

Women and Leadership in Higher Education

Subjects: **Womens Studies**

Contributor: Mónica del Carmen Meza-Mejía , Mónica Adriana Villarreal-García , Claudia Fabiola Ortega-Barba

The theoretical postulates of gender studies demonstrate that inequality, when it comes to women, is more of a sociocultural construct than the result of nature. Gender inequality is typical of higher education, where inclusion of women was a milestone and where the “female advantage” phenomenon refers to the rise of women at this level.

women

leadership

higher education

university leadership

1. Introduction

Both gender studies and the theoretical postulates they are based on demonstrate that inequality, when it comes to women, results from sociocultural construction rather than being established in nature ([Samudio 2016](#)). This is derived in part from stereotypes—specifically, gender stereotypes. These relate to beliefs established throughout history that typify male and female characteristics and behaviors to perpetuate the social order established in public and private spheres. The public or productive sphere comprises paid and socially valued jobs, offering social prestige. Traditionally, men have occupied this sphere, allowing them to develop and occupy positions of power and privilege. Meanwhile, the private sphere focuses on generating goods with no remuneration or exchange value in the labor market; this sphere is usually associated with women. In the socializing processes of both spheres, institutions have played a significant disseminating role, since they have reproduced norms and values conventionally considered to pertain to each sex throughout generations, to the point that “the male/female stereotype ends up becoming deeply rooted in subjects, composing a form of apprehension in the environment and in the person” ([Moncayo and Zuluaga 2015, pp. 144–45](#)). This process has established numerous obstacles for the incorporation of women into the paid labor sphere.

It is precisely in the paid work environment where gender difference becomes gender wage inequality since, according to the study by [Larraz et al. \(2019\)](#), this is more due to an imbalance in the relationship among the type of work, its value, and remuneration for said activity. In this way, under the principle of “equal pay for equal work and work of equal value, a baseline has been established to contribute to improving the place of women in society” (p. 3). Consequently, salaries and their distribution are unequal between men and women.

Academia is not exempt from the above and indeed, the widespread inclusion of women there was achieved in very recent history. With a progressive increase in female students, teachers, and administrative and managerial staff, women’s participation has increased in relevant positions, as there is a correlation between the higher educational level achieved and the involvement in tasks of greater scope and responsibility in the academic world—a phenomenon called “the female advantage” ([Buchmann and DiPrete 2006](#); [Niemi 2017](#)). This is a concept that

has been used since 1990 to refer to the phenomenon of women's incursion into the workplace where their talents, skills, and ideas were highlighted ([Helgesen 1995](#)); in the academic field, this is manifested by the rise of women to relevant positions and reflected in the ascent of women to this level ([Eurostat 2018](#)). This is globally seen in increased female enrollment compared to male enrollment between 2000 and 2018, as the gross enrollment rate of men in higher education increased from 19% to 36%, while that of women increased from 19% to 41% ([United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization \[UNESCO\] 2021](#)). Although such a phenomenon predicts an increase in coming years ([DiPrete and Buchmann 2013](#)), paradoxically, the female advantage does not go hand in hand with women occupying the majority of academic positions in universities after graduation, participating in relevant research, taking on leadership roles, or even earning competitive and comparable salaries as recorded in the United Nations report (2021) *Women in higher education: Has the female advantage put an end to gender inequalities?* ([United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization \[UNESCO\] 2021](#)). Among other reasons, this is due to the aforementioned stereotypes in which scientists and managers are associated with male figures, as [Nett et al. \(2021\)](#) concluded.

According to a report titled Gender Equality: How Global Universities are Performing ([United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization \[UNESCO\] International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean \[IESALC\] and Times Higher Education 2022](#)), only 18% of university rectors were women in nine Latin American countries, while only 15% were women in 48 European countries, of which 20 did not have any female leaders. Meanwhile, female researchers at higher education institutions represent 39.7% of the world's total.

Without a doubt, there have been notable changes in women's participation in higher education institutions, and predictions suggest a further increase in the coming years. However, there is still a long way to go, since growth is not equal in all fields of knowledge or in all activities carried out in academia. This is because gender biases that hinder the insertion of women at levels that involve decision making are still observed ([Bustos 2012](#)).

This demonstrates that there are still marked differences and discriminatory behaviors in academic participation when it comes to gender relations. In line with this, women face a variety of internal and external barriers in this process. The former is characterized by traditionalist cultural aspects such as a lack of dedication to professional practice and the tension that work roles imply at home, while the latter includes a lack of mentoring, other members' open opposition to promotion, the female quota, gender wage differences, and the absence of female role models to look up to ([Zuluaga 2014](#)).

The idea of labor market segregation, which differentiates labor positions according to gender from a perspective of horizontal or differentiated segmentation in terms of professions, has historically placed the employment of women in academia in teaching roles and has assigned men to areas such as research and the management or deanship of educational institutions. At the same time, a vertical segmentation perspective, which refers to hierarchical positions in organizational charts, reveals a scarce presence of women in top academic positions, as they face a set of invisible barriers that limit their professional advancement. This phenomenon, known as the "Glass Ceiling" ([Morrison et al. 1987](#)), refers to an invisible ceiling that, in the labor field, is difficult to cross and therefore prevents women from advancing. In universities, the glass ceiling negatively impacts the trajectories of female academics

and affects their chances of promotion, especially because of work–life balance ([Clark et al. 2016](#); [Gallego-Morón et al. 2020](#); [Hernández and Ibarra 2019](#); [Meza et al. 2019](#); [Meza-de-Luna et al. 2022](#)), some institutions' lack of social responsibility ([Gaete 2018](#)), and discrimination in hiring decisions ([Moss-Racusin et al. 2012](#)), among other factors.

2. Women's Leadership in Academia

In academia in general, attention to gender issues is dissimilar, as regions such as North America and some European countries have progressed, while a lack of progress is still evident in others, including Africa, the Middle East, and Asia ([Spanò 2020](#)) due to cultural issues ([Henry 2015](#); [Li 2020](#)), the predominance of a patriarchal system of leadership ([Ekine 2018](#)), institutional practices ([Masika et al. 2014](#)), sexual harassment attitudes ([Bhatti and Ali 2022](#)), and different forms of sexism, which discourage women from seeking senior positions ([Edwards 2017](#)). Hence, studies show that the demographic and cultural marginalization of women negatively impacts opportunities to grow and deploy their leadership within university settings ([Kataeva and De Young 2017](#)) and even reveals the existing gap in research on the topic, where women are underrepresented in academia in some regions ([Aiston and Yang 2017](#)).

Despite greater attention to gender issues in advanced countries, some gaps have yet to close, such as traditionally masculinized areas of knowledge including Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) ([Li 2020](#)); Geography, where sustained leadership is needed to address the inequalities experienced in the workplace ([Maddrell et al. 2016](#)); Agricultural Sciences, which have historically been a male-influenced field ([Niewoehner-Green et al. 2022](#)); and Tourism, in terms of performance indicators ([Pritchard and Morgan 2017](#)), among others.

Likewise, global neoliberalism trends intensify a neutral scope in academic work where such neutrality blurs gender equity ([Brabazon and Schulz 2020](#)). A case in point is a study by [Rauhaus and Carr \(2020\)](#), who comment that in the division of academic labor, female faculty members assume a disproportionate amount of advising and mentoring responsibilities, which reduces their likelihood of rising to leadership positions in their institutions. Due to the impact of neoliberal values and underlying systemic structures, male academics are often favored or privileged. For this reason, [Gouthro et al. \(2018\)](#) propose incorporating a critical feminist perspective into the concept of organization as a model in the higher education sector, and authors like [Acker \(2012\)](#) suggest understanding the experience of female academic leadership based on differentiated analytical frameworks.

Notwithstanding the above and despite neoliberal trends, some women have managed to overcome certain crises and barriers inherent in the academic trajectory and in being a woman, and they have reconciled their personal and professional lives, which has allowed them to prevail ([Van Helden et al. 2023](#); [Hacifazlioglu 2010](#)). The social predictors that help women establish their professional trajectory include parental influence, spousal support, and collegial support from male academics ([Oti 2013](#)), among others.

At the same time, gender is also identified as an inequality factor when it comes to the attribution of positions of power in research activities ([Morais et al. 2022](#)). These positions are predominantly occupied by men, who tend to lead research activities and decision-making processes, thus relegating women ([Hakiem 2022](#)) to other roles and making them invisible in high-impact research projects ([Davies et al. 2019](#)).

Given the above, female academics experience the profession differently than their male colleagues, as they experience microinequities and small events that cause them to remain silent or be directly silenced, as in the case of Asian countries where the hierarchical culture forces women to assume dutiful attitudes and relegates them to traditional household tasks ([Aiston and Fo 2021](#)). As females, they are less likely to be tenured, tend to publish less, receive less external funding, have fewer indicators of research prestige, and spend more time teaching ([Aiston 2014](#)), even though women are more likely to be authors and leaders in publications in bold/innovative and resistance spaces ([Acai et al. 2022](#)).

Among the proposals that address the different inequities, the researchers highlight the ideal institutional transformation model that establishes how to implement innovative context-sensitive strategies to promote gender equity, inclusion, and leadership from female academics at all levels ([Bilimoria and Singer 2019](#)). Similarly, action research is a resource for developing leadership through programs and training that raise awareness of these phenomena and pivot professional development in higher education beyond teaching and mentoring ([Louw and Zuber-Skeritt 2009](#); [Edwards 2017](#)).

3. Women's Leadership in Management

Female representation has successfully increased—but only in academic tenure-track positions and not in leadership positions of greater responsibility such as deanships and presidencies ([Park 2020](#)) due to the disproportionate workload of women compared to that of men, as women take on more hours teaching, advising, and mentoring. This makes them less likely to access leadership positions ([Rauhaus and Carr 2020](#)), and results in the perception of women as being poorly prepared to hold leadership positions in higher education ([Sayler et al. 2019](#)), among other. Some gender studies indicate the low representation of women in advanced professional ranks ([Nica 2014](#)) and the delay of their growth toward positions of greater responsibility, as Pyke already stated in 2013 ([Pyke 2013](#)).

Following the above, [Neale and White \(2014\)](#) conclude that a stereotypical male culture causes problems for women in senior management positions for reasons such as structural constraints, competitive work imperatives, demanding hours, and efforts to balance family life, which are aggravated in situations of turbulence and problematic organizational circumstances in which status, merit, and prestige are prominent factors. This makes it difficult and challenging to combine management with a successful academic career ([Peterson 2016](#)).

Other factors have to do with the formation of a culturally structured self-concept, from gender beliefs, deliberate exclusion during selection, employment and promotion, political implications, and human resource management practices, which are generally constricted and limit progression to higher leadership positions ([Alexander 2010](#);

[Semela et al. 2020](#)). It should also be noted that not all women aspire to higher leadership positions due to the heavy demands these jobs place on them, as [Chesterman et al. \(2005\)](#) state.

The factors above lead to the question proposed by [Mackay \(2021\)](#) regarding how to provide a feminist approach to managerial levels in higher education institutions. [Peterson \(2019\)](#) suggests modifying self-perception in the conception of gender equality. [Bhatti and Ali \(2021\)](#) state that women must learn to foster peer mentoring networks to direct their professional careers toward leadership positions and increase representation in senior management. Those who have succeeded have used their ingenuity to seek career guidance and social support from multiple sources, including male and female mentors, role models, colleagues, friends, and family ([Hill and Wheat 2017](#); [Obers 2015](#)).

Finally, the view of female leadership has changed from competitive, bold, and strong leadership to transformational leadership ([Machado-Taylor and White 2014](#)), which consists of these five categories: vision and goal setting, accountability, role model, encouragement, and empowerment ([Almaki et al. 2016](#)). From a gender perspective, this change implies that the ideal of masculine leadership has decreased in influence while the feminine transformational leadership with these categories acts as a counterweight ([Peterson 2018](#)).

Undoubtedly, women's inclusion in higher education leadership—both in academia and in management—has transformed this space mainly due to their commitment to and valuing of educational institutions ([Wallace and Wallin 2015](#)). This does not exclude the fact that, in academia, some women truly prefer teaching and research roles over positions of greater responsibility and hierarchy ([Harford 2020](#)) because they value these activities more than senior management roles ([Privott 2012](#)).

References

1. Samudio, Edda. 2016. El acceso de las mujeres a la educación superior. La presencia femenina en la Universidad de Los Andes. *Procesos Históricos* 29: 77–101.
2. Moncayo, Bibiana, and David Zuluaga. 2015. Liderazgo y género: Barreras de mujeres directivas en la academia. *Pensamiento & Gestión* 39: 142–77.
3. Larraz, Beatriz, José Pavía, and Luis Vila. 2019. Beyond the gender pay gap. *Convergencia Revista de Ciencias Sociales* 81: 1–34.
4. Buchmann, Claudia, and Thomas DiPrete. 2006. The Growing Female Advantage in College Completion: The Role of Family Background and Academic Achievement. *American Sociological Review* 71: 515–41.
5. Niemi, Nancy. 2017. *Degrees of Difference: Women, Men, and the Value of Higher Education*. New York: Routledge, pp. 61–86.

6. Helgesen, Sally. 1995. *The Female Advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership*. New York: Doubleday Currency.
7. Eurostat. 2018. Gender Statistics. Available online: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Gender_statistics (accessed on 14 February 2023).
8. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization . 2021. *Women in Higher Education: Has the Female Advantage Put an End to Gender Inequalities?* Paris: UNESCO, pp. 14–17. Available online: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000377182> (accessed on 14 February 2023).
9. DiPrete, Thomas, and Claudia Buchmann. 2013. *The Rise of Women: The Growing Gender Gap in Education and What It Means for American Schools*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, pp. 1–24. Available online: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7758/9781610448000> (accessed on 8 February 2023).
10. Nett, Nadine, Tillmann Nett, Julia Englert, and Robert Gaschler. 2021. Think scientists—Think male: Science and leadership are still more strongly associated with men than with women in Germany. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 52: 643–59.
11. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean and Times Higher Education. 2022. *Gender Equality: How Global Universities Are Performing*. Available online: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381739> (accessed on 20 September 2023).
12. Bustos, Olga. 2012. Mujeres en la educación superior, la academia y la ciencia. *Ciencia* 63: 24–33.
13. Zuluaga, David. 2014. Perspectivas del liderazgo educativo: Mujeres académicas en la administración. *Suma de Negocios* 1: 86–95.
14. Morrison, Ann, Randall White, and Ellen Van Velsor. 1987. *Breaking the Glass Ceiling: Can Women Reach the Top of America's Largest Corporations?* Reading: Addison-Wesley.
15. Clark, Emily, Melissa Fuesting, and Amanda Diekman. 2016. Enhancing interest in science: Exemplars as cues to communal affordances of science. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 46: 641–54.
16. Gallego-Morón, Nazareth, Mauricio Matus, and Lina Gálvez. 2020. Revisión sistemática de la literatura sobre el fenómeno del techo de cristal en las universidades españolas. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación Superior* 11: 130–49.
17. Hernández, María, and Luz Ibarra. 2019. Conciliación de la vida familiar y laboral. Un reto para México. Iztapalapa. *Revista de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades* 86: 159–84.

18. Meza, Mónica, Sara Galbán, and Claudia Ortega. 2019. Experiences and Challenges of Women Belonging to the Mexican National Researchers System. *Revista Iberoamericana para la Investigación y el Desarrollo Educativo* 10: 1–33.
19. Meza-de-Luna, María Elena, Tania Conde, and Leticia Meza-de-Luna. 2022. Conciliación trabajo-familia con y sin niños y niñas, durante el confinamiento por COVID-19 en México. *Psicoperspectivas* 21: 1–14.
20. Gaete, Ricardo. 2018. Conciliación Trabajo-Familia y Responsabilidad Social Universitaria: Experiencias de Mujeres en cargos directivos en Universidades Chilenas. *Docencia Universitaria* 12: 81–100.
21. Moss-Racusin, Corinne, John Dovidio, Victoria Brescoll, Mark Graham, and Jo Handelsman. 2012. Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 109: 16474–79.
22. Spanò, Emanuela. 2020. Femina Academica: Women 'confessing' leadership in Higher Education. *Gender and Education* 32: 1–10.
23. Henry, Annette. 2015. 'We especially welcome applications from members of visible minority groups': Reflections on race, gender and life at three universities. *Race Ethnicity and Education* 18: 589–610.
24. Li, Yun Ling. 2020. First-generation immigrant women faculty's workplace experiences in the US universities—Examples from China and Taiwan. *Migration Studies* 8: 209–27.
25. Ekine, Adefunke. 2018. Women in Academic Arena: Struggles, Strategies and Personal Choices. *Gender Issues* 35: 318–29.
26. Masika, Rachel, Gina Wisker, Lanja Dabbagh, Kawther Jameel Akreyi, Hediye Golmohamad, Lone Bendix, and Kristin Crawford. 2014. Female academics' research capacities in the Kurdistan region of Iraq: Socio-cultural issues, personal factors and institutional practices. *Gender and Education* 26: 52–69.
27. Bhatti, Aisha, and Rabia Ali. 2022. Negotiating Sexual Harassment: Experiences of Women Academic Leaders in Pakistan. *Journal of International Women's Studies* 23: 1–24.
28. Edwards, Jane. 2017. Narrating experiences of sexism in higher education: A critical feminist autoethnography to make meaning of the past, challenge the status quo and consider the future. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 30: 621–34.
29. Kataeva, Zumrad, and Alan De Young. 2017. Gender and the academic profession in contemporary Tajikistan: Challenges and opportunities expressed by women who remain. *Central Asian Survey* 36: 247–62.

30. Aiston, Sarah Jane, and Zi Yang. 2017. "Absent data, absent women": Gender and higher education leadership. *Policy Futures in Education* 15: 262–74.
31. Maddrell, Avril, Kendra Strauss, Nicola Thomas, and Stephanie Wyse. 2016. Mind the gap: Gender disparities still to be addressed in UK Higher Education geography. *Area* 48: 48–56.
32. Niewoehner-Green, Jera, Mary Rodriguez Mary, and Summer McLain. 2022. The Gendered Spaces and Experiences of Female Faculty in Colleges of Agriculture. *Rural Sociology* 87: 427–53.
33. Pritchard, Annettea, and Nigel Morgan. 2017. Tourism's lost leaders: Analysing gender and performance. *Tourism's lost leaders. Analysing Gender and Performance* 63: 34–47.
34. Brabazon, Tara, and Samantha Schulz. 2020. Braving the bull: Women, mentoring and leadership in higher education. *Gender and Education* 32: 1–18.
35. Rauhaus, Beth, and Isla Carr. 2020. The invisible challenges: Gender differences among public administration faculty. *Journal of Public Affairs Education* 26: 1–20.
36. Gouthro, Patricia, Nancy Taber, and Amanda Brazil. 2018. Universities as inclusive learning organizations for women? Considering the role of women in faculty and leadership roles in academe *The Learning Organization* 25: 29–39.
37. Acker, Sandra. 2012. Chairing and caring: Gendered dimensions of leadership in academe. *Gender and Education* 24: 1–18.
38. Van Helden, Daphne, Laura Den, Steijn Bram, and Meike Vernooij. 2023. Career implications of career shocks through the lens of gender: The role of the academic career script. *Career Development International* 28: 19–32.
39. Hacifazlioglu, Ozge. 2010. Balance in academic leadership: Voices of women from Turkey and the United States of America (US). *Perspectives in Education* 28: 51–62.
40. Oti, Adepeju Olaide. 2013. Social Predictors of Female Academics' Career Growth and Leadership Position in South-West Nigerian Universities. *SAGE Open* 3: 1–11.
41. Morais, Ricardo, Clara Fernandes, and Valeriano Piñeiro-Naval. 2022. Big Girls Don't Cry: An Assessment of Research Units' Leadership and Gender Distribution in Higher Education Institutions. *Social Sciences* 11: 345.
42. Hakiem, Raff. 2022. Advancement and subordination of women academics in Saudi Arabia's higher education. *Higher Education Research and Development* 41: 1528–41.
43. Davies, Julie, Emily Yarrow, and Jawad Syed. 2019. The curious under-representation of women impact case leaders: Can we disengender inequality regimes? *Gender, Work & Organization* 27: 129–48.

44. Aiston, Sarah Jane, and Chee Kent Fo. 2021. The silence/ing of academic women. *Gender and Education* 33: 1–18.
45. Aiston, Sarah Jane. 2014. Leading the academy or being led? Hong Kong women academics. *Higher Education Research & Development* 3: 59–72.
46. Acai, Anita, Lucy Mercer-Mapstone, and Rachel Guitman. 2022. Mind the (gender) gap: Engaging students as partners to promote gender equity in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education* 27: 18–38.
47. Bilimoria, Diana, and Lynn Singer. 2019. Institutions Developing Excellence in Academic Leadership (IDEAL): A partnership to advance gender equity, diversity, and inclusion in academic STEM. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal* 38: 362–81.
48. Louw, Cecilia, and Ortrun Zuber-Skeritt. 2009. Reflecting on a leadership development programme: A case study in South African higher education. *Perspectives in Education* 27: 237–46.
49. Park, Sanghee. 2020. Seeking changes in ivory towers: The impact of gender quotas on female academics in higher education. *Women's Studies International Forum* 79: 102346-1–102346-9.
50. Sayler, Micheal, Smith Pedersen, and Marc Cutright. 2019. Hidden leaders: Results of the national study of associate deans. *Studies in Higher Education* 44: 1–11.
51. Nica, Elvira. 2014. The importance of leadership development within higher education. *Contemporary Readings in Law and Social Justice* 5: 189–94.
52. Pyke, Joanne. 2013. Women, choice and promotion or why women are still a minority in the professoriate. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 35: 444–54.
53. Neale, Jenny, and Kate White. 2014. Australasian university management, gender and life courses issues. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion* 33: 384–95.
54. Peterson, Helen. 2016. Is managing academics “women’s work”? Exploring the glass cliff in higher education management. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 44: 112–27.
55. Alexander, Traci. 2010. Roots of Leadership: Analysis of the Narratives from African American Women Leaders in Higher Education. *The International Journal of Learning: Annual Review* 17: 193–204.
56. Semela, Tesfaye, Haile Hirut, and Rahel Abraham. 2020. Navigating the river Nile: The chronicle of female academics in Ethiopian higher education. *Gender and Education* 13: 12–19.
57. Chesterman, Collen, Anne Ross-Smith, and Margaret Peter. 2005. Not doable jobs!” Exploring senior women’s attitudes to academic leadership roles. *Women’s Studies International Forum* 28: 163–80.

58. Mackay, Fiona. 2021. Dilemmas of an Academic Feminist as Manager in the Neoliberal Academy: Negotiating Institutional Authority, Oppositional Knowledge and Change. *Political Studies Review* 19: 75–95.
59. Peterson, Helen. 2019. Women-Only Leadership Development Program: Facilitating Access to Authority for Women in Swedish Higher Education? *Social Sciences* 8: 137.
60. Bhatti, Aisha, and Rabia Ali. 2021. Women's Leadership Pathways in Higher Education: Role of Mentoring and Networking. *Asian Women* 37: 25–50.
61. Hill, Lilian, and Celeste Wheat. 2017. The Influence of Mentorship and Role Models on University Women Leaders' Career Paths to University Presidency. *The Qualitative Report* 22: 2090–111.
62. Obers, Noëlle. 2015. Influential structures: Understanding the role of the head of department in relation to women academics' research careers. *Higher Education Research & Development* 34: 1220–32.
63. Machado-Taylor, María de Lourdes, and Kate White. 2014. Women in Academic Leadership. In *Gender Transformation in Academy, (Advances in Gender Research)*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, vol. 19, pp. 375–93.
64. Almaki, Samah, Abu Silong, Idris Khairuddin, and Wahat Nour. 2016. Understanding of the Meaning of Leadership from the Perspective of Muslim Women Academic Leaders. *Journal of Educational and Social Research* 6: 225–36.
65. Peterson, Helen. 2018. From “Goal-Orientated, Strong and Decisive Leader” to “Collaborative and Communicative Listener”. *Gendered Shifts in Vice-Chancellor Ideals, 1990–2018. Education Sciences* 8: 90.
66. Wallace, Janice, and Dawn Wallin. 2015. ‘The voice inside herself’: Transforming gendered academic identities in educational administration. *Gender and Education* 27: 412–29.
67. Harford, Judith. 2020. The path to professorship: Reflections from women professors in Ireland. *Irish Educational Studies* 39: 193–204.
68. Privott, C. 2012. The Occupational Science of Women Faculty Work: A Qualitative Approach. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences* 6: 37–50.

Retrieved from <https://encyclopedia.pub/entry/history/show/115779>