



JUTLP

Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice

Revisiting “Sticky Floor and Glass Ceilings”: A Commentary on Navigating Gender in Higher Education

Dr Jolyn E. Dahlvig, Natalie Dickinson Kulick, and Amy Greenhalgh
Maryville University, United States of America | *authors listed alphabetically

Abstract

This commentary revisits Dahlvig and Longman's (2020) "Addressing Glass Ceilings and Sticky Floors" to update the global status of women's leadership in higher education. Additionally, the authors advocate for expanding the inclusive leadership conversation beyond the historic male/female binary. Institutional barriers persist that hinder minoritized leadership, therefore using intersectionality and an inclusive view of gender in framing current problems and solutions will benefit the path forward.

Editors

Section: Educational Leadership
Editor in Chief: Dr Joseph Crawford
Senior Editor: A/Prof Gail Wilson

Publication

Received: 15 April 2024
Accepted: 20 May 2024
Published: 20 May 2024

Copyright

© by the authors, in its year of first publication. This publication is an open access publication under the Creative Commons Attribution [CC BY-ND 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/) license.

Citation

Dahlvig, J. E., Dickinson Kulick, N., & Greenhalgh, A. (2024). Revisiting “Sticky Floor and Glass Ceilings”: A Commentary on Navigating Gender in Higher Education. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 21(7).

Introduction

Women's underrepresentation in leadership is not merely a consequence of individual choices but is deeply entrenched in persisting gender biases (Mate et al., 2019). Despite advancements in gender equality rhetoric, women's leadership remains starkly underrepresented across various sectors. In a chapter titled "Addressing Glass Ceilings and Sticky Floors," Dahlvig and Longman (2020) adopted a macro-, meso-, micro-framework to synthesize women's higher education research across the globe. The societal (macro-), institutional (meso-), and individual (micro-) layers interact and holistically demonstrate the complex ways women's leadership is limited. Since 2020, other literature reviews further demonstrate the relevance and necessity of dismantling gender bias internationally (American Council on Education, 2021; Avolio et al., 2024; Cheung, 2021; Maheshwari & Nayak, 2022). Understanding these multifaceted challenges is imperative for devising effective strategies to promote gender inclusivity in higher education.

Within the US, the ever-changing political landscape necessitates a renewed focus and commitment to human rights, particularly women's rights. Historically a leader in human rights, changes to US constitutional law cause concerns about other human rights that could be questioned. Specifically, anti-Diversity-Equity-Inclusion legislation targeting US higher education erodes systemic support for gender equity concerns. Since 2023, 82 bills in 28 states have been introduced, with 12 becoming law. These laws dismantle Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion offices, eliminate mandatory diversity training and the use of diversity statements in hiring and promotion, and disallow considering race, sex, ethnicity, or national origin in admissions or employment (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2024). Finally, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) is tracking 484 anti-LGBTQ+ bills in the US. Many bills advocate for redefining sex, removing LGBTQ+ history and experiences from school curriculums, restricting healthcare access, and other limitations to human rights (ACLU, 2024). The combination of these concerns has implications for higher education leaders and our efforts to address gender-based inequities.

Therefore, this commentary builds on what is known about women's leadership in higher education by reporting statistics substantiating the prevalence of gender inequities globally. Recognizing the limitations of how gender-based statistics are collected and reported, a rationale for extending women's leadership conversations to include intersectionality and nonbinary transgender perspectives follows. Given this journal's focus on higher education institutions, the commentary updates the meso-level barriers to women's leadership provided by Dahlvig and Longman (2020), with a particular focus on intersectionality and nonbinary transgender perspectives. Following the section on institutional barriers, institution-level solutions are discussed. Finally, the authors conclude with a call to action for higher education leaders.

A Note about Inclusive Language

These authors understand gender as socially constructed and not limited to a male/female, man/woman, or masculine/feminine binary; therefore, this article includes queer, trans, and other nonbinary identifiers whenever possible although most statistics are limited to the historic binary terms. We recognize that biological sex, gender expression, sexual identity, and gender identity are distinct concepts. This commentary advocates including nonbinary, trans, and queer experiences in discussions of women's leadership. Although "queer" was historically a pejorative

term, it has been reclaimed by the community as a term of empowerment. In this context, 'LGBTQ+' and 'queer' are used interchangeably to represent a spectrum of identities and experiences that further inform minoritized experiences within male-normed organizational systems.

Gender and Leadership in Higher Education

The World Economic Forum's Gender Parity Report assesses international progress toward gender equity across sectors, although gender references the historic male/female binary. As of 2023, 68.4% of the global gender equity gap is closed, a 4.1% improvement since 2006 (*Global Gender Gap Report 2023*, 2023). Analysts project the educational attainment gap will close in 16 years, but global gender parity remains over a century away at the current rate. Education sector data shows 86-99% of the gender gap in educational attainment addressed across regions, with women comprising 46% of senior roles despite being 54% of the workforce. In elite US higher education (103 R1 institutions), women have been the majority of doctoral graduates for 15 years but represent only 27% of tenured professors, 43% of president's cabinets, and 22% of higher education presidencies (Silbert et al., 2022). Women occupy 39% of dean and 38% of provost positions, despite 75% of presidencies arising from these roles, challenging the notion of a pipeline issue.

Despite efforts to promote gender diversity, parity remains challenging. Studies suggest gender-diverse leadership teams outperform homogeneous ones (Catalyst, 2004; Desvaux et al., 2007; Diehl, 2023; Welbourne et al., 2007). Organizational culture influences gender disparities in leadership. Leadership roles in higher education demand considerable time and effort, with societal caregiving expectations often limiting women's advancement (Moors et al., 2022; Tabassum, & Nayak, 2021). Addressing societal barriers requires policy and cultural changes. Initiatives promoting gender-aware leadership and inclusive cultures are essential. Tailored mentorship and support networks aid women's leadership development. By dismantling structural inequalities, organizations and societies can foster environments that allow minoritized genders to fully engage in leadership roles.

Expanding the Conversation

Discussions of women's leadership within higher education can be confined to race and ethnicity and a binary view of gender. Dahlvig and Longman (2020) provided a global perspective and heeded Henrich et al.'s (2010) caution to not only include Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic (WEIRD) experiences, but did not address our evolving understanding of gender beyond the binary male or female. While Regulska (2021) emphasized understanding intersectionality within higher education leadership narratives, nonbinary transgender voices were not specifically identified under the umbrella of intersectionality. Additionally, nonbinary transgender voices were absent from the American Council on Education's brief on international gender equity efforts within higher education (DeLaquil, 2021). As our collective understanding of gender evolves, so must our inclusion of voices about women's leadership. Therefore, this commentary defines intersectionality and nonbinary transgender, and subsequently reviews the higher education organizational barriers to women's leadership, purposefully including nonbinary transgender perspectives.

Intersectionality is an ever-developing critical social theory focused on systems of power (Ocampo González & Hill Collins, 2019). The concept of the theory of intersectionality describes how systems of privilege and discrimination intersect to create unique dynamics and effects. For example, biases can overlap in classifications such as race, social status, gender, and sexual orientation, leading to various forms of discrimination.

An intersectional approach is essential when examining nonbinary transgender issues within higher education. The nonbinary transgender community shares common ground with other minoritized groups when facing a multitude of challenges and systems of oppression. Minoritized groups are often invisible, have limited access to healthcare and legal advice, and are ignored by the power and privilege of the majoritized community. Additional factors, such as socioeconomic status and disability, can come into play, intersecting other communities with the same challenges. Policies must address these disparities and cultivate supportive environments that affirm gender identities. By using critical thinking and incorporating intersectionality into our discourse, we can continue cultivating a more equitable and inclusive society for all genders.

The challenges nonbinary transgender people face at the societal level are often compounded at the institutional level. Higher education leaders must introduce policies, support systems, and educational practices that affirm the experiences of all community members. Acknowledging the diverse identities experienced by nonbinary transgender faculty, students, and staff will promote equality within the system, give equal access to opportunities for learning, leadership, and success, and affirm the lives of those minoritized people, ultimately leading to better well-being and professional attainment of the nonbinary transgender person. Queer perspectives enrich educational practices and promote innovative experiences. It is vital for institutions to contribute to a more inclusive and effective education system and to remove social exclusion due to heteronormative policies.

Centering intersectionality at the micro level provides a deeper understanding of the nonbinary transgender individual's challenges within minoritized communities. This can include pressure to conform to societal norms in the workplace and at home and bias or stereotypes about gender, relationships, and identities. Prioritizing binary gender customs pushes away people who are nonbinary, impacting the individual's life experiences and sense of belonging. An inclusive environment that values diversity requires collective action and advocacy at every level.

Higher Education Organizational Barriers

In the landscape of higher education, women constitute a significant portion of students and faculty members, yet their representation in leadership roles remains disproportionately low. This disparity stems from systemic institutional barriers hindering women's advancement into top leadership positions. Diehl and Dzubinski (2016) offered 16 meso-level barriers: devaluing communal practice, discrimination, exclusion from informal networks, glass cliff, lack of mentoring, lack of sponsorship, lack of support, male gatekeeping, male organizational culture, organizational ambivalence, queen bee effect, salary inequality, tokenism, two-person career structure, unequal standards, and workplace harassment. Since discussions of these barriers can be found elsewhere, this commentary will focus on three that may particularly resonate with the nonbinary transgender experience: male organizational culture, institutional ambivalence, and tokenism.

Glass Cliff Phenomenon

Ryan and Haslam (2005) coined the term *glass cliff*, in which women were appointed to precarious leadership positions as a last resort for a declining company or organization. Their work responded to the idea that women leading British companies were adversely affecting performance, decreasing the value of stocks, and that “corporate Britain may be better off without women on the board” (Judge, 2003, p. 21).

After a decade of further research, Ryan et al. (2016) demonstrated that women are purposefully selected for leadership when a corporation faces a crisis. Additional research showed that “male participants tended to favor the male candidate when all was well, but showed no gender preference when things were going badly. In contrast, female participants consistently favored the female candidate, but did so more strongly when performance was poor” (Ryan et al., 2016, p. 450). Additionally, Morgenroth et al. (2020) found that it is not only women who encounter this glass cliff but that people who are from underrepresented racial and ethnic minority communities are also more likely to face the glass cliff when appointed to a risky leadership position.

Furthermore, Ryan (2022) asserted that the glass cliff can be seen at all levels of politics, including Prime Ministers Theresa May (United Kingdom) and Julia Gillard (Australia). Ryan suggested that gender stereotypes may create the impression that women possess characteristics that enhance their effectiveness as leaders in a crisis and/or “...women do not have the luxury of turning down a sub-optimal leadership position” (Ryan, 2022, para. 5).

Male Organizational Culture

Globally, educational institutions were designed by and for men. Although societies evolve with time, the foundational organizing principles and hierarchical structures remain unchanged within higher education. Therefore, male-normed organizational cultures persist and disadvantage women seeking leadership positions (Braun et al., 2017; Schein et al., 1996). These entrenched norms marginalize women's contributions and limit their access to decision-making processes (Diehl, 2023; Eagly & Carli, 2007).

People who identify as nonbinary transgender in higher education leadership positions face additional bias and discrimination as compared to their cisgender female colleagues. The conversations surrounding gender equity within male-normed cultures usually revolve around the binary, assuming that there are only two genders traditionally based on assigned sex at birth. When discussing gender disparities in salary, representation, education, health, and so on, transgender and nonbinary people remain invisible, devaluing their community and perspectives. Eliminating the idea of a socially constructed binary gender would benefit trans educators (Pitcher, 2020) while simultaneously challenging the inherent biases that permeate male-normed organizational cultures.

Organizational Ambivalence

Diehl and Dzubinski (2016) referenced organizational ambivalence as a lack of institutional recognition for women's leadership contributions. Rooted in preferences for male leadership, organizations reward and highlight male contributions to shared goals without noticing how others

enabled institutional success. Fitzgerald (2014, as cited in Fitzgerald, 2020) used the provocative, gendered image of “institutional housekeeping” (p. 223) to describe the leadership opportunities afforded to women. The hidden work of quality assurance, student advising, committee work, or service opportunities disproportionately falls to women within higher education but may not significantly aid career advancement (Harvey & Jones, 2022). Additionally, O’Connor (2023) applied “bonsai-ing,” or purposeful trimming or limiting of a leader’s impact, to describe women’s leadership. While initially applied to women’s leadership, these metaphors extend nonbinary transgender experiences. Higher education institutions may allow minoritized leaders but in a controlled and limited capacity. Both institutional housekeeping and bonsai-ing are potent metaphors to describe a pervasive ambivalence towards women’s contributions to education.

Tokenism

First coined by Kanter (1977), tokenism is the heightened visibility associated with being the only one representing a particular identity in a group. Initially applied to U.S. women in the workforce, the concept has been used across sectors with multiple identities. Some consequences of tokenism include exaggerated differences, social isolation within a group, and individuals being confined to culturally normative gender roles. Tokenism persists but may be particularly applicable to leaders who identify as nonbinary transgender or whose intersectional identities offer visual cues that could be stereotyped within the organization.

In a study of 3065 employees from five countries (Australia, Brazil, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States), Brassel et al. (2022) found that 61% of respondents actively guard against bias in their workplace teams. While not labeled as tokenism per se, respondents described an emotional tax consistent with heightened visibility or being minoritized within a group. Specifically, the percentage increased to 85% for nonbinary transgender employees, demonstrating the added burden experienced by this group. A diverse team and cultural climate for psychological safety mitigated an individual’s vigilance against bias and increased team cohesion and problem-solving. Although the study was not limited to higher education, Brassel et al.’s findings demonstrate the inclusive, intersectional disaggregation of data this commentary advocates higher education researchers aspire to.

One such study by Catalano and Wagner (2024) used the term “Queer battle fatigue” (p. 75) to describe the experiences of nonbinary transgender educators. Within male and heteronormative institutions, nonbinary transgender people face microaggressions and hostile environments. It is often necessary for nonbinary transgender individuals to advocate for themselves, but this can be damaging to mental health, physical well-being, and professional success. Microaggressions such as subtle comments and behaviors such as assuming gender can belittle and invalidate nonbinary transgender people’s gender identities, also leading to feelings of self-doubt. Queer battle fatigue describes the physical, emotional, and mental toll undertaken by minoritized people as a result of continuous microaggressions, stereotypes, and bias, similar to the emotional tax expressed by Brassel et al. (2022).

Nonbinary Transgender Leaders in Higher Education

In summary, institutions must commit to providing an inclusive, safe space for all community members. Senior leaders can advocate for others by calling for the reform of higher education policies and practices. Queer people are woefully underrepresented in higher education

leadership positions, which makes it more difficult for a nonbinary transgender individual to encounter a mentor or advocate from their community. Queer policy must change to adapt away from a heteronormative environment and eliminate the notion of the binary gender. Higher education leaders are responsible for advocating for social and political change to alleviate systemic discrimination.

Higher Education Organizational Solutions

Addressing gender inequities in higher education requires a multifaceted approach. The biases and assumptions that pervade gendered organizational structures minoritize the women and nonbinary transgender communities with long-lasting consequences for individuals. As leaders address gender inequity by rewriting and updating policies, senior-level administrators must expand guidelines regarding anti-discrimination, parental leave and flexible working hours, restroom access, name/pronoun usage, gender-sensitive curricula, and active promotion of women and nonbinary transgender individuals into leadership positions. Additionally, healthcare coverage must also be considered, as any limitation on access to healthcare is detrimental to a person's economic stability.

Holistic Health as an Institutional Priority

Gallup's State of the Global Workplace Report (2023) summarized that 23% of the global workforce is thriving at work (high engagement), with 59% described as quiet quitting (low engagement) and 18% as loud quitting (actively disengaged). Of those who reported low engagement, 41% cited a poor organizational culture (e.g., a desire for managers to be more approachable, more respectful, and clearer organizational goals), 28% cited pay and benefits, and 16% cited the organization's lack of attention to their wellbeing. Harter et al. (2020) found investing in a positive organizational culture is a worthwhile, long-term investment for organizations and leads to eleven positive organizational outcomes, including profits: "Doing what is best for employees does not have to contradict what is best for the organization" (p. 32).

Consistent with Gallup's findings, the Surgeon General's Framework for Workplace Mental Health and Well-Being (Surgeon General, 2022) serves as a tool for higher education institutions, providing a roadmap for supporting the well-being of all leaders within their ranks. Centered around worker voice and equity, the framework covers five essentials to help workplaces become engines of well-being, providing employees with the resources and support they need to thrive. The five essentials are Protection from Harm, Work-Life Harmony, Matterering at Work, Connection & Community, and Opportunity for Growth (Surgeon General, 2022).

Cultivating a Positive Organizational Culture

Ironically, the substantive research extolling the importance of university students' sense of belonging to education outcomes (Crawford et al., 2024; Kirby & Thomas, 2022; Manaze & Ford, 2021; Museus et al., 2017) is not often applied to higher education employees. Positive organizational behavior scholarship documents that the individual and collective benefits of belonging extend to workplaces (Achor, 2018; Brassel et al., 2022; Edmondson, 2019; Miranda-Wolff, 2022). Further evidence suggests belonging mitigates workplace sexism and contributes positively to mental health and overall job satisfaction (Rubin et al., 2019).

Edmondson (2019) asserted that developing psychological safety within teams and organizations leads to innovation because individuals fully engage without fear of reprisal for voicing their perspective. Psychological safety can be fostered through trusting relationships, particularly with organizational leaders, which also boosts a sense of belonging. Specifically relevant to progress toward gender equity, Sattari et al. (2021) found a relationship between “feeling heard,” closely related to psychological safety, and interrupting sexism at work.

Implementing Institutional Policies that Make a Difference

In the US, women earn about 82% of men's pay, while Black women earn 70% and Hispanic women earn 65% (Agovino, 2022). This pay gap reflects a global gender pay disparity. In higher education, male-dominated fields such as medicine, business, and engineering lead to higher salaries for academic deans compared to fields with more women, like nursing and social sciences (Silbert et al., 2022). While many educational institutions aim to increase women's representation, broader diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts remain limited. According to the World Economic Forum (2023), only 13% of educational institutions have broader diversity, equity, and inclusion programs or hiring quotas. This gap highlights a lack of focus on including non-binary and other identities in gender equity initiatives.

Quotas and policies can help establish accountability, but they may not be enough to overcome entrenched cultural barriers. For instance, 26% of elite US higher education board chairs are women, and only 8% of boards have reached gender parity (Silbert et al., 2022). In contrast, Fortune 500 companies have higher levels of diversity on their boards (Deloitte, 2018). National and institutional policies and quotas establish benchmarks and accountability but may not address cultural issues allowing inequities to persist. Leadership must actively support and prioritize gender equity efforts for progress. Regulska (2021) warns that policies fail without support from top leadership or when there is a mismatch between expectations and reality. Therefore, higher education institutions need the accountability quotas provided to make progress toward equity within boards.

Research suggests that gender-diverse leadership teams outperform homogeneous ones, showcasing the benefits of greater inclusivity (Diehl, 2023; Diehl & Dzubinski, 2016; Soares et al., 2011). Higher education institutions need to confront persistent gender biases and promote accountability for progress. This includes prioritizing candidates with a proven record of accomplishment of accomplishments in gender equity when hiring leaders (O'Connor, 2019). Higher education institutions must model equitable paths forward and embrace proven solutions. This includes prioritizing gender equity work, allocating resources, and striving for greater accountability and transparency. By doing so, they can bridge the gap between policy and implementation, leading to a more equitable education sector.

Conclusion

Efforts to dismantle institutional barriers and promote gender equity in higher education leadership require concerted action at macro- (societal), meso- (institutional), and micro- (individual) levels. While this commentary focused on meso-level challenges and solutions, the interaction between layered complexities must be considered when developing effective strategies to reach gender parity. Implementing effective policies to establish the necessary accountability for progress,

fostering inclusive organizational cultures that embrace intersectional identities and an expansive understanding of gender, and embracing holistic personal health as normative within workplaces are essential steps toward creating environments where women can thrive and ascend to leadership positions. Addressing multifaceted barriers with proactive and positive leadership is indispensable for fostering diverse, equitable, and inclusive academic institutions that leverage the full potential of talent across gender lines.

Acknowledgements

The authors disclose that they have no actual or perceived conflicts of interest. The authors disclose that they have not received any funding for this manuscript beyond resourcing for academic time at their respective university. The authors drafted this manuscript without artificial intelligence support. The authors utilized artificial intelligence for the manuscript's final editing and formatting. CReDIT: JD: Conceptualization, Writing-Original Draft, Writing-Review & Editing. NDK: Writing-Original Draft, Writing-Review & Editing. AG: Writing-Original Draft, Writing-Review & Editing.

References

- Achor, S. (2018). *Big potential: How transforming the pursuit of success raises our achievement, happiness, and well-being*. Currency.
- American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). (2024, April 5). *Mapping attacks on LGBTQ rights in US state legislatures in 2024*. <https://www.aclu.org/legislative-attacks-on-lgbtq-rights-2024>
- Agovino, T. (2022, Fall). The big reveal. *HR Magazine*, 33–39.
- Avolio, B., Pardo, E., & Prados-Peña, M.B. (2024). Factors that contribute to the underrepresentation of women academics worldwide: A literature review. *Social Psychology of Education: An International Journal*, 27(1), 261–281. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-023-09838-3>
- American Council on Education (ACE). (2021). *Women's Representation in Higher Education Leadership Around the World*. <https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Womens-Rep-in-Higher-Ed-Leadership-Around-the-World.pdf>
- Brassel, S., Shaffer, E., & Travis, D. J. (2022). *Emotional tax and work teams: A view from five countries*. Catalyst. <https://www.catalyst.org/reports/emotional-tax-teams/>
- Braun, S. Stegmann, S., Haernandez Bark, A. S., Junker, N. M., & van Dick, R. (2017). Think manager-think male, think follower-think female: Gender bias in implicit followership theories. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 47, 377–388. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12445>
- Catalano, D. C. J., & Wagner, R. (2024). Gender as spectacle: Safe zone facilitation experiences of nonbinary/trans educators. *Journal of Women and Gender in Higher Education*, 17(1), 63–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26379112.2024.2307482>
- Catalyst. (2004). *The bottom line: Connecting corporate performance and gender diversity*. New York, NY: Author.
- Chronicle of Higher Education. (2024, April 5). *DEI legislation tracker*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/here-are-the-states-where-lawmakers-are-seeking-to-ban-colleges-dei-efforts>
- Crawford, J., Allen, K., Sanders, T., Baumeister, R., Parker, P., Saunders, C., & Tice, D. (2024). Sense of belonging in higher education students: An Australian longitudinal study from 2013 to 2019. *Studies in Higher Education*, 49(3), 395–409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2023.2238006>

- Crawford, J., Cowling, M., Ashton-Hay, S., Kelder, J. A., Middleton, R., & Wilson, G. S. (2023). Artificial intelligence and authorship editor policy: ChatGPT, bard bing AI, and beyond. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 20(5), 1. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.5.01>
- Dahlvig, J. E., & Longman, K. A. (2020). Women's leadership in higher education: Addressing glass ceilings and sticky floors. In N. S. Niemi & M. B. Weaver-Hightower (Eds.), *The Wiley Handbook of Gender Equity in Higher Education* (Chapter 2). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119257639.ch2>
- DeLaquil, T. (2021). *Striving to achieve the "unfinished business" of gender equality: The case of women's leadership in higher education*. American Council on Education. <https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Womens-Rep-in-Higher-Ed-Leadership-Around-the-World.pdf>
- Deloitte and the Alliance for Board Diversity. (2018). *Missing pieces report: The 2018 board diversity census of women and minorities on Fortune 500 boards*. <https://www.catalyst.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/us-missing-pieces-report-industry-view.pdf>
- Desvaux, G., Devillard-Hoellinger, S., & Baumgarten, P. (2007). *Women matter: Gender diversity, a corporate performance driver*. <http://www.mckinsey.com/~/>
- Diehl, A. (2023). *Glass walls. [electronic resource]: Shattering the six gender bias barriers still holding women back at work*.
- Diehl, A. B. & Dzubinski, L., M. (2016). Making the invisible visible: A cross-sector analysis of gender-based leadership barriers. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 27(2), 181–206. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21248>
- Eagly, A., & Carli, A. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Edmondson, A. C. (2019). *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth*. Wiley.
- Fitzgerald, T. (2020). Mapping the terrain of leadership: Gender and leadership in higher education. *Irish Educational Studies*, 39(2), 221–232. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2020.1729222>
- Global Gender Gap Report 2023*. (2023, October 20). World Economic Forum. <https://www.weforum.org/publications/global-gender-gap-report-2023/>
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Agrawal, S., Blue, A., Plowman, S. K., Josh, P., & Asplund, J. (2020). *The relationship between engagement at work and organizational outcomes*. Gallup. <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/321725/gallup-q12-meta-analysis-report.aspx?thank-you-report-form=1#ite-321731>
- Harvey, M. & Jones, S. (2022). Challenge accepted: Women claiming leadership in higher education learning and teaching. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practices*, 19(1), 68–91. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.19.1.05>
- Judge, E. (2003). Women on board: Help or hindrance? *The Times UK*. <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/women-on-board-help-or-hindrance-2c6fnqf6fng>
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(5), 965–990. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2777808>
- Kirby, L. A. J., & Thomas, C. L. (2022). High-impact teaching practices foster a greater sense of belonging in the college classroom. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 46(3), 368–381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2021.1950659>
- Manaze, M., & Ford, A. (2021). Campus climate for diversity and students' sense of belonging in Ethiopian public universities. *Educational Planning*, 28(4), 5–24.
- Maheshwari, G., & Nayak, R. (2022). Women leadership in Vietnamese higher education institutions: An exploratory study on barriers and enablers for career

- enhancement. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(5), 758–775. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220945700>
- Miranda-Wolff, A. (2022). *Cultures of belonging. [electronic resource]: Building inclusive organizations that last*.
- Morgenroth, T., Kirby, T. A., Ryan, M. K., & Sudkämper, A. (2020). The who, when, and why of the glass cliff phenomenon: A meta-analysis of appointments to precarious leadership positions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 146(9), 797–829. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000234>
- Mate, S. E., McDonald, M., & Do, T. (2019). The barriers and enablers to career and leadership development: An exploration of women's stories in two work cultures. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 27(4), 857–874. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJOA-07-2018-1475/full/html>
- Moors, A.C., Stewart, A.J. & Malley, J.E. (2022). Gendered impact of caregiving responsibilities on tenure track faculty parents' professional lives. *Sex Roles* 87, 498–514. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-022-01324-y>
- Museus, S. D., Yi, V., & Saelua, N. (2017). The impact of culturally engaging campus environments on sense of belonging. *Review of Higher Education*, 40(2), 187–215. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2017.0001>
- O'Connor, P. (2019). Gender imbalance in senior positions in higher education: What is the problem? What can be done? *Policy Reviews in Higher Education* 3(1): 28–50. doi:10.1080/23322969.2018.1552084
- O'Connor, P. (2023). Is gendered power irrelevant in higher educational institutions? Understanding the persistence of gender inequality. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, 48(4), 669–686. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03080188.2023.2253667>
- Ocampo González, A., & Hill Collins, P. (2019). Interview with Patricia Hill Collins on critical thinking, intersectionality and education: Key objectives for critical articulation on inclusive education. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 17(2), 151–170. <http://www.jceps.com/archives/6434>
- Office of the US Surgeon General. (2022). *The US Surgeon General's framework for workplace mental health & well-being*. <https://www.hhs.gov/surgeongeneral/priorities/workplace-well-being/index.html>
- Pitcher, E. N. (2020). Toward academic gender justice: Trans faculty reconceptualizing gender equity. *Teacher College Record*, 122(8), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146812012200805>
- Regulska, J. (2021). *Women and equity in higher education: Eradicating barriers in a post-pandemic world*. American Council on Education. <https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Womens-Rep-in-Higher-Ed-Leadership-Around-the-World.pdf>
- Rubin, M., Paolini, S., Subasic, E. & Glacomini, A. (2019). A confirmatory study of the relations between workplace sexism, sense of belonging, mental health, and job satisfaction among women in male-dominated industries. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 49(5), 267–282. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12577>
- Ryan, M. (2022). The glass cliff: Why women lead in a crisis. *Broad Agenda*. <https://www.broadagenda.com.au/2022/the-glass-cliff-why-women-lead-in-a-crisis/>
- Ryan, M. K., Haslam, S. A., Morgenroth, T., Rink, F., Stoker, J., & Peters, K. (2016). Getting on top of the glass cliff: Reviewing a decade of evidence, explanations, and impact. *The Leadership Quarterly* 27(3), 446–455. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.10.008>
- Ryan, M. K., & Haslam, S. A. (2005). The glass cliff: Evidence that women are over-represented in precarious leadership positions. *British Journal of Management*, 16(2), 81–90. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2005.00433.x>

- Sattari, N., DiMuccio, S., & Gabriele, L. (2021). *When managers are open, men feel heard and interrupt sexism*. Catalyst. <https://www.catalyst.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/interrupting-sexism-capstone.pdf>
- Schein, V. E., Mueller, R., Lituchy, T. & Liu, J. (1996). Think manager-think male: a global phenomenon? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17(1), 33–41. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2488533>
- Silbert, A., Punty, M., & Ghoniem, E. B. (2022). *The women's power gap at elite universities: Scaling the ivory tower*. <https://www.womenspowergap.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/WPG-Power-Gap-at-Elite-Universities-v17.pdf>
- Soares, R., Marquis, C. & Lee, M. (2011). *Gender and corporate social responsibility: It's a matter of sustainability*. Catalyst. https://www.catalyst.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/gender_and_corporate_social_responsibility.pdf
- Tabassum, N., & Nayak, B. S. (2021). Gender stereotypes and their impact on women's career progressions from a managerial perspective. *IIM Kozhikode Society & Management Review*, 10(2), 192-208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2277975220975513>
- Welbourne, T. M., Cycyota, C. S., & Ferrante, C. J. (2007). Wall Street reaction to women in IPOs. *Group & Organization Management*, 32 (5), 524 – 547. doi:10.1177/1059601106291071
- Workplace Mental Health & Well-Being - Current Priorities of the U.S. Surgeon General. (2022). <https://www.hhs.gov/surgeongeneral/priorities/workplace-well-being/index.html>