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Abstract

The purpose of this research was to explore the subjective lived experiences of female faculty in leadership positions in higher education. Women remain disproportionately represented in leadership roles among most areas of organizations and society. Researchers state that women ideally rise to successful leadership practices once they have served, or possess the potential to serve, in leadership (Byrd, 2009). However, the female academic leaders find it challenging to appreciate their individual leader development, work effort and success independence of being linked to historical marginalization, results of stereotypes among other disgraces (Sule, 2008). The group of faculty that was interviewed consisted of two doctoral program deans and two department chairs who were also full professors, one program coordinator who was associate professor, and two faculty specialists of universities in Texas, the United States. A heuristic phenomenological approach was adopted to collect and analyze the described lived experiences of seven female academic leaders. Most participants in this study expressed that higher education is a great and rewarding place to work even if the challenges and difficulties they experienced. Since it is the place to get access to research grants which are unavailable elsewhere and can become and be recognized as an expert in a field of choice. The findings provided brief narratives of a total of five major categories, twelve themes, and twenty-five subthemes were emerged from the participants’ responses, which include concrete personal experiences, crisscross of gender, challenges and fronting strategies, courage, and definitions and evaluation of success inside and outside the academy.
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Introduction

This study is not a historical trace of the achievements women have made in higher education. However, it is an exploration by the researcher to understand, explain, and describe the experiences of other female academic leaders using dimensions of personal experiences, essential occurrences, and perceptions. The motivation is based on the trends indicating a significant
increase of female leaders in top leadership positions across industries in the US, including higher education. It is also based on personal witness described to the researcher about the frustration of being called a token or being asked how it feels to be one in disregard of the personal effort one puts in to become an academic leader.

Female academic leaders in the 21st century still find it challenging to celebrate their individual leader development effort and success or have their institutions appreciate their contributions (Loury, 2005; Sanchez-Hucles & Davis, 2010). Most women leaders in academia become symbols of diversity and inclusion and role models by default and not by choice (Sule, 2008). Their success is not always celebrated without being linked to historical marginalization, results of affirmative action, stereotypes, and tokenism among other disgraces (2008). When some of them raise their concerns about these issues, they get accused of hypersensitivity, playing the gender card, or historical collective group wound (Jones, Dawkins, & McClinton, 2012). These stigmas and the personal struggle with multiple identities cause women to be viewed as not being proactive or possessing agency in the process of personal purpose and self-determination (Loury, 2005). Women entering organizations to lead, including those in higher education, are constantly faced with situations that require them to debunk these myths or exhibit the stereotypical images society has imposed on them. This leaves them with little or no room to flourish and self-actualize as individuals (Byrd, 2009; Jones, Dawkins, & McClinton, 2012).

Context of the Research

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to explore and describe the lived experiences of female faculty who are in leadership positions in higher education in the USA. This was also to determine whether stereotypes about women leaders impact how they define and pursue success and or how they lead in higher education.

Studies (Loury, 2005; Mainah, 2016) on female faculty in leadership positions were considered by analyzing their personal narratives for perceptions and dimension of comparison within group of female faculty, common characteristics if any, beliefs, values and criteria for success. By use of the findings and drawing from the strength of shared experiences, from the interview responses on experiences and perceptions, inferences were made from the recurrent themes about how it is to be a female academic leader. There was an intention to generalize the findings to some particular population of academic leaders. The intention was to understand and describe how it is to be a successful female academic leader through the lived experiences of these seven participants.

The rich and detailed descriptions increased the researcher’s awareness about the benefits of a culturally and ethnically diverse leadership population and hopes that this will influence hiring processes that offer women opportunity without requiring them to ignore their ethnicity and leadership style. This research may also inform the design of a model for mentoring women who are aspiring to join aca-
academic leadership or for coaching those already in leadership in higher education.

Theoretical Framework

This phenomenological study provides a depiction of the proposed study’s important concepts, ideas, theories, variables, thoughts, and their connection flow out of the research questions of how it is to be a female academic leader (Carter, 2011). In the research, there was one dependent variable: professional or career success. The independent variables included self-identity/self-esteem, gender, challenges, support and courage.

The theoretical framework for this study was derived from four main theories concluded by Leathers (2010), Roulston (2010), and Bennis and Thomas (2002): self-determination, group reference, the expectation states, and courage theories. These theories were used to describe the intensity of the frustration caused by the inability to appreciate personal effort freely, lived experience, and perception level of impact of increased visibility of women in top leadership positions amidst gender bias and leadership challenges as perceived by female academic leaders.

Research Questions

This study examined the following research questions:
1. How do female academic leaders describe their lived experiences of leadership practices?
2. What aspects do female leaders in higher education use to define and evaluate success?

Literature Review

The literature was used to expand on the existing understanding of female faculty in leadership in addition to the stories that the selected women told about their lived experiences and perceptions of rising and being successful or not in top leadership positions, within the contexts of their lives. These were explored using a phenomenological feminist lens combined with theories of self-determination, group reference, and expectation states. Meanwhile, guided by the research questions, the literature also investigated gender bias, awareness of leadership self-identity, success indicators, and factors impeding success.

Self-Determination and Group Reference Theories

The choice of self-determination and group reference theories was influenced by the fact that they are linked to theories of organizational behavior and have an ability to make a case for subjective wellbeing, self-motivation, and reference point for cognitively evaluating one’s own achievements, role performance, aspirations and ambitions (Deci & Gagne, 2005). Their combination was intended to help in strengthening the argument that the presence or absence of self-determination and motivation is a product of personal motivational preferences, and one’s style of self-regulation among other factors including group expectations and not a gender issue (Leathers, 2010; Vliek & Leach, 2008). Hyman (1960) asserted that when evaluating their own achievements, their role performance, aspirations, and ambitions, the individual
uses the group as a frame of reference and source for ordering experiences, perceptions, cognition, and ideas of self. The theory was related to this study in that the reference groups influenced the individual’s determination of their profile of traits, the competencies and values that they bring to work or to a group (Scholl, 2002).

Expectation States Theory

Expectation states theory was chosen because apart from being an approach for understanding how people evaluate other people’s competence, it is related to identity theories and has an influence on self-determination, self-identity, and self-esteem, all of which impact an individual’s confidence, success, and resilience (Scholl, 2002). Leathers (2010) concluded that the expectation states theory focuses on gender, status hierarchies, and leadership in the workplace, based especially on competence, outcomes, and power and their link to the ability to master events and achieve expected results in a desired manner (based on the cultural beliefs). These eventually affect performance expectations and an individual’s self-esteem (Ridgeway, 2001). This author further interpreted social inequality by use of the expectation states theory and interpersonal status hierarchies and asserted that beliefs, values and perceptions were important because it is through repeated encounters with people who consistently differ from oneself that causes individuals to perceive and form beliefs that the favored group members are more competent and thus more respected than the disfavored group members.

Courage Theory

In reviewing the literature, the evidence proposes that there is value associated with how female leaders may impel themselves toward accessing a uniqueness of courage concept that exceeds the ordinary and conquers adversity. Bennis and Thomas (2002) theorized extensively about the predictors of impactful leadership and suggested that an individual incidentally uses courageous leadership by finding the meaning in negative circumstances and by overcoming predicaments. There is the challenge of how women access this interpersonal attribute in order to handle the inevitable predicaments that are inherent within their realm of leadership (Brant, 2014). Bennis and Thomas (2002) also asserted these particular challenges as “crucible experiences” and distinguished them as trials catalyzed by passive or active threats to one’s leadership success.

Awareness of Leadership Self-Identity

The ways in which one perceives oneself and evaluates personal competence, success, and one’s overall self-concept is based on two major components: identities and self-esteem (Schmitt & Allik, 2005). Recurrent themes in the literature included observations that female faculty members have unique perceptions and identity challenges compared to their male peers.

Exploring the concept of leader and leadership self-identity through the stories of female leaders in higher education, self-reflections on their core identity and personal narrative, their
self-descriptions and definitions of themselves as leaders, and what personal attributes they believe allow them to be leaders, Hertneky (2008) used exploratory narrative inquiry to interview women college presidents. Hertneky found out that female presidents believe they succeed because they “have strength of character and conviction, practice a style of inclusion and continuously solicit input from others team members, openly praise their senior teams, yet take charge and responsibility” (2008, p. 150).

Linden (2012) also revealed that women would have been more successful if organizational and national systems and processes did not prevent them from advancing professionally in proportion to their increasing numbers and high education levels.

Gender Bias

Nostrand (1993) contributed to this section of the study by focusing on the need to start the conversation about gender bias through individual action and calling for leaders to take responsibility and to change the situation. Although minorities and women seem to have gained entry into many and varied aspects of the workforce despite their struggles with the identity issues, structural and cultural inequities in promotion and career progression, retention, and equal pay persist (Department of Labor, 2012).

In addition, Linden (2012) argued that the effect of sex construction and assignment as people get sorted into males and females at birth may also be another factor that causes women to be invisible in organizations as they do not seem to rise as the level of organizational power increases because the boundaries between woman and man are socially located and differentiated, which demands what roles one takes on in life. Robinson, Esquibel, and Rich (2013) concluded that it is very hard for women to challenge centuries of internalized myths and images and gender stereotype because these strategies are deliberately designed to make sexism, poverty, and other forms of social injustices appear as natural, the norm, and as inevitable parts of everyday life.

Success Indicators

There are two indicators being described as follows:

Being Visible and Significant. Data from the American Association of University Presidents indicates there are 494 female presidents out of the 2,148 four-year degree institutions positions. When the graduation rate data for women is broken down by racial or ethnic group, Asian Americans had the highest graduation rate at 76%, White at 69%, Hispanic women at 60%, and African American women at 48% (Women in Academia Report, 2014).

Madsen (2007) conducted a phenomenology on 20 women University Presidents (two were women of color) using one-on-one interviews with open-ended probing questions and follow-up questions lasting anywhere between 40-50 minutes. Madsen (2007) found out that all these Presidents had role models and mentors who were strong and competent women and that the most influential individuals in their lives included female teachers.
Women in Leadership. Enhancing Participation Rate of Garrett-Browder (2003) asserted that women have been effective leaders who were praised for their adaptability, courage, and resilience, despite leading in oppressive environments and power structures that did not include their voices. Eagly and Carli (2003) found that “stereotypically feminine qualities of cooperation, mentoring, and collaboration are important to leadership, perhaps increasingly in contemporary organizations where effective leadership has become more consonant with the female gender role” (p. 808). Despite at a slow pace, women’s corporate and political leadership generally is on the rise accompanied by changes in theories and practices of leadership most of which agree that feminine qualities are necessary in organizations.

Factors Impeding Success

Leader identity as individual internalization, relational recognition, and collective endorsement is both an internal cognition and a socially constructed cognition that is impacted by the environment and thus influences the relationship of leader and follower (DeRue, Ashford & Cotton, 2009). In a predominantly Male environment, this would make it hard for women to identify as leaders since they do not fit into the characteristics of leader identity giver. They suggested further research especially on the conflicting issue of “what happens when multiple people in a single context (e.g., team) claim a leader identity” (p. 22).

Harris and Watson (2007) expressed that the invisibility of women in top positions is probably due to “the seriousness of men’s desire for control, fears, concerns, and frustrations felt by the hegemonic male as a result of the increasing presence and power of women and minorities” (pg.81). They indicated that women were not seeking preferential treatment but equitable treatment and a fair utilization of their talents.

Methodology

The methodology utilized by the researcher to conduct this study was the heuristic inquiry method modeled by Moustakas (1990), in order to obtain a deeper understanding of how it is to be a female leader in higher education and how they are getting to top positions. This particular model was chosen largely because it allowed for each participant’s unique experience to be captured while focusing on the rich, lived descriptions that emerged. This section presents the research paradigm, the population and sample, data analysis, and credibility or validity for the investigation.

Research Paradigm

The heuristic phenomenological design, using semi-structured questions and follow-up discussions, and face-to-face and in-depth interviews was the data collection methods used. This research design was presented to the respondents as an evolving set of questions “that may seem more like a friendly conversation than a data-gathering interview” (Knox & Burkard, 2009, p.3).

Population and Sample

Seven women were invited to par-
participate in this study based on being currently employed in an academic institution as a faculty member, and in a leadership position. Leadership positions were operationally defined as deans, department chairs, program coordinator, and faculty specialist. Purposeful sampling occurs when the investigator selects a sample from a specific population from whom the most can be taught (Patton, 1990). To protect identities and increase readability, the sample size chosen for this current study was seven to compare the data collected from one female academic leader representing, these subjects were referred as SA1 for:
(a) a Dean of 4-year private university in San Antonio, SA2 for
(b) a Department Chair of 4-year private university in San Antonio, SA3 for
(c) a program coordinator of 4-year private university in San Antonio, SA4 for
(d) a faculty specialist of 4-year private university in San Antonio, SA5 for
(e) a Dean of 4-year public university in San Antonio, SA6 for
(f) a Department Chair of 4-year public university in San Antonio, and
SA7 for
(g) a faculty specialist of 4-year public university in San Antonio.

This differentiation by position types had the potential to provide rich, comparative data during cross-case analyses.

Data Analysis

Within-case analysis consists of transcribing the case record, using the software program of MAX.qda2, coding data, determining internal homogeneity and external heterogeneity, displaying data, drafting analytic text, and linking data with theoretical constructs (Kuckartz, 2004). It is used to systematically evaluate and interpret texts and is a powerful tool for developing theories, as well as testing theoretical conclusions of data analysis (2004).

Credibility or Validity

Member checks were conducted by sending the interview transcripts to the corresponding female faculty in higher education so they could remark on whether or not the findings appeared to be accurate. The interview transcripts were sent to the faculty leaders with a cover letter explaining how to conduct the member check. Lincoln and Guba (1985) declared that member checks are critical to establishing validity; therefore, they were used them to guarantee the validity and credibility of this study’s findings.

Findings

The seven study participants were selected based on their shared experiences of being female faculty leaders in higher education. All these female leaders interviewed had their own private offices at their workplaces. Interviews were conducted there with the door closed to ensure they felt comfortable and safe to speak freely and that there was no chance of being overheard by unintended colleagues. Those interviews which were implemented face-to-face at the participants’
convenience and also conducted over the phone and Line. The participants consisted of two Deans, two Department Chairs who were also full professors, one Program Coordinator who was associate professor, and two Faculty Specialists. Table 1 provides a profile of each participant and Table 2 summarizes a brief overview of their responses to the research questions.

Table 1. Profiles of Study Participants and Interview Length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA 1</th>
<th>SA 2</th>
<th>SA 3</th>
<th>SA 4</th>
<th>SA 5</th>
<th>SA 6</th>
<th>SA 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job title</strong></td>
<td>Dean (Professor)</td>
<td>Department Chair (Professor)</td>
<td>Program Coordinator (Associate Professor)</td>
<td>Faculty Specialist (Professor)</td>
<td>Department Chair (Professor)</td>
<td>Faculty Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public/Private college</strong></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age range</strong></td>
<td>60-68</td>
<td>58-66</td>
<td>48-56</td>
<td>40-48</td>
<td>56-64</td>
<td>46-54</td>
<td>34-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantity of Children</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range of years in service</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Area of Doctoral degree</strong></td>
<td>Education and Organization</td>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>Business Admin. and Education</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>Management &amp; Organizational Studies</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration interview lasted</strong></td>
<td>Face-to-face 1.2-1.5 hours</td>
<td>Face-to-face 1.5-2.0 hours</td>
<td>Face-to-face 1.5-2.0 hours two phone/Line</td>
<td>Face-to-face 1.5-2.0 hours 50 minutes to an hour/Line</td>
<td>Face-to-face 1.5-2.0 hours one phone/Line</td>
<td>Face-to-face 45-55 minutes phone/Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Categories, Themes, Subthemes and Percentage of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete personal experiences</td>
<td>Sexism (100%)</td>
<td>Exclusion, isolation and the need for inclusive strategies; Lack of diversity; Lack of exposure to leadership;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discrimination based on gender (90%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisscross of gender</td>
<td>Challenges and disparate treatment (100%)</td>
<td>Lack of support from team members; Under representation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prejudice (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges and fronting strategies</td>
<td>Being consistent in one's values and respect (90%)</td>
<td>The importance of spiritual and emotional intelligence (inner wisdom); Having a clear vision; Self-Care;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Identity/Self-esteem (90%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration and nurturing qualities (90%)</td>
<td>Coping skills and adaptability; Support from peers and friends; Team building;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>Undergoing moral courage (100%)</td>
<td>To perform what is right or just To uphold for the self and others To remain risk and uncertainty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exercising vulnerability (80%)

To counteract fear of being revealed, uncomfortable, or refused
To experience effects of vulnerability
To exercise hunch and foresight

Defining and assessing success

Academy’s definition (100%)
Teaching and coaching student’s success;
Being recognized as an expert;
Research and publications;
Family involvement and support;
Support from the institution and colleagues;
Respect from organization;

Beyond the Academy’s definition (80%)

Concrete Personal Experiences

In higher education, Wardell (2010) indicated that most women leaders have experienced exclusion, condescension, isolation, loneliness, communication challenges, being taken advantage of, and not receiving credit. She identified four factors that she attributes to the invisibility and disparity, which are “wage gap, institutional kinship, the ole boy system, and the role played by prejudice” (2010, p. 20). All the seven participants reported that they had to work harder than everyone because of being female. To counter the systemic sexism, the participants were hopeful that if their University was more committed to inclusion and not just diversity, this might begin to solve the issue. SA1, SA2, SA3, SA5, and SA7 mentioned that being excluded and then being considered as not being a team player was very frustrating.

Crisscross of Gender

Linden (2012) revealed that women would have been more successful if organizational and national systems and processes did not prevent them from advancing professionally in proportion to their increasing numbers and high education levels. SA2, SA3, and SA6 said that they found the promotion process very difficult because of such an environment. For one, they got promoted and did not get any informal leadership development and or support in their leadership levels. Learning on the job is expected to be a norm in workplaces, but it was hard. Lack of exposure to leadership roles and responsibilities, lack of support from leadership, and discrimination in a hostile environment made the issue of exclusion and being viewed as non-team player even more complicated (Eagly and Carli, 2003). SA2 and SA3 commented that being the only female Dean made them feel like they did not have as much power and impact as the rest of the male Deans. They also felt that their relationship with them was superficial, as they had no real connection with them beyond the official capacity.

Challenges and Fronting strategies

The importance of spiritual and emotional intelligence (inner wisdom); having a clear vision and being consistent in one’s values; and early preparation and acquisition of leadership skills were also cited as important self-care strategies (Dover, Kaiser, and Major, 2016). Most strategies included
conforming to the dominant culture, downplaying their differences and fitting into the success prototype (Riordan, 2014). Among the major leadership lessons all the seven participants cited the need to remain true to one guided by consistency in one’s values and respect. Others comprised continuously applauding and celebrating self, appreciate one’s unique differences and not waiting for others to recognize and reward you. SA2, SA3, SA4, and SA7 said that after years of waiting for external recognition and getting it, the “Academy is not necessary to validate your worth, because there is life beyond the academy.” The importance of spiritual and emotional intelligence (inner wisdom) and having a clear vision was also derived.

Dover, Kaiser, and Major (2016) and Riordan (2014) argued that the failure of diversity programs stems from the insecurity of the favored groups who are usually the dominant categories in an organization. This is because they feel threatened by such policies and the entrants of these new categories of people. To achieve greater diversity and inclusion, organizations need to figure out how to “create an atmosphere in which all people feel valued and respected and have access to the same opportunities” (Riordan, 2014, p.1). SA1, SA2, and SA5 expressed that leading in a collaborative and supportive style, although viewed in a less positive manner than being bureaucratic, had got their more support and long-term success in their colleges.

Courage

Female academic leaders express to consistently experience their leadership by undergoing moral courage and exercising personal and professional vulnerability. Having conducted extensive research on women leadership, Bell and Villarosa (2010) emphasized that the increasing phenomenon of women practicing transformational leadership is significant, but female leaders may be well-served in discovering opportunities beyond what readily exists to increase their moral courage.

In addition, Baldoni (2008) concluded how imperative moral courage relates to leadership when he asserted, “Moral courage is not a nice-to-have; it’s a must-have for every leader. It does not come easily; and it is not taught in leadership development programs” (p.15). His theory reveals that moral courage is an attribute of leadership that is earned, cultivated and sustained through inner conscience and external experience. All these seven participants indicated that leaders who experience moral courage in leadership were motivated to do so for the expression of social and professional justice and to accept the mantle of authority for the freedom of themselves or those around them, specifically in a supportive or protective way. Whether such courage was asserted through taking a stand, questioning, or disputing, it irresistibly appeared to be as much a conscious choice as it was one of necessity (Brown, 2012).

SA1, SA2, SA3, SA4, and SA5 considered interests larger than themselves when deciding how or why they would execute their leadership. The emergent theme of advocating for the self and others was characterized by
the leader’s predicament to retake or protect the authority ad freedom of herself or her followers. Given their descriptions, SA1, SA2, SA3, SA5, and SA6 expressed to persevere amid risk consistently as leaders, and they also seemed to rely upon their own instinct and confidence when deciding to express moral authority. The female leaders often described these patterns in ways that seemed isolating. However, the impacts often gave transformative results including affecting others to access courage.

Vulnerability was unexpectedly explained as a common experience that was practiced by female leaders with courage. Namely, they tended to assume significant risk and responsibility whether the larger goal or strategy involved others or not (Ali, 2014). According to the participants’ descriptions, SA1, SA2, SA3, SA5, and SA6 launched projects mostly for the purpose of empowering others while assuming full risk and responsibility for all involved. This is supported within the recent literature as Brown (2012) revealed the intersection of vulnerability and leadership by suggesting “A leader is anyone who holds her- or himself accountable for finding potential in people and processes” (p.185).

SA2, SA3, SA4, and SA6 talked about their experiences in ways that seemed to resist the fear of being disclosed, uncomfortable, and rejected by others. More specifically, while fear was a part of the experience, it was consciously resisted in the pursuit of leadership targets. These study participants revealed that this type of vulnerability was exerted in spaces of the unknown, but such indefinite spaces were not as significant as their goals. Additionally, all the seven participants expressed that when they decided to experience vulnerability, they were gifted with the reward of shared strength and inspired resolve that propelled them toward prevailing over their fears or difficulties.

Defining and Assessing Success

Sule (2008) found out how female faculty defined career success and found that agency, which she defined as the “ability to identify and implement choices to achieve a self-defined goal” and an opportunity to support for other faculty and students were popular definitions (p.15). This was also evident in this study as SA2, SA3, SA6, and SA7 defined success using academic expectations of publishing, teaching excellence and becoming mentors for the students as well as other dimensions outside of the academy including being involved in something meaningful and that was beyond self.

Defining and Assessing Success

Most literature reviewed for this study defined success in higher education holistically from inside and outside of the academy based on one’s principles, experiences, journeys, paths and other contributing factors such as dimensions of promotion, higher salaries, more benefits, greater visibility, enhanced prestige, and tenure and recognition (Leathers, 2010). SA1, SA2, SA5, and SA6 concluded their success from a perspective that was outside of the academy. For them it was about living according to their personal values, finding meaning and purpose in what they do and in the relationships they have with the people.
they serve as well as serving in a goal that is bigger than self. They also defined success along academic expectations including number of publications in peer reviewed journals and amount of grant. Since it is the place to get access to research grants which are unavailable elsewhere and can become and be recognized as an expert in a field of choice.

Another literature evidence in this study was that self-determination theory links very well with the responses by SA2, SA3, SA6, and SA7 while they described to seek a career in higher education to serve groups of minorities they felt were ignored and to become better educators.

Conclusion and Implications

As a result, there two major conclusions were drawn to respond to the research questions, which were discussed in this section. The first conclusion, based on responses about the challenges that female leaders in higher education face, is that exclusion and discounting cause stress levels to rise and also contribute to lowered self-confidence and increased self-doubt (Mainah, 2016). The second conclusion was that, in the long term, the definition of success evolves and becomes less about academic expectations and more about authenticity and personal values.

The strength of this research dwells in the fact that the data was collected interactively and as close to the occurrences as possible. The findings from all of the participants’ explanation, the conclusions drawn, and the existing literature interconnect to support the implications for leadership practice. The implication for leaders is the need to facilitate an advantageous circumstance that is intolerant of the prejudices and discrimination continue indefinitely through gender prejudice. Additionally, implications for women leaders in higher education consist of working more on expanding their worldviews and supporting cognitively sundry and comprehensive workplaces where everyone is accepted and collaborated and has equal access to all resources available (Mainah, 2016). Leaders in higher education should recognize the strength and pliability of female leaders and work to decrease the challenges they face. Further, leaders in higher education need to be aware that women are not seeking any privileges but impartial treatment and an equal utilization of their talents.
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