of a fluid structure' for career development within higher education administration.

2. Time and Structural Effects: Broad structural or cultural effects have major impacts upon institutions. Shifts over time result from these forces. However, a span of five years is a relatively short period when assessing institutional accommodation to such forces. It was not hypothesized that shifts in some of these areas would occur during the study. It was also not anticipated that the outcomes would be evident in an assessment of gender differentiated career patterns. However, changes did occur and these shifts underscore the rapidity with which change in higher education can occur. The importance of including the study of structural effects in any future research effort is evident from these analyses.

The shift in the use of the internal labor market is one significant finding. Overall market conditions within higher education administration do not appear to have markedly altered in the five year period. However, hidden within what appears to be continuity over time is a major change. In 1979, women were heavy users of internal candidacy in order to attain positions. By 1984, this route was not actively utilized by either men or women. Moreover, men were actually more likely to use this avenue than women. It is unclear what factors influence this change. Further work must be done in order to learn the reasons and the forces which contribute to this shift.

The impact of affirmative action within higher education also appears to have shifted during the five year period. Older women specifically named affirmative action mandates as crucial to their
entry into higher education administration. However, it is this same group of women who are the most unsuccessful in attaining their advancement aspirations. For them, affirmative action permitted entry but did not support mobility. This pattern is also evident for some younger men. Younger women however are able to advance when they desire to do so. It then appears that changes have occurred in the way affirmative action mandates are executed. Such outcomes are having a differential impact upon older versus younger women, and upon men versus women. It is evident that a dual opportunity structure exists and that it is much more dynamic than envisioned.

These two areas highlight the need to incorporate changing structural elements into any future work. The operationalization of such factors is a formidable problem. Yet, the importance of these features cannot be put aside. The combination of unsystematic career line progression with the dynamic nature of structural elements such as market conditions and affirmative action enforcements, forces a further recognition of the complexity of studying career pattern development. The phenomenon is complex. Simplifying it by studying only certain elements distorts the knowledge base. It is this interactive nature that incumbents must confront. It is this interactive nature which must then be fully explored. Time-sequencing must be an integral component of any study of career development. Also, the particular era within which the study is done must be identified as an analytic variable, not just a static background feature. Longitudinal studies that take these interactive issues into account are then the preferred
research design for studying career pattern development, whether or not it is gender differentiated.

D. Context Considerations

1. Objective Context Elements: The original premise of the study assumed that contextual elements would influence career moves and changes. Again, the goal was to move away from explanations of gender differences which focused exclusively on the characteristics of the individual. Two context variables were used systematically throughout the study: type of institution and type of position. Both heavily contributed to an increased understanding of career movement.

The review of the literature identified contextual differences between the two and four year schools. This dichotomy was broadened to reflect the three distinct institutional categories within the State system. That separation proved to be important within the analysis.

The results show contextual differences do matter. In 1979, the community colleges operated to constrain entry and advancement for women in ways that were different from men, and different from women at the other institutions. By 1984, the community colleges were the least restrictive environment for women. It was the Arts and Science colleges, but not the university centers, where women were experiencing the greatest difficulty in advancing. On the other hand, the community colleges had the largest percentage of their incumbents leaving higher education entirely. In contrast, no one at the university centers left higher education.
These results merely underscore the range of significant findings which is anchored by institutional context. This study employed institutional type as a control variable in order to assess the differential impact of gender on various career variables. The reoccurring evidence supporting the importance of context makes it imperative that the type of institution be viewed as a zero-order independent variable. The impact of institutional type, regardless of gender, needs further exploration.

The type of position was another contextual variable introduced into the study. In 1979, a line and staff dichotomy was utilized. Important differences did emerge but not as dramatically as for the type of institution variable. That outcome is now understood within the context of the fluid career lines and unpredictable career pattern progression within higher education administration. In the 1984 follow-up study, significant results emerge when the location of the post within the bureaucratic hierarchy is studied. Gender differences are evident at the entry level and at the upper echelon level. Gender similarities are evident within the middle levels. These results confirm the importance of studying the objective features of the position itself as an element in career movement. However, the current results are merely indicative. They hint at an area of potential importance. The extent to which the objective features of the post are a significant factor in the study of career movement awaits further empirical work.

The variable of size of the institution was noted by several subjects as a factor which contributed to career development.
In some cases it appeared the person saw small size as advantageous while in other cases it was large size. This was not gender differentiated. The respondent often merely noted size as a feature without specifying the exact size. It was also not clear whether small to some respondents might be large to other subjects. Since this was a retrospective question, it was not possible to assume the present institution was the referent for the respondent. The impression is then that size does matter but the dynamics are not assessable. This variable needs to be included in future work so that the indications made by these respondents can be fully understood. This variable along with the other two under discussion demonstrate that objective contextual features are important career determinants which aid in comprehending differential outcomes.

2. Subjective Context Elements: Objective context elements were included in the study and were hypothesized as factors tied to gender differentiated outcomes. The issue of the power of other, more subjective, contextual elements was not raised in the research design. Fortunately, several questions were asked about enhancing and retarding career influences. What emerges from this analysis is a strong picture of the subjective position and institutional characteristics that assist or dampen career mobility. Gender similarity is dramatically evident. Repeatedly subjects focus upon the same contextual elements. Positions need to provide task variety, innovation and the exercise of leadership. Institutions need to be committed to excellence and need to provide a sense of community to their staffs. As further confirmation, the hindering factors are the reverse of these positive features.
The importance of including these subjective elements cannot be stated too strongly. In this exploratory study they represent the most consistent results. They are also the area of greatest gender similarity. For both of these reasons, these subjective elements must now be a part of any study of career development. Movement patterns are clearly associated with the possession of these positive features. The movement cohort with the strongest clustering of these positive features is the group whose members advanced within higher education administration.

Context is then important. Objective features must be taken into account. Yet, it is within the subjective contextual features that the greatest power to influence career pattern development appears to reside. Distinctions between those who advance and those who do not, regardless of gender, appear linked to the more subjective milieu elements. The perception of power and the ability to experience professional growth are crucial. Subsequent studies that incorporate both objective and subjective contextual elements will move toward grasping the full picture of the way milieu supports or hinders career pattern development.

E. Summary

Each of the foregoing considerations makes it apparent that the original hypothesis incorporating multiple levels of analysis is valid. Comprehending gender differentiation in career pattern development requires an awareness of the interaction of social psychological, organizational, and social structural variables. Such an understanding must also be time-specific. The external forces acting upon higher education
produce career outcomes which are unique to a particular period. In order for equality of opportunity to both exist and persist these dynamics must be known and assessed on a continuing basis. Applied adaptations can now move higher education toward fulfilling the promise of access and advancement for all individuals. Gender differentiation need not result in gender discrimination and the ensuing loss of administrative talent. It is through the application of this knowledge about career development patterns that action can come to reaffirm institutional and societal commitment to full participation for any person who aspires to a career within higher education administration.

III. Applied Outcomes

A. Introduction

Significant gender differences and similarities in career pattern development have been identified. The conclusions underscore the existence of career elements that impact upon men and women in gender specific ways. The project has then achieved its initial goal of broadening our understanding of career movement within higher education. A second goal is the application of the knowledge derived from these efforts. These results can now be utilized to the benefit of both individual administrators and higher education as an institution. It is with this latter goal in mind that attention now focuses upon pertinent applications of the project results.

The three levels of analysis continue to provide the basis for this endeavor. One applied potential within each of the major areas, social structural, organizational and social psychological, is discussed.
The issue of equality of opportunity remains the overriding applied consideration at the structural level. Gender differences in access and movement were a major empirical focus. Particular findings can now be oriented toward opening the opportunity structure so that greater equality is introduced into areas where it may not currently exist.

The applied emphasis at the organizational level is upon the techniques management can employ in order to increase the position characteristics which facilitate career development and satisfaction for employees. Tied to this is the need to build the previously discussed sense of community at the institutional level. Lastly, at the level of the individual, the applications are in the areas of career counseling and career planning. The study identified the factors most strongly related to career movement. Individuals interested in such movement are advised to integrate those elements into their own career development. Gender-specific recommendations are made. Such career planning is especially appropriate since many of the factors are within the control of the individual. A concentrated exploration of each of these three applied outcomes is now presented.

B. Social Structural

The extent and nature of equality of opportunity within an occupational sector is partially represented by the likelihood of career movement for any individual within that sector. The present study produced results which point toward aspects of the opportunity structure within higher education administration that merit closer examination. The assumption that gender differences in career pattern development exist because of blocked opportunities for women was
supported. The utilization of affirmative action legislation by older women in order to gain access was noted. This is consistent with the beginning phase of any attempt to open a system to previously devalued group members. However, results which show gender similarity among younger cohorts indicate a system which is no longer in this beginning phase of accommodation. Adjustments within the system have occurred. An intermediary stage has been reached where it appears men and women are both beneficiaries of the opportunity structure; however, men benefit at the end of their careers and women at the beginning.

A sensitivity to this dual nature of the opportunity structure must be incorporated within the hiring process. It is now known that the likelihood of career movement is dependent upon different factors for men than for women. While it is true that equality of opportunity does not mean that identical opportunity must exist, a sensitivity to these differences is needed if equality is to be assured. For example, the impact of age and newcomer status is especially destructive to the advancement aspirations of older women. There is no such impact upon older men. Additionally, the results of the five year follow-up study show men more likely than women to be internal institutional candidates into their next post. This is a dramatic reversal of the 1979 findings. These particular findings do indicate a gender differentiated opportunity structure. However, at this stage of accommodation, it is no longer one which only benefits men and excludes women. It is much more complex.

These issues are then important considerations which must be addressed within the screening and selection process. Affirmative
action guidelines must be retained. However, the focus of attention must be adjusted to take into account changes in the system. A review of these guidelines with emphasis upon implementing policies and procedures that speak to a dual opportunity structure, indicative of an intermediary stage of accommodation, is needed. Equality of opportunity must exist for both men and women. A reversal of exclusionary practices so that the previous beneficiaries are now victimized is still discriminatory. The subtle nature of the differential impact of the opportunity structure must be identified. It can then be taken into account within hiring and promotion activities.

It is also important to be sensitive to areas of gender similarity. Such areas indicate points where adjustment has been successful or where institutionalized patterns are powerful enough to impact upon all candidates regardless of gender. One area of gender commonality is in the career movement profile at the middle management level. This is in contrast to patterns of gender difference at the lower and upper management levels. Both men and women in middle management have five year career patterns marked by stability. Career movement typically demands that time be spent in a single post while skills are fine-tuned and career commitments firmly established. Life cycle elements, such as those related to childrearing, also interact with these same career building needs to reinforce a pattern of stability for both men and women. Similarity then reflects the interactive power of both career and life cycle factors to influence patterns of movement regardless of gender. The opportunity structure is not unidimensional but dynamic.
Such complexity poses added difficulties in maintaining both access and advancement opportunities for men and women.

Gender equity is then raised as one applied focus for these research results. The findings can be used to heighten our sensitivity to the complex and dual nature of the opportunity structure. Such an understanding can encourage a concerted effort to take into account these areas of difference in the hiring and promotion process. Moreover, the recognition that such differences may obscure similarities which produce differential interaction effects has been noted. All of these points combine to underscore the need to promote a continuing vigilance aimed toward avoiding the traditional problems of personal prejudice and institutional sexism. Over-accommodation, which could result in reverse discrimination, must also be monitored. An opportunity structure in an intermediary phase of accommodation can produce the varying circumstances evident in the analysis. Further adjustments will occur. These also must be evaluated so that equity is sustained.

In a dynamic system there is no final solution. The issue of attaining gender equity is rather one of continuing resolution. Future research is needed in order to document these changes.

C. Organizational

The second applied potential is in organizational management. The results indicate that specific steps can be taken to improve the level of productivity and employee satisfaction within any institution. Contextual elements within the worksite were repeatedly noted as salient career influences. Several position characteristics were linked with positive career outcomes by the respondents. The sense of
community personnel sought was clearly related to the extent the individual employee believed what he or she did mattered at the institution. Each of these areas represents spheres over which management has some control. Whether management recognizes this elective power and then chooses to implement supportive policies and procedures is the issue.

The results identified three core position characteristics these subjects believe contributed to their professional growth: task variety; innovation without fear of failure; and, the exercise of leadership abilities within program development and personnel supervision. It is true that every organization must have certain onerous tasks completed. However, it is also true that a management team focusing on the positive elements of position responsibilities can exercise leadership in a manner which signals employees that sensitivity to their circumstance exists. The benefits of this approach can produce a ripple effect, creating the sense of community which enables an institution to be its most vital. The commitment to excellence subjects spoke about as binding them to their colleges and universities would then exist.

A specific recommendation will be considered as an illustration of the type of change needed. Position characteristics need to be the focus of an annual or on-going review. The responsibilities of each post must be examined. This should not be tied to an individual's performance evaluation. Among the crucial questions would be: 1) What tasks previously considered to be important could be deleted either permanently or temporarily? What new ones, if any, need to be added? 2) How could remaining tasks be done differently or in a different
sequence? Could especially onerous tasks be completed in new ways? 3) What new programs or techniques for expanding or improving services could be tried? Could these be tied to personnel evaluation only if they succeeded? 4) What are the career goals of the incumbent? How could the responsibilities of the present post be shifted to aid in reaching those goals? 5) How could authority be exercised and delegated so that staff development is enhanced? and, 6) In what ways is the present organizational structure and operation interfering with role fulfillment? What is recommended is a yearly position performance evaluation, not the typical individual performance evaluation. The results support the contention that position dynamics are a crucial element of career development. Bureaucratic structures pass through stages of institutionalization and can become over rationalized. Position performance evaluations could function to minimize the more destructive aspects of this process.

This recommendation would work toward enhancing each of the organizational factors deemed important by the respondents. Individual employees would know that management is interested in what they do, not merely whether it is done. Position responsibilities would change. Innovation would be encouraged in ways which take into account the talents of the incumbent. Additionally, a sense of community would be fostered since the process forces a two-way flow of communication between higher echelon management, administrators, and their staffs. In this way the contextual features identified as crucial milieu considerations would be consciously developed within the organization.
D. Social Psychological

A final application is at the personal or social psychological level. New approaches to career counseling and career planning are direct outcomes of the present findings. Career counseling requires a knowledge base of the employment sector and of the particular person. Specific planning can then occur based upon the career goals of the individual. In this context, a discussion of the gender differentiated factors within administrative career development is needed. Each person needs to heighten his or her sensitivity to career elements, especially those beyond the level of the individual. Decisions about which elements related to career mobility are most open to the exercise of individual control need to be made. The individual would then be in a position to make informed choices about his or her career pattern development.

The goal and attainment profiles provide one source of career counseling information. It is commonly assumed that developing a five-year goal focus is a productive career planning activity. The results indicate that the relationship between goal setting and actual attainment of that goal is relatively weak. It appears much more important to establish working guidelines that maintain options and encourage flexibility. Many subjects moved in unanticipated directions. This was true even for those who indicated a desire for stability. Additionally, people who changed positions, especially those who left higher education or who moved to new institutions, reported high levels of satisfaction with their new posts. Goal setting then need not be overly emphasized, especially in an employment sector with fluid career
lines. A sensitivity to the subjective content of a desired position is far more the crucial issue. Advancement within a particular occupational sector appears less important than locating a post where the position characteristics complement the individual and where those characteristics promote career development.

It is clear however that age is related to career goals and attainments. Goals did focus more on stability and retirement as subjects moved through the age ranges. However, this was not uniform and did show gender differentiation. In particular, older women were interested in career advancement but were unable to attain the desired mobility. Older men were interested in stability but often moved despite their goal statements. Career counseling activities need to discuss the impact of age on career development. Career planning activities must incorporate the issues of age and gender. For instance, techniques could be recommended in order to assist the older woman in combatting the double standard of aging. All of these ideas would apply the results so that particular individuals could understand the forces impinging upon career development. Each person could then plan specific techniques to achieve his or her desired career outcomes.

The individual would also be made aware of the position and institutional characteristics which appear to be associated with career development. The person might then seek to change positions to a post where such traits exist. At a minimum, he or she could actively strive to implement such features into his or her present post and institution. This area of counseling and planning then involves an application of the impact of organizational and social structural features upon career
advancement. Too often individuals are not aware of these broader issues. Sensitivity to these issues by recognizing their impact and endeavoring to respond in a positive fashion to their power is encouraged.

The personal possession of social psychological factors related to career development also needs assessment. Attribution tendencies, for example, are one focus of this phase of career counseling. A person with external success attribution would be advised about the limitations of this orientation. If mobility is a career goal, specific steps would be charted in order for the person to cultivate activities and characteristics in the direction of internal attribution. This need not require personality reconstruction. It is attainable by encouraging skill development in three specific areas: 1) assertiveness training; 2) management communication skills; and, 3) professional development activities that are personally enhancing. Each of these prepares the person to act in ways that promote career mobility. These activities would greatly assist the individual who, without such knowledge and planning, is less likely to experience the career movement he or she seeks, and less likely to be knowledgeable about the reasons for that failure.

The current research has thus aided in the identification of important applied outcomes. Gender equity has been expanded by the more open opportunity structure for women. The results also underscore the importance of change over time. The administration of policies and procedures oriented toward ensuring equality of opportunity for every applicant and incumbent must be constantly monitored. The
possibility of position performance evaluations is raised as an application of the results. This would maximize the positive features of institutions and organizations identified as important to career development. Finally, the results are especially applicable to the areas of career counseling and career planning. A knowledge of the factors related to career movement allows for informed choices. With informed choices, each person is more able to exercise control over his or her own career development. He or she is also able to influence the circumstances that affect the careers of others through the institutional policies and organizational structures that exist within higher education administration.

It is now evident that the results can be incorporated into the operational procedures of institutions and organizations. They can also be utilized to improve individual career counseling and planning. Institutions can apply the knowledge gained to enhance the equality of opportunity within the processes of hiring and promotion. Organizations can directly work to create the sense of shared mission and employee satisfaction so crucial to the positive contextual features of the workplace. Individuals can utilize the knowledge to better understand the forces that govern career pattern development and can, as a consequence, plan for their own career movement. If these three specific applications are implemented, the benefits to individual administrators and to higher education in general can be realized. New knowledge can again be generated and subsequent research can further enhance the understanding of gender differentiated career development patterns within higher education administration.
V. Summary

The foregoing results and conclusions provide an improved understanding of the mechanism of career pattern development. Specific results combine to demonstrate the interactive power of career variables. Linkages between the levels of analysis are identified. The range of gender similarity as well as gender differentiation is outlined. Lastly, the major implications arising from the focal issues of gender, age, and context are delineated. Based upon these conclusions, it is crucial to continue to reformulate theoretical positions and to encourage future empirical efforts.

The constant process of change occurring within each of the three levels of analysis further confirms the importance of continuous study. Major changes occurred in the five year time-frame of this study. It is anticipated that further changes will occur over any subsequent period of time. While the present conclusions are important in focusing attention on the interaction of social structural, organizational and social psychological variables within career movement, they are anchored to the particular time period, 1979 to 1984. This is made even more evident by the conclusion that the system has moved to an intermediary stage of accommodation with respect to the entry of women and other minority group members into administrative ranks. Future study needs to follow subsequent changes as these processes continue.

The current research also aids in the identification of important applied outcomes. Gender equity has been expanded by the opportunity structure becoming more open to women. The results underscore the importance of change over time in the administration of policies and
procedures oriented toward ensuring equality of opportunity for every applicant and incumbent. At the organizational level, the possibility of position performance evaluations is raised as an application which would maximize the positive features of institutions and organizations. Finally, the present results are especially applicable to the areas of career counseling and career planning. Knowledge of factors related to career movement allows for informed choices to be made. With informed choices, each person is more able to exercise control over his or her own career development.

The conclusions thus add to our knowledge in ways which have direct application. They demonstrate the utility of the multi-factor analysis of career movement. They identify new directions for theory development and methodological adjustment. The information can be added to the literature within this area in order to broaden our understanding of the range and complexity of the relationships involved in any assessment of career pattern development. The goal of the exploratory study is attained. A continuation of the present effort is encouraged by the range of findings. The project fulfilled its mission of knowledge expansion, significant application, and a heightening of theoretical and research curiosity. It is hoped that the merging of such goals will produce an even greater understanding of these forces so that men and women within administration can function in ways that contribute to the improvement of the institution of higher education within our society.
Appendix A

1979 Matched Pair Listing

UNIVERSITY CENTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIR NUMBER</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dean, School of Health Professions</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Dean, School of Health Professions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director, Personnel</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director, Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Budget Officer</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director, Budget and Financial Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Associate Vice President, Student Affairs</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Associate Vice President, Student Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director, University Relations</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director, University Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Personnel Associate</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Personnel Associate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director, University Health Service</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director, Student Health Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Affirmative Action Officer</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Affirmative Action Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vice President, Student Affairs</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vice President, Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**University Centers (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIR NUMBER</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bursar</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bursar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOUR YEAR COLLEGES OF ARTS AND SCIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIR NUMBER</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dean of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Dean, Natural and Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dean, Liberal Studies</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Dean for Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director, Institutional Research</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director, Institutional Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bursar</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bursar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director, Public Relations</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director, Public Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vice President and Provost</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Academic Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director of Health Service</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director, Health Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>College Registrar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Four Year Colleges of Arts and Science (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIR NUMBER</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Executive Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director, Career Planning and Placement</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Acting Director, Career Planning and Placement</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director of Placement</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director, Placement</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director, Instructional Resources</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Coordinator for Instructional Resources</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director of Financial Aid</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director of Financial Aid</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vice President, Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vice President, Academic Programs</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Executive Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director, Financial Aid</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Financial Aid Officer</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President, Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director of College Libraries</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director of Libraries and Coordinator of Instructional Services</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Four Year Colleges of Arts and Science (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIR NUMBER</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director of the Student Union</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Associate Dean for College Activities and Director of the College Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: Out of sequence—was included with Community Colleges

### Community Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIR NUMBER</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director, Publications and Public Relations</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Public Relations Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director of Admissions</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director of Admissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Assistant Dean to the President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>College Registrar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director of Admissions</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director of Admissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAIR NUMBER</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>TYPE OF POST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director of Public Information</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director of Public Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director of Libraries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Library Director and Professor</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dean of Curriculum</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Dean of Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dean of Instruction</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Dean of Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director of Admissions</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director of Admissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Associate Academic Dean, Community Services</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Assistant Dean, Community Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Academic Dean</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Academic Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director, Community Services</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director, Division of Community Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director, Information Services</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director of Information Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Coordinator, Community Services</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Coordinator, Special Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAIR NUMBER</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>TYPE OF POST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Head Librarian</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Head Librarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Assistant Dean of Instruction</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Assistant Dean of Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director of Records</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director, Student Activities</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director of Student Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Personnel Director</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director of Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Registrar and Coordinator of Institutional Research</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director, Student Activities</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director of Student Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director, Learning Resources Center</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director, Library Learning Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director, Continuing Education</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director of Continuing Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAIR NUMBER</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>TYPE OF POST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director, Campus Center</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director, College Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: Four Year College - included at end of that listing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIR NUMBER</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Associate Dean of Administrative Affairs</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Associate Dean of Administrative Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIR NUMBER</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Executive Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Executive Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIR NUMBER</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Community Services</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Community Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIR NUMBER</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Associate Academic Dean</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Associate Academic Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIR NUMBER</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Coordinator of Grants</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Coordinator, State and Federal Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIR NUMBER</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director of Learning Resources Center</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Associate Dean of Learning Resources Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIR NUMBER</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director of Continuing Education</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director, Continuing Education and Community Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIR NUMBER</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>TYPE OF POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director of the Library</td>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director, Library Learning Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Sample 1979 Questionnaire

No._____

RESEARCH SURVEY ON CAREER PATTERNS
OF SIMILARLY POSITIONED ADMINISTRATORS

The information requested in the following items will be used to identify and analyze factors related to the career development patterns of administrators in similarly titled positions. All responses will be treated in a manner which will insure complete anonymity and confidentiality. Please respond to all items in this questionnaire which apply to you. Most items can be answered with a check mark or a brief phrase.

PART 1: CAREER PATTERNS

A. CURRENT POSITION: Please answer questions 1-8 in relation to the position you now hold.

1. Title of current position______________________________

2. Position title of your immediate supervisor______________

3. Length of time in position, including this year (in years)____

4. Current salary (before taxes, excluding fringe benefits, consulting/lecture fees, etc.)

5. Employment status for this position____Full-time;____Part-time;____Other (please specify)__________________________

6. Type of position
   ____Line (principally supervisory and policy setting responsibilities)
   ____Staff (principally support functions even if some supervision/policy formation)
   ____Other (please specify)__________________________

7. Type of initial appointment to this position
   ____Acting (temporary);____Permanent;____Other (please specify)__________________________

8. As you recall the entire process involved in obtaining your present position, what one aspect of the process or personal/professional attribute do you feel was the most instrumental in your being hired? (Please list in priority order if more than one).
8. PRIOR POSITION: Please answer questions 9-16 in relation to the last full-time position, in or outside education, you held before you received your present appointment. (If your current position is the first full-time position you have held, go to Section D, Q-28.)

9. Title of position

10. Position title of the immediate supervisor of this position

11. Year of appointment to this position

12. Length of time in position (in years)

13. In what state, province or foreign country was the institution/organization located?

14. Type of employer

   Academic: ___2-yr. College; ___4-yr. College;
   ___University

   Government: ___Federal; ___State; ___Local

   Private Industry: ___Profit; ___Non-profit

   Other

   Check both if appropriate:
   ___State-system institution
   ___Current institution

15. Type of position ___Line; ___Staff; ___Other (please specify)

16. Type of movement from this position to your current position

   ___Vertical UP (a move which increased your power, relative salary and/or prestige)

   ___Vertical DOWN (a move which decreased your power, relative salary and/or prestige)
Lateral (a move which put you at about the same level of power, relative salary and/or prestige)

The positions are too dissimilar to make an assessment

Other (please specify)

C. FIRST POSITION: Please answer questions 17-24 in relation to the first full-time position you held in college administration.

My current position is my first full-time position in college administration

My prior position (already discussed) was my first full-time position in college administration

IF CHECKED, please go to Section D, Q-25.

17. Title of first position -------------------

18. Position title of the immediate supervisor of this position

19. Year of appointment _________________

20. Length of time in the position (in years) _________________

21. Type of institution (please check as many as apply)

2-yr. College; 4-yr. College; University;
State-system institution; Current institution

22. Type of position Line; Staff; Other (please specify)

23. In what state, province or foreign country was the institution located?

24. Type of movement from this position to the next position you held Vertical—UP; Vertical—DOWN; Lateral;
Too dissimilar to assess; Other (please specify)

D. ADDITIONAL CAREER INFORMATION: Please answer questions 25-30 in relation to further aspects of your overall career development pattern.

25. During the period from your first full-time position in college administration to your present position, were you ever employed
in a full-time position outside college administration?
____ NO; ____ YES (please specify type of employer, type of position, title and dates)

26. During the period from your first position in college administration to your present position, was there ever a period (or periods) when you were not employed full-time?
____ NO; ____ YES (please specify the dates, amount of time, and the nature of the activity you were involved in during this/these period(s))

27. Please indicate the position title of the last full-time position you held BEFORE you entered college administration
____ I have never been employed full-time outside college administration

28. In reviewing your career development pattern, what key elements, decisions, relationships or motivating factors need to be included in order to understand how you came to be where you are today?

29. In reviewing your career development pattern, what would you identify as the greatest obstacle (or obstacles) you faced in getting to where you are today?

30. When you think about your future, what is the activity, position title, or type of position you hope to be in five years from today?

PART 2: EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

Please complete the following educational summary beginning with the highest degree attained (include ABD):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>DEGREE EARNED</th>
<th>DATE EARNED</th>
<th>SUBJECT AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year graduated from high school__________________________
31. During the past five years, how many professional books, monographs or articles have you had accepted for publication?
   Books; Monographs; Articles; Other (please specify)

32. Please indicate the number of regional, national or international professional societies/associations you are currently a member of
   are or have been an officer of in the past five years

33. How many papers have you presented before regional, national or international societies/associations in the past two years?
   (Please circle)
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 +15

34. Which of the following have you done during the past two years?
   (Please check as many as apply)
   served on a local civic or political committee
   served as a paid consultant on issues in higher education
   published one or more administrative or policy statements in the area of higher education
   served on a college accreditation visitation team
   developed a research study or scholarly inquiry
   developed a major (+100,000) funded grant in the area of higher education
   Other (please specify)

PART 3: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

35. Your sex: Male; Female

36. Your year of birth

37. Your race/ethnic status (check one): White; Black; Asian; Native American; Hispanic; Other (please specify)
38. Your present marital status:

-___Never married

-___Married - Year Married

-___Divorced - Year Divorced

-___Widowed - Year Widowed

-___Legally separated - Year separated

-___Separated - Year separated

-___Other (please specify)

Year this marriage occurred

39. Has your marital status changed during the period from your first position in college administration to your present position? No; Yes

IF YES, please describe the change(s) as well as the dates involved:

40. Number of children you have had? (Please circle)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 +10

Year of each child's birth:

Of these children, how many live with you on a daily basis?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE A SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY, PLEASE FILL OUT THE ENCLOSED ADDRESS FORM AND RETURN IT WITH THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.
Appendix C

Sample 1984 Personnel Office Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME AND TITLE</th>
<th>YES, s/he is still employed by this institution</th>
<th>NO, s/he has left the institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is his/her title the same as listed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>His/her last forwarding address is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes   No</td>
<td>If no, please state his/her new title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is his/her title the same as listed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>His/her last forwarding address is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes   No</td>
<td>If no, please state his/her new title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is his/her title the same as listed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>His/her last forwarding address is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes   No</td>
<td>If no, please state his/her new title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
Sample 1984 Follow-Up Questionnaire

No._____

FOLLOW-UP STUDY ON CAREER PATTERNS OF HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS

The information requested in the following items will be used to identify and analyze factors related to the career development patterns of higher education administrators. All responses will be treated in the analysis in a manner which will insure complete anonymity and confidentiality.

SECTION I: CURRENT STATUS

When I contacted you in the Fall of 1979 the position you held was:

__________________________________ at ______________________________

Please answer the following questions as they relate to your career since that time.

1. Are you presently employed at the same institution as in 1979?
   ____ Yes--Please go to the next question.
   ____ No--Please go to question 3.

2. Are you presently employed in the same position you held in 1979?
   ____ Yes, my title and responsibilities are essentially the same. Please go to question 4.
   ____ No, my present position is entirely different. My title is ________________________________.
      Please go to question 4.
   ____ No, my present position is somewhat different in that______________________________.
      My title is ________________________________.
      Please go to question 4.

3. Please complete the following phrase which best describes your present situation.
   1. I am employed full-time at ________________________________ and my current title is ________________________________
   2. I am a full-time student or intern at ________________________________ in the Program of ________________________________
3. I retired in ____. If you are presently involved in higher education in some way please state how: ____________________________

4. Other circumstance (please explain) ____________________________

Please complete the rest of the questionnaire as it applies to your situation.

4. Do you consider your present position to be:

____ an entry position on your career ladder (a sequence of progressively more responsible positions leading to a high echelon administrative post)

____ an intermediate position on your career ladder

____ the top position on your career ladder

____ a position which is not on the career ladder you hope to pursue

____ a position not on your career ladder because you do not have employment plans that fit the career ladder concept

____ other (please specify) ____________________________

SECTION II: SEARCH ACTIVITIES

If you have changed positions since 1979 or if you have submitted applications for other positions even though you are still in the same post, please answer questions 5 through 9.

If you have not sought to move from your 1979 position, please state the two most important factors in your decision to remain in your present position and then go to question 16.

1. ____________________________

2. ____________________________

5. About how many applications for a new position have you submitted in all of your search activities over the past five years: ________

What is the title of the position you most frequently sought:

________________________________________________________

If you have left higher education administration, what were the two most important reasons for this decision:

1. ____________________________

2. ____________________________
6. In your search activities were you ever offered a position?
   ____ YES, and I accepted
   ____ YES, and I rejected the offer
   ____ NO, I was never offered a post

   If YES, please state the two most important factors in your
decision to accept or reject the offer.
   If NO, please state the two most important factors you believe
contributed to your not being offered a post.
   1. ______________________________
   2. ______________________________

7. During your search activities, what were the three principal sources
   of position information you used?
   1. ______________________________
   2. ______________________________
   3. ______________________________

8. In your search activities, were you ever an internal applicant
   (applied for a different position at your own institution)?
   ____ Yes, that is the only type of application I've submitted.
   ____ Yes, along with the external applications I've submitted
     elsewhere.
   ____ No.

9. In your search activities, did you ever apply to another institution
   within the State system (other than your own institution)?
   ____ YES—In each case, please indicate the number of such applica-
   ____ Community college    ____ Arts and Science college
   ____ University center    ____ Other (please specify)    ____ NO.

SECTION III: POSITION CHANGES

Please answer the questions in this section only if you have actually
changed positions (even if at the same institution) since 1979. If you
have not changed positions, please go to question 16.

10. How long have you held your current post (in years including this
    year)? ______________
11. How do you believe your present post is viewed by your employer?
   ____ Line (principally supervisory and policy setting responsibilities)
   ____ Staff (principally support functions even if some supervision/policy formation)
   ____ Other (please specify) _______________________________________________________

12. How would you describe the type of movement from your 1979 position to this position?
   ____ Vertical UP (a move which increased your power, relative salary and/or prestige)
   ____ Vertical DOWN (a move which decreased your power, relative salary and/or prestige)
   ____ Lateral (a move which put you at about the same level of power, relative salary and/or prestige)
   ____ The positions are too dissimilar to make an assessment
   ____ Other (please specify) _______________________________________________________

13. As you recall the application process involved in obtaining your present position, what two factors do you believe were the most significant in attracting you to apply?
   1. ___________________________________________________________
   2. ___________________________________________________________

14. As you recall the entire process involved in obtaining your present position, what two factors do you believe were the most instrumental in your being hired?
   1. ___________________________________________________________
   2. ___________________________________________________________

15. Please list any full-time positions, or internships, etc. you have held between your 1979 position and your present position.
   1. _______________________________ Dates __________________________
   2. _______________________________ Dates __________________________
   3. _______________________________ Dates __________________________

SECTION IV: GENERAL CAREER INFORMATION

16. When you think over the past five years, what three factors or activities do you believe have made the greatest contribution to your career development? (Please list in priority order.)
   1. ___________________________________________________________
Of these three, which were planned by you as techniques for enhancing your career development?

None  #1  #2  #3  All

17. When you think over the past five years, what three factors or activities do you believe have been the most significant in retarding your career development? (Please list in priority order.)

1.

2.

3.

18. When you think about your future, what is the activity, position title, or type of position you hope to be in five years from today?

19. One of the areas of interest in this research project is the way in which a person's career is influenced by the characteristics of his/her institution. Thinking back over your career, what three institutional characteristics do you believe have had the greatest impact on your career development or lack thereof?

1.

2.

3.

20. Another area of interest in this research project is the way in which a person's career is influenced by the characteristics of the particular position s/he holds. Thinking back over your own career, what three characteristics of the positions you have held do you believe have had the greatest impact on your career development or lack thereof?

1.

2.

3.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.
### Appendix E

#### Chart 5.5

**Ten Year Goal and Attainment Profile for the Pair Partners of the Leavers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Non-respondent</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Expanded 1979 post</td>
<td>Assistant to the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Policy-level post</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Retired or Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F

### Chart 5.6

Ten Year Goal and Attainment Profile for the Pair Partners of the Movers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bursar</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to the</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>Expanded 1979</td>
<td>No Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Public Education</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Expanded 1979</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Chart 5.7

Ten Year Goal and Attainment Profile for the Pair Partners of the Changers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1979 Post</th>
<th>1979 Goal</th>
<th>1984 Post</th>
<th>1984 Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Community Post</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Director or Dean</td>
<td>Expanded 1979</td>
<td>No Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinator</td>
<td>Similar to 1979</td>
<td>Expanded 1979</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Similar to 1979</td>
<td>Non-respondent</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to the</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Management Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H

### Chart 5.8

Ten Year Goal and Attainment Profile for the Shifters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1979 Post</th>
<th>1979 Goal</th>
<th>1984 Post</th>
<th>1984 Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Associate Vice President</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Retired and Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Director</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Expanded Director</td>
<td>Semi-retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Director</td>
<td>Beachcomber</td>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Political Assistant</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Director</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Associate Vice President</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Vice Provost</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Director</td>
<td>Top Administrative Post</td>
<td>Expanded Director</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Key Leadership Post</td>
<td>Executive Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Out of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Registrar</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Director</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Expanded Director</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Assistant Dean and Director</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Co-ordinator</td>
<td>Similar Post</td>
<td>Expanded Co-ordinator</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Director</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Expanded Director</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Director</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Director</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>No Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Associate Dean</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Associate Vice President</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix I

#### Chart 5.9

**Ten Year Goal and Attainment Profile for the Pair Partners of the Shifters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1979 Post</th>
<th>1979 Goal</th>
<th>1984 Post</th>
<th>1984 Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Associate Vice President</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Non-respondent</td>
<td>No information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Director</td>
<td>Same area</td>
<td>Expanded title</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Director</td>
<td>Similar post</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Director</td>
<td>Semi-Retired</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Associate Vice President</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Director</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Registrar</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Director</td>
<td>Same type of post</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Co-ordinator</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Director</td>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>No Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Executive Post in Administration</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Director</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Director</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Associate Dean</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chart 5.10

**Ten Year Goal and Attainment Profile for the Pair Partners of the Seekers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1979 Post</th>
<th>1979 Goal</th>
<th>1984 Post</th>
<th>1984 Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dean</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>No Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Director</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>No Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assistant to the President</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Director</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. President</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Same as 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Director</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Director</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>No Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Director</td>
<td>Top Admin. Post</td>
<td>Extended 1979</td>
<td>Retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Director</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
<td>Same as 1979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOOTNOTES

1 A complete listing of paired subjects is provided in Appendix A: page 268.

2 A sample 1979 questionnaire is provided in Appendix B: page 275.

3 A sample Personnel Office questionnaire is provided in Appendix C: page 281.

4 A sample 1984 questionnaire is provided in Appendix D: page 282.

5 A complete listing of paired subjects is provided in Appendix A: page 268.

6 A summary of the goal and attainment profile for these pair partners of the Leavers is provided in Appendix E: page 287.

7 A summary of the goal and attainment profile for these pair partners of the Movers is provided in Appendix F: page 288.

8 A summary of the goal and attainment profile for these pair partners of the Changers is provided in Appendix G: page 289.

9 A summary of the goal and attainment profile for these respondents who shifted positions (Shifters) is provided in Appendix H: page 290.

10 A summary of the goal and attainment profile for these pair partners of the Shifters is provided in Appendix I: page 291.

11 A summary of the goal and attainment profile for these pair partners of the Stayers is provided in Appendix J: page 292.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ashburn, Elizabeth

Association of American Colleges

Averitt, Robert T.

Beck, E. M., Patrick Horan and Charles M. Tolbert II

Bem, Sandra and Daryl Bem

Benokraitis, Nijole and Joe Feagin

Berg, Ivar, editor

Berger, Joseph, M. Hamit Fisek, Robert Z. Normal and Morris Zelditch, Jr.

Blank, Rolf

Caplow, Theodore
Clark, Linda Nielsen

Dalton, Gene, Paul Thompson and Raymond Price

Digest of Educational Statistics

Doeringer, Peter and Michael Piore

Dudley, Gordon and David Tiedeman

Farley, Jennie, editor

Faunce, Patricia

Fennell, Mary, L., Patricia Barchas, Elizabeth Cohen, Anne McMahon and Polly Holdebrand

Finlay, Cheryl and Patricia Crosson

Fitzgerald, Louise S. and Crites, John O.
Freeman, Bonnie Cook

Freeman, Jo

Gappa, Judith and Barbara Uehling

Glaser, Barney

Gordon, R. Susan and Patricia Ball

Hall, Donald T.

Hall, Richard H.

Halley, Fred S. and Craig B. Little

Harvey, John, Gifford Weary and Ben Harris

Hennig, Margaret and A. Jardim

Hodgkinson, Harold
1974 "Adult Development: Implications For Faculty and Administrators." Educational Record. Fall Issue: 263-274.
Horner, Matina S.  

Howard, Samuel  

Jaspars, Joseph, Frank Fincham and Miles Hewstone  

Kahn-Hut, Rachel, Arlene Kaplan Daniels and Richard Colvard  

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss  

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss  

Kaufman, Debra and Barbara Richardson  

Kleiman, Carol  

Lipman-Blumen, Jean  

Lockheed, Marlaine E., and Katherine Hall  

Loring, Rosalind K.  

Maanen, Edgar Schein and Lotte Bailyn  
Mark, Sandra

McCormack, Arlene

Moore, Kathryn M.

Morgan, Marilyn

Murphy, Patrick and Harman Burck

O'Leary, Virginia

O'Leary, Virginia, Rhoda Unger and Barbara Wallston

Osipow, Samuel H., editor

Osipow, Samuel H.

Palley, Marian Lief

Patterson, M. and Engelberg, L.
Pietrofesa, John and Howard Splete  

Place, Irene and Alice Armstrong  

Reissman, Leonard G.  

Rosen, Benson and Thomas H. Jerdee  

Ruch, L. and R. Newton  

Sandler, Bernice Resnick  

Schein, Virginia Ellen  

Scott, Robert A.  

Slocum, Walter  

Sontag, Susan  

Spence, Kenneth, Luther Otto and Vaughn Call  
Spilerman, Seymour

Srebalus, David, Robert Marinelli and Jeffrey Messing

Taylor, Lee

Touchton, Judy and Donna Shavlik

Touchton, Judy and Donna Shavlik

Travis, Thomas

Van Alstyne, Carol, Julie Withers and Sharon Elliott

VanderWaerdt, Lois

Warsaw, Jacqueline

Welch, Mary Scott

Welkowitz, Joan, Robert B. Ewen and Jacob Cohen
Williams, Gregory

Wilson, J.

Yohalem, Alice M.