Playing the Game: Understanding the Gender Gap in Art Museum Directorships

Kathryn Loraine Dawson

A thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the

Requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

University of Washington

2017

Committee:

Wilson O'Donnell

Angelina Ong

Shirley Yee

Program Authorized to Offer Degree

Museology

University of Washington

Abstract

Playing the Game:

Understanding the Gender Gap in Art Museum Directorships

Kathryn Loraine Dawson

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:
Lecturer Wilson O'Donnell
Museology

The Association of Art Museum Directors has identified a gender gap in art museum directorships particularly in the largest and wealthiest institutions. In order for art museums to create inclusive, accessible educational spaces, it is imperative that the field explores the inequities present in its leadership. This research aims to understand the experiences of women who have achieved leadership positions in medium to large art museums. Fifteen art museum directors from museums with budgets from $10-$30 million, from across the United States were interviewed. The desire to make an impact is a strong theme throughout the interviews, as is the desire to remove barriers for others in the field. Another strong theme that emerged is the importance of, and need for, mentorship. Participants highlighted how gender does not operate in a vacuum, however, but rather interacts with other identities, such as age, race, and sexuality. Interviews emphasized a strong need to address inherent biases against women's leadership within organizations, particularly on boards of directors. Executives are foundational to organizational culture, building organizations that make critical choices about whose art, history, and culture is considered worthy of collecting and exhibiting, and how that is done. These findings suggest that further research should be done to investigate how boards of directors might begin diversifying leadership and mitigating the leaks in the pipeline.

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank the women who participated in this study, graciously lending their time, experience, and knowledge: Hope Alswang, Dr. Julie Decker, Dr. Kim Rorschach, Lori Fogarty, Lial Jones, Nannette Maciejunes, Olga Viso, Kaywin Feldman, Dr. Kathleen Jameson, Dr. Susan Edwards, Marianne Richter, Kim Sajet, Judith O'Toole, and Lynn Zelevansky. Their expertise made this research what it is and I am immensely grateful.

Secondly, I would like to thank my committee, Wilson O'Donnell, Angelina Ong, and Dr. Shirley Yee for their guidance, enthusiasm, and encouragement. Particular gratitude is due to my advisor Angelina Ong, without her wisdom and patience this thesis would not have been written.

Finally, thanks are due to the women who have made me who I am and have encouraged me to be passionate and ambitious in everything I do. There are no words to describe how grateful I am to the love, patience, and wisdom of my grandmother, my mother, and my girl gang.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Since gaining the right to vote in 1920 and the second wave feminist movement of the 1960s and 70s, American women have made great strides toward equality. Despite this progress, a gender discrepancy remains. This gender disparity in corporate and for-profit workplaces, especially in leadership positions, has been widely discussed and researched across disciplines in the social sciences, sciences, and humanities. Indeed, there is now a great deal of scholarly work not only on gender, identity, and difference itself, but also on the gender gap in executive leadership and women in the workplace writ large. Non-profit organizations such as museums are not exempt from these inequities, and in order to further understand how the gap is created and to map a way forward, more research needs to be done in these particular organizations.

While for decades the metaphor of the *glass ceiling* has been used to illustrate the invisible barriers women face at work, it is now clear that it is not one single barrier that keeps women out of top positions but a winding path full of many obstacles (Eagly & Carli, 2007). The metaphor of the glass ceiling implies that women and men have equal access to entry and midlevel positions, which research has found to be untrue. By depicting a single, unvarying obstacle, the glass ceiling fails to incorporate the complexity and variety of challenges that women can face in their leadership journeys. Women are not turned away only as they reach the penultimate state of a distinguished career, but rather disappear in varying numbers at many points leading up to that stage.

In the for-profit sector, less than 5% of Fortune 500 and Fortune 1000 companies are led by female CEOs. This trend remains true in the nonprofit sector as well. According to GuideStar's 2013 Nonprofit Compensation Report, the median pay for female CEOs lags behind that of men across all budget categories (Guidestar, 2013). In fact, less than half of CEOs are

female at non-profits with operating budgets above $1 million and at the largest of these organizations, those with budgets over $50 million, women hold only 16% of CEO positions. Additionally, the Mellon Foundation released a report in 2015 detailing the demographics of art museum staffs which found the case for inclusivity in museums to be "clear and urgent, and constructive responses to it will be critical to the continued vitality of art museums as public resources for a democratic society" (Shonfeld, Sweeney & Westerman, 4).

In reports released in 2014 and 2017, the Association of Art Museum Directors acknowledged that across many sectors in the United States, women are underrepresented in leadership roles and receive comparably less compensation than their male counterparts (Gan, Voss, Phillips, Anagnos & Wade, 2014). This report sought to further understand how art museums fit into conversations about the changing role of women in leadership and historical biases in favor of male leadership. The AAMD paper, however, only considered pre-director positions in a limited way, leaving questions about whether a gender gap exists in the talent pipeline. Engaging this line of inquiry may illuminate the extent to which women may be starting off with disadvantages, whether through salary, flexibility in their positions, or lack of mentorship. For them, the glass ceiling was never even in sight.

Research confirms that that male leaders receive more favorable evaluations than equivalent female leaders, especially in roles usually occupied by men. This remains true whether the evaluators are men or women (Powell, 2010). Moreover, these studies affirm that people associate women and men with different traits, linking men with more of the traits that tend to connote leadership. For example, kindness that is seen as noteworthy in men is seen as unimpressive in women, a dynamic that becomes much more complicated when race is also in question. In order to navigate the *double bind*, women seek ways to project authority without

relying on the autocratic behaviors people find so jarring in women. Pigeonholing like this, researchers emphasize, limits women's options and makes it difficult for them to rise to positions of managerial responsibility, and ultimately toward executive roles.

A gender imbalance permeates American museums despite the existence of more high-level opportunities for women than in many other fields. As far as raw numbers are concerned, women dominate museum staffs at an estimated two-thirds of all professional and senior-level staff in the field (American Alliance of Museums & New Knowledge Organization Limited, 2014). Even still, across the field the gender-pay-gap is approximately the same as the national average of 78 cents on the dollar (Schwarzer, 2007). Men, however, dominate museums in two critical areas: money and power, holding sway over boards of directors, major donor lists, and pay scales.

Existing literature lacks deep insight into the experiences and career paths of the women who have made it to leadership positions, as well as what can be done in the future to promote equity in these positions. To that end, the purpose of this study is to investigate the pipeline toward executive leadership (CEO/Executive Director) positions in medium to large public non-profit art museums for women by discovering trends and patterns in career trajectory and professional experiences from women who have reached these positions. This will be addressed through the following research questions: Where did the path toward leadership positions begin for these women? What were the barriers to achieving a leadership position? What was beneficial along the way? How does their career path inform how they lead? Leadership in this study is positioned as both an organizational role, like CEO or director, as well as an abstract concept describing the practice of cultivating a vision and establishing a following among individuals or teams to achieve that vision.

The imbalance of power and funding raises significant questions about who selects objects and how they are presented, whose history and culture is considered worthy of collecting and exhibiting, and how this is done. Who works in a museum is a critical part of identifying the political, ideological, and aesthetic practices at work in the institution. This study offers deeper understanding and raises awareness for issues currently facing the museum field. For those who seek to redefine museum leadership positions, this work is necessary to begin solving these problems. A focus on diversification of leadership would propel museums in a progressive direction toward greater accessibility and wider public participation and to dispel elitism and increase diverse representation among staff in museums, despite resistance to these forces of change.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Gender dynamics are foundational to understanding other gender gaps in museum leadership. Gender studies literature has established gender as a socialization process that creates a masculine identity and worldview for men and a feminine identity and worldview for women (Debebe, 2011). This literature also explores how these identities are embodied and socially coded into how men and women present themselves and are understood at work (Trethewey, 1999). Theories rejecting the binary of gender have emerged to more holistically embrace all versions of gender expression. Understanding gender as fluid seeks to circumvent the limitations of a standard gender binary (Stryker & Whittle, 2006). It is important to recognize that these orientations are deeply embedded in society and culture such that people view them as inherent to the sexes (Debebe, 2011).

Despite the obvious gains of the last half-century in women's access to leadership, equal occupancy of social change makes it possible to cite statistics that seem encouraging or discouraging in relation to achieving gender equality. It is tempting for those who observe women emerging as leaders in some contexts to conclude that our society offers equal opportunity. These issues encompass the complications of inequality that are still present but less extreme than in the early decades of the 20th century. Traditional notions of leadership are masculine; women who pursue leadership roles are at risk for seeming unqualified and therefore having others resist their efforts to exert influence. Given conventional expectations that women should be nice and kind and that leaders should be assertive and dominant, cultural norms dictate these traits as mutually exclusive, causing women leaders to face everyday challenges of finding a mix that blends niceness and assertiveness. Beyond the obvious importance of equal

opportunity, access to leadership opens up chances for individuals to make a tangible difference in the world.

Research into the shadow cast by gender on executive leadership is wide-ranging and interdisciplinary. There are a variety of bodies of literature germane to this study and it is important to highlight where each intersects one another. These fields include diversity in executive leadership, leadership characteristics and styles, feminist leadership, and challenges for women in leadership roles. Exploring the demographics of, and writing specific to, female leadership in museums and nonprofits will add a further layer of complexity to this topic. The literature establishes the need for diversity in executive leadership and to investigate the differences between men and women in leadership roles. Moreover, the research examines the barriers women face when aspiring to leadership positions. Finally, the literature focuses in on how leadership and gender affect the future of the museum field.

Gender Diversity in Leadership

According to a 2008 Catalyst report, women comprised 46.5% of the total labor force in the United States and accounted for nearly 51% of all managerial and professional jobs. However, women holding top positions remained at about 7% of all executives nationwide (Catalyst, 2007). These statistics represent a significant underutilization of the talent in the available labor force across all sectors. Citing corporate gender equity research, Facebook COO Sheryl Sandberg highlights that leaving women out of leadership is not only bad for women, it is bad for the company and for our economy (Sandberg, 2016). Sandberg is correct in that as recently as 2016, researchers have consistently found that companies with at least 30% female executives make as much as six percentage points more in profits than their all-male counterparts

(Noland, Moran & Kotschwar, 2016; Ellison & Mullin, 2014). The lack of women in these upper-level roles may indicate to lower-level women that aspiring to executive positions is untenable, resulting in organizations losing the opportunity to capitalize on the skills and talents of this portion of their workforce (Hoobler, Lemmon & Wayne, 2011). Moreover, when there are fewer women in senior leadership positions, women at entry- or mid-level positions in the organization have few, if any, mentors with experience in executive management (Hoobler et al, 2011). These factors impact the retention of future leaders, leading women with aspirations for leadership to be unprepared for such positions and keep them from applying (Hoobler et al, 2011; Beeson & Valerio, 2012).

Echoed in research done by Hoobler, Lemmon and Wayne, they found that the underrepresentation of women in senior leadership to be problematic because it stymies the opportunity for a substantial proportion of the US workforce to contribute to organizations via powerful managerial roles (Hoobler et al, 2011). Furthermore, a Catalyst study notes that inclusion of a large number of women leaders correlates with improved corporate performance (Weisul, 2004). Beeson and Valerio (2012) conclude that female executives are an underutilized resource who could substantially boost corporate performance if given the right opportunities for advancement. Theorized by Hoobler, Lemmon and Wayne, the family-work conflict bias results in inefficient allocation of talent in organizations. This means that a large, highly educated proportion of the workforce is being overlooked as possible upper managerial material due to preconceived notions about women's ability to balance work and family responsibilities.

Female managerial underutilization will become apparent as the Baby Boomer generation retires, leaving a large gap in the leadership pipeline (Beeson & Valerio, 2012). According to many reports over the last 15 years, a leadership shortage is fast approaching. As a result,

companies will need to focus on identifying the development of new leaders, particularly women (Beeson & Valerio, 2012; Tierney, 2006; McKee & Froelich, 2016; Carman, Leland & Wilson, 2010). In the years between 1980 and 2000, the labor pool aged 34-50 grew by 35 million, while that same group is expected to expand by only 3 million between 2000 and 2020 (Tierney, 2006). In addition, the approximately 80 million Baby Boomers in the United States now retire at a rate of 5% annually according to a 2012 Social Security Administration report. A Brookings Institute report confirmed that the downturn in labor market participation, down 3% since 2007, was due to structural forces rather than cyclical or labor market slack (Aaronson, Cajner, Fallick, Galbis-Reig, Smith & Wascher, 2014). Indicating a significant and continuous turnover in senior leadership across sectors, a majority of organizations must anticipate an executive transition in the next decade (Tierney, 2006; McKee & Froelich, 2016; Carman et al, 2010). This problem is exacerbated for nonprofits that already struggle to attract and retain talented senior leadership. Executive leadership shortages combined with the growing numbers, size, and economic and social significance of nonprofits draws attention to the need for developing a new pool of talented senior managers (Virick & Greer, 2012). These shortages across sectors point to an imperative for companies and organizations to prioritize gender diversity not only in their hiring but also in their leadership development pipelines.

Leadership Styles and Characteristics

In order to increase diversity in the workplace, it is necessary to address the unconscious and conscious biases against women's leadership styles. Research has shown bias against women in leadership roles, indicating a core reliance on the assumption that being a woman is incompatible with being a leader (Hoobler et al, 2011; Elsesser & Lever, 2011; Powell, 2011;

Eagly & Carli, 2007; Madden, 2007; Chin, 2008). Elsesser and Lever's analysis indicates that participants were less likely to show gender bias when evaluating their own boss, despite the opposite being true when evaluating a hypothetical female boss (Elsesser & Lever, 2011). While the rationale for preferring female managers tends to be the positive characteristics of those managers, the explanations given for preferring male bosses centers on negative attributes of female bosses (Elsesser & Lever, 2011; Powell, 2011). This indicates that the source of bias does exist within women violating their sex roles by adopting leadership roles but rather the assumption that women have less inherent potential for management (Elsesser & Lever, 2011). Researchers hypothesize that this reveals that some workers still hold blatant prejudice about women's leadership abilities (Elsesser & Lever, 2011; Powell, 2011). In agreement with other findings that theorize that simply being a woman signals to a manager that her family will interfere with her work irrespective of whether or not said woman actually has any such conflict, this is referred to as the family-work conflict bias (Hoobler et al, 2011).

Researchers have found that the perceptions and subtle choices of direct managers are the most relevant to the progress of women's careers today. The combination of the "think leader, think male" and the "way work is structured" arguments have been found to powerfully predict women's lack of upward progress (Hoobler et al, 2011; Powell, 2011; Chin, 2008). These perceptions favor the leadership of men as more effective, and their masculine traits as indicators of good leadership (Chin, 2008). Findings suggest that there remain subtle biases about women at work that do not mesh with deeply held perceptions of what is necessary to be a successful manager and have profound implications for women's career trajectories and progress (Hoobler et al, 2011). Perceived incongruity between female gender roles and leadership leads to two forms of prejudice. One is the perception of women as less likely candidates for leadership roles,

and the other is the evaluation of behavior that fulfills leadership roles as less favorably when it is enacted by women (Chin, 2008). Thus, not only are attitudes less positive toward women leaders but it is also more difficult for women to become leaders and achieve success in leadership roles (Chin, 2008). This suggests that individual's reactions to women leaders remain tempered by gender expectations (Chin, 2008). Women are regarded as less likely to have key leadership behaviors, especially by male raters, and while this effect is small in statistical terms, other studies show that small biases can compound over time to stymie career mobility (Martell & Desmet, 2001; Madden, 2007).

Evidence refutes the idea that men are better leaders and that better leaders are masculine, however many individuals, especially men, describe leaders in stereotypical terms that favor male-bodied individuals over female-bodied individuals (Powell, 2011). Stereotypes fuel *trait approaches* to leadership, which suggest that individuals have special innate characteristics that make them better leaders (Chin, 2008). These approaches typically identify the traits associated with great leaders as intelligence, dominance, confidence, and masculinity all specifically tied to an embodied male identity (Chin, 2008). According to meta-analysis over three decades, a good manager is typically described as having more stereotypically masculine traits than stereotypically feminine traits (Powell, 2011; Chin, 2008; Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell & Ristikari, 2011). This suggests that leaders are more effective if they display personal characteristics associated with men such as independence, decisiveness, and aggressiveness (Powell, 2011). This research also found that prejudice directed toward female leaders may make it difficult for women to be as effective in leadership positions as men and reduce their desirability as leaders (Powell, 2011).

By contrast, the *skills approach* is promising for women because it suggests that leadership skills are competencies that can be acquired (Chin, 2008). Women have frequently been categorized as transformational leaders; those who act as catalysts of change and tend to be visionary, with a holistic picture of how the organization would look when meeting its stated goals (Chin, 2008; Eagly & Carli, 2007). These theories are consistent with feminist principles of inclusion, collaboration, and social advocacy (Chin, 2008). In contrast, men are more frequently thought to be transactional leaders; focused on getting things done, task-oriented, acting with directedness, and using rewards, such as power or status, to achieve an organization's stated goals. While these categorizations are widely held, research does not show large differences between strategic management techniques of men and women (Madden, 2007). Transformational leadership styles have been found in some studies to be highly effective, while transactional styles are only somewhat effective or in some cases actually hinder efficacy (Eagly & Carli, 2007).

An important distinction between transactional and transformational leadership styles is the way in which power is exercised. In an interview study with eighty executives, researchers found a great majority of men and women have both personal and position-based power and all leaders concentrating on people/relationship and task/result aspects of work (Eisner, 2013). They also found that effective leaders adapt their style to situational factors, and those leaders may adapt the gender-linked characteristics they use to the circumstances they seek to lead (Eisner, 2013; Carli & Eagly, 1999). Because men have more societal status than women, they are likely to be granted higher status in feminized work environments than female leaders are granted in masculinized work settings (Powell, 2011). Madden (2007) hypothesizes that gendered management styles represent female managers coping with the constraints imposed by

stereotyped notions of leadership and discriminatory opportunities for gaining experience. Attempts to intervene and navigate disparities in personal and organizational power have led to the rise of feminist leadership strategies.

Feminist Leadership

Feminist leadership is a style of leadership that uses the values of feminism as its primary organizing principles. Feminism, though defined in many ways throughout the last century, is defined here as a social movement whose goal is women's social, legal, political, economic, and cultural equality (Lysa, 2012). Feminist leadership principles center around the idea that leaders of all genders can promote social change, fairness, justice, equity, collaboration, community development, and shared power (Lysa, 2012). The feminist leadership paradigm was developed as an alternative to masculinized or authoritarian leadership principles, aimed at renegotiating institutional power structures. Feminist leadership has transformational attributes but is also interactive in nature (Rosener, 1990; Jacocks, 2012). Interactive leadership is directed toward promoting self-worth, reenergizing organization members, and involves increased support for organizational decisions characterized by the sharing of power and information (Jacocks, 2012; Madden, 2007). Moving toward the goal of creating gender-equitable environments in which women and men can function as effective leaders, this type of leadership is intentionally evolutionary (Chin, 2008).

Communication is a cornerstone of effective leadership and as such, feminist communication must necessarily embody feminist values of equity, cooperation, collaboration, and inclusion (Yabusaki, 2008). Feminist communication must attempt to bridge the predominant male styles of leadership while also maintaining its authentic voice (Yabusaki,

2008). Additionally, collaborative leadership has emerged as essential to the skills and processes of the "modern" leader (Chin, 2008). Collaborative leadership promotes the empowering of others through stewardship of organizational resources, creating a vision for the organization, social advocacy, and changing organizational cultures to create gender-equitable environments (Chin, 2008). Focusing on leadership as contextual, feminist leadership acknowledges that behavior occurs within a context and is influenced by the power relationships among the participants in that context (Madden, 2007).

Alternative methods proposed by feminist leadership seek to change the power relations in a community and to challenge patriarchal processes (Madden, 2007). Feminist planning processes prioritize flexible teams, mutual planning and problem solving, consensual decision making and process, rotating leadership based on specific expertise, and nonhierarchical staff relations (Madden, 2007). Organizations with feminist values redefine power relationships by eliminative hierarchal structure, reducing division of labor and specialization, sharing programmatic decision making, and focusing on empowering workers and clients (Madden, 2007). These methods acknowledge multiple perspectives, avoid simplistic analyses of problems and solutions; and acknowledge the value of interdisciplinary approaches and collaboration to build consensus (Madden, 2007).

As the United States' economy shifts from manufacturing towards service and information-based industries, a great deal of research is calling for a feminine leadership practice that is more participative and focused on people rather than commodities (Jackocks, 2012). Envisioning leadership as collaboration and valuing relational or emotional intelligence significantly shifts what it means to be a good leader. Yet, organizations by and large have neither adjusted the definition of leadership nor redefined planning in gender-neutral terms

(Madden, 2007). Feminist leadership practices require organizations to challenge the power structure and masculine frameworks in which they operate (Chin, 2008). Moreover, feminist management theorists advocate the rejection of the masculine values that situate leaders as 'heroic' or authoritarian, in favor of a more democratic system of governance, involving a flatter, more participative decision-making structure (Kirton & Healy, 2012). While organizations may have feminist attributes such as relational and collaborative processes, environments that ignore gender and power dynamics fundamentally do not have feminist goals (Chin, 2008).

Feminist leadership and strategic planning emphasizes an awareness of difference, identity, and forms of power, challenge dichotomous construction, and focus on procedural equity, not solely outcome (Madden, 2007). These feminist theories can illuminate the underlying assumptions that must be addressed to implement systemic change, rather than focusing on molding women to conform to masculine definitions of leadership (Madden, 2007). Feminist leadership must necessarily confront the gendered asymmetries of power that reside in most organizational structures (Kirton & Healy, 2012; Chin, 2008; Carli,1999; Madden, 2007; Yabusaki, 2008). In some organizations, this has taken the form of flattening hierarchies or removing communication silos (Kirton and Healy, 2012). Addressing the asymmetries and gender dynamics present in modern workplaces is key to understanding the challenges women face in gaining executive leadership positions.

Challenges for Women in Leadership

While it can be helpful to construct new leadership ideals in contrast to conventional forms of leadership and management, women still face concrete challenges in the workplace and in leadership positions. In the past, these barriers were known as the glass ceiling. Coined in the

mid 1980s, the metaphor of the glass ceiling describes the hidden and unbreachable barriers that keep women and minorities from achieving management positions or climbing the corporate ladder (Reich, 1995; Hymowitz & Schellhardt, 1986). The 1995 report by the US Department of Labor and the Federal Glass Ceiling Commission confirmed that women and minorities experience a host of barriers at many hierarchical levels in organizations that prevents them from advancing (Hoobler et al; 2011; Reich, 1995).

In the intervening decades, however, many have questioned the metaphor. The glass ceiling metaphor implies that women and men have equal access to entry- and mid-level positions when the research shows that they, in fact, do not (Eagly & Carli, 2007). By depicting a single unvarying obstacle, the metaphor fails to incorporate the complexity and variety of challenges that women can face on their leadership journeys (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Ultimately, this has led to time, thought, and resources being allocated toward the top, rather than a holistic view of systemic problems (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Instead, scholars advocate a change of metaphor to the *glass labyrinth*, noting that passage through the labyrinth is not simple or direct, but requires persistence, awareness of one's progress, and a careful analysis of the puzzles that lie ahead (Eagly & Carli, 2007). The labyrinth metaphor also acknowledges that the attrition that takes place over a career and that scarcity of women in top positions is the sum of systemic barriers that operate at each level (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Yee, Thomas, Krivkovich, Finch, Kutchner, Cooper, Epstein & Konar, 2016). The labyrinth begins with deeply-held, largely unconscious prejudices that benefit men and penalize women, and continues with resistance to women's leadership, questioning their leadership style and authenticity, and features the challenge of balancing work and family responsibilities (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Hoobler et al, 2011; Yee et al, 2016). While these studies largely do not control for race and ethnicity within

their data, they do acknowledge the increased systemic barriers that arise for women of color in the workplace (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Hoobler et al, 2011; Yee et al, 2016).

Leadership Pipeline

Research shows that women continue to be sidetracked into auxiliary staff roles such as human resources and administrative services, rather than being promoted into line positions where they are responsible for an organization's direct functions (Hoobler et al, 2011). Side-tracking ultimately keeps women out of the pipeline for leadership advancement while reinforcing stereotypes about women at work. In the early decades of women's leadership research, pipeline arguments pointed to the few women in preparatory programs, assuming that once enough qualified women are in the pipeline, they will eventually assume leadership positions in senior management (Hoobler et al, 2011). This assumption is no longer supported by data because according to the National Center for Educational Statistics, women have been gaining the majority of bachelor's and master's degrees since the late 1980s and the majority of Ph.D.s since the mid 2000s. Contemporary women seem to have gained the requisite experience and education, but the pipeline seems to be "leaking" on the way to leadership positions (Hoobler et al, 2011). Lack of advancement to top management in organizations is starkly juxtaposed against the strong advancement of women's educational attainment and workforce participation (Beeson & Valerio, 2012).

Research has indicated that the pipeline may be leaking in a variety of ways. An organization's status symbols, hidden promotional criteria and information loops, as well as the corporate culture itself all represent potential barriers that must be examined when trying to understand why these factors make it difficult for women to assume leadership roles.

Researchers have noticed that larger numbers of women are occupying staff and other internal-facing roles, while men are considerably better represented in line management and customer-facing roles; the kind of positions that historically have led to top corporate positions (Beeson & Valerio, 2012; Klenke, 2004). Siloing of women into these staff positions results in the feminization of those jobs, causing them to look too much like "women's work" for men to want to do them, creating de facto occupational segregation, a process that is more pronounced for women of color (Klenke, 2004). Indeed, recent research has confirmed that declining wages also accompany occupational gender shifts (Blau & Kahn, 2016). When it comes to future opportunities, the siloing of women results in a narrower network and sphere of influence for those women which means they have less political support within the organization to help them attain senior leadership positions (Beeson & Valerio, 2012). This may be why promotions come more slowly for women than for men with equivalent qualifications (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Even in feminized occupations such as nursing, librarianship, and social work, men ascend to supervisory and administrative positions more quickly than women (Eagly & Carli, 2007).

Klenke (2004) suggests that in the selection and promotion of women, attributes of candidates not directly related to job qualifications, such as gender and marital or family-status, may overwhelm job-relevant attributes and lead to discrimination. Additionally, Beeson and Valerio (2012) have suggested that women are often screened on different personal and temperamental criteria than men. In order to reach executive positions, women are expected to have more strengths and fewer faults than their male colleagues (Klenke, 2004). Additionally, poorly articulated rules for advancement fuels cynicism and leaves aspiring leaders in the dark about where to focus their development efforts (Beeson & Valerio, 2012). These practices are exacerbated by an increased reluctance to share feedback with female candidates (Beeson &

Valerio, 2012). When feedback is given, male leaders tend to receive somewhat more favorable evaluations than equivalent female leaders, especially in roles usually occupied by men (Eagly & Carli, 2007).

Leadership Double Binds

Stereotypical expectations in office culture perpetuate prejudicial practices, leading women to face a host of double binds at work. "Double bind" is a catchphrase of the 20th century used to describe the dilemmas facing contemporary women and is commonplace in feminist literature. It identifies a situation in which a person is confronted with two conflicting demands between two courses of action (Jamieson, 1995; Klenke, 2004). As previously mentioned, studies have affirmed that people associate women and men with different traits and link men with more of the traits that connote leadership (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Carli, 1999; Jamieson, 1995; Hoobler et al, 2011). Women in leadership are measured by two opposing metrics—they are asked to ascribe to gender-stereotyped appropriateness as well as masculinized managerial effectiveness (Jamieson, 1995; Klenke, 2004; Debebe, 2011). As women navigate their way through this double bind, they seek ways to project authority without relying on the autocratic behaviors that both men and women find so jarring in women (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Jamieson, 1995; Debebe, 2011). The construct of the double bind functions to deny women access to power and, where individuals may slip past these constraints, to undermine their exercise of whatever power they have achieved (Jamieson, 1995; Klenke, 2004).

As a result, women leaders find that if they have communal leadership traits, they are criticized for not being authoritative enough and if they are agentic, they are criticized for lacking rapport (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Jamieson, 1995; Elsesser & Lever, 2011). In this way,

women are required to walk a narrower path and are given less leeway in the range of leadership behaviors that they are allowed to display (Beeson & Valerio, 2012; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Debebe, 2011; Elsesser & Lever, 2011; Jamieson, 1995; Klenke, 2004; Yee et al, 2016). This double bind additionally denies women the benefits of being warm and considerate, as it is unimpressive in women while studies show that helpful, considerate men receive praise (Eagly, 2007; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Elsesser & Lever, 2011; Debebe, 2011; Jamieson, 1995). Either way, women leave the impression that they do not have what it takes for powerful jobs (Eagly, 2007; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Elsesser & Lever, 2011; Klenke, 2004).

Work/Family Balance

Another stereotypical assumption leads decision makers to continue to assume women have domestic responsibilities that make it inappropriate to promote them to demanding leadership positions (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Hoobler et al, 2011). Studies have confirmed that women are still responsible for the majority of household labor including parenting, remain the ones who interrupt their careers and are more likely to work part-time, and head the majority of single-parent households. (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Hoobler et al, 2011). As a result, they have fewer years of job experience and fewer hours of employment per year, they invest less in social capital or professional networks, and routinely fall short of managers' expectations that they will drop everything for their job, which slows their career progress and reduces earnings (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Hoobler et al, 2011). Women's social investment is in contrast with fast-track managers who spent comparatively more time and effort socializing and networking than did their less successful colleagues (Eagly & Carli, 2007). This suggests that social capital is even more essential to managers' advancement than skill performance (Eagly & Carli, 2007).

Women continue to face prejudices in leadership roles that men do not face and these prejudices make it more difficult for women to be effective leaders (Powell, 2011). Another explanation for the lack of women in upper management propose that men and women simply differ in their priorities; that men prefer high-stakes environments and management while women choose security and less challenging roles (Hoobler et al, 2011). These reports cite studies that interviewed high-potential women workers with family responsibilities who chose to leave full-time employment in order to raise a family (Hoobler et al, 2011). They tend to blame the genetic makeup of women for the lack of career-parity, justifying the status quo as a natural, predetermined difference between men and women (Hoobler et al, 2011).

Organizational Culture & Resistance to Female Leadership

According to a recent report published by LeanIn.org, when women ask for raises or promotions, they often face social repercussions (Yee et al, 2016). Seen as bossy or aggressive simply for asking for raises or negotiating salary, these women were more likely to receive this kind of feedback than men (Yee et al, 2016). LeanIn's report stands in contrast to those who have argued that the lack of women in managerial positions is due to increased numbers of women leaving the workforce (Yee et al, 216; Hoobler et al, 2011). Their findings suggest that women and men are leaving their companies at the same rate and attribute the lack of promotion to a compounding of discrimination throughout the corporate ladder (Yee et al, 2016). The report also stresses that these challenges are more pronounced for women of color, who experience the deepest drop-offs in middle and senior management despite being more likely than white women to say they aspire to senior executive positions (Yee et al, 2016).

These beliefs are compounded by what is borne out in organizational culture, where employee potential is judged on subjective traits which can be highly vulnerable to bias based on stereotyping, leading to underestimating a candidate's potential based on preconceptions rather than actual performance or leadership capabilities (Beeson & Valerio, 2012). Biases, whether conscious or unconscious, have significant impact on the culture of an organization. Organizations that allow biases to exist risk being viewed by both existing and potential staff as discriminatory, impacting their ability to recruit and retain employees (Hoobler et al, 2011). These organizations are also likely to compound the shortfall in leadership talent as high-potential women leave to take advantage of other opportunities, thus reducing the company's pipeline of talent (Beeson & Valerio, 2012). Based on the implications of these biases, employees may form ideas about the implicit values and culture of an organization (Hoobler et al, 2011). Creating a new organizational mindset toward talent development is twofold, encompassing specific practices that companies can make part of succession planning and career development within the organization as well as actions women can take to proactively address their own development as leaders (Debebe, 2011; Beeson & Valerio, 2012). Ultimately, organizations must ensure a critical mass of women in executive positions-- not just one or two. When women are not a small minority, their identities as women become less salient, and colleagues are more likely to react to them in terms of their individual competencies (Eagly & Carli, 2007).

Women, Museums, and Leadership

While many of these previously cited studies remain relevant when applied to nonprofits or museums specifically, there is also a body of literature with specific regard to leading a

museum. Nonprofit leadership, perhaps even more so than in the corporate world, is focused on the development of an environment where consensus can be reached, rather than autocratic or strictly hierarchical decision making processes (Orr-Cahall, 1994). Research indicates, however, that most curatorial staff are not necessarily suited for a major leadership role, raising questions about how museums can create career paths, manage succession planning, and invest in leadership training (Suchy, 2000). Museums frequently fall into the habit of advancing those with good professional or academic skills and museological ethics without focusing on leadership or management development (Griffin & Abraham, 2000). In the past, emphasis has been placed on academic disciplines with little thought to the relationship between the curatorial product of those academics and the real needs of the communities being served (Griffin & Abraham, 2000). This results in museums ignoring the problem of museum managers not being qualified specifically as managers even while museums need effective governance to face modern problems (Griffin & Abraham, 2000).

Lack of effective museum management particularly affects women as American museums have benefited significantly from their contributions. Women comprise the majority of museum visitors, attending more educational programs, and spending more money on museum amenities, as well as dominating all professional and senior-level staff positions in the field (Schwarzer, 2007). In fact, American museums have offered women more high-level opportunities than most other professions (Schwarzer, 2007). However, injecting more women into leadership positions has proved a difficult task. In 1973, AAM Women's Caucus was established to help women in museums challenge discrimination, offer support for open salary information, and guidelines for fair employment practices (Van Damme, Dickey, Ferey,

Mukund, Putz, Baldwin & Ackerson, 2016). Though the Caucus was disbanded only a few years later, very little has changed in the intervening 43 years (Van Damme et al, 2016).

While the field is discussing pay equity, many museums also fail to offer adequate health insurance, paid family and medical leave, access to affordable childcare, and protection from sexual harassment (Van Damme et al, 2016). A wage gap means that over the course of a career, white women are missing out on approximately $400,000 in salaries and this figure is even more pronounced for black and Latina women who earn only 60 cents and 55 cents per dollar respectively (Van Damme et al, 2016). Moreover, because women live longer, the retirement gap results in deepening poverty for elderly women, particularly women of color (Van Damme et al, 2016). According to workplace psychologists, balanced workplaces are more efficient, inventive, productive (Van Damme et al, 2016). Yet, female-dominated fields are typically stigmatized, whereby people earn less when they work in "women's" jobs and "women's" jobs pay less because they are done by women (Van Damme et al, 2016). Barriers such as these make it difficult to earn a living wage that, in turn, discourages or prevents women, particularly women of color from joining the field (Van Damme et al, 2016). Museums will not be able to address museum staff diversity unless they address salary equity in a systemic, sustainable way (Baldwin & Ackerson, 2006).

Despite the contributions of women, men control museums in two critical areas, power and money; occupying more than 77% of director seats at the nation's largest and best-funded museums (Schwarzer, 2007; Gan et al, 2014). In 2014, the Association of Art Museum Directors (Gan et al, 2014) undertook a study to understand the gender gap in art museum leadership and explore potential factors to help art institutions advance toward greater gender equity (see Table 1). Across all AAMD member museums, women hold fewer than 50% of directorships and the

average female director's salary lags behind the average male director (Gan et al, 2014). When it comes to compensation, the position a director held before entering their current position was found to influence the average salary (Gan et al, 2014). While this was true for both men and women, the number of women who have become directors through internal promotion is greater, and may have contributed to the salary disparity (Gan et al, 2014).

Table 1

		Men % in Directorship	Women % in Directorship	Wage Index[3]
All Museums[1]	All operating budgets	43.9%	55.6%	$0.71
(n= 781)	Below $3 million	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Above $3 million	56.5%	43.5%	n/a
Art Museums[2]	All operating budgets	58%	43%	$0.79
(n=211)	Below $15 million	52%	48%	$1.02
	Above $15 million	76%	24%	$0.71

[1] American Alliance of Museums, "National Comparative Museum Salary Survey," 2014
[2] Association of Art Museum Directors, "The Gender Gap in Art Museum Directorships," 2014
[3] Indicates average amount women earn per dollar earned by men

While this appears to signal a narrowing of the gender gap, segmented data shows that gender disparities are concentrated in museums with budgets over $15 million (Gan et al, 2014). Most importantly, within all segments of the data, women hold fewer than half of directorships and earn less as a percentage of the budget and on an absolute dollar basis (Gan et al, 2014). To understand why this might be, researchers spoke to executive search consultants who noted that the presence of an unconscious bias amongst board members may result in hiring people who look like them, which frequently means white and male (Gan et al, 2014).

In the museum field as whole, the picture is less clear. The American Alliance of Museums (AAM) 2014 National Comparative Museum Salary Survey's respondents reported female-dominated art museum directorships at 55.6% female and 43.9% male. Only 7% of those respondent organizations have budgets above $10 million, some distance from the range where

AAMD found the gap widening (AAM, 2014). Despite this fact, the AAM findings agree on the wage gap noting that the gap widened as the budget of the museum increased (AAM, 2014; Gan et al, 2014; Van Damme et al, 2016). Additionally, the AAM study suggests that at the director level, women are only earning 71 cents for every dollar earned by a male director even when controlling for education levels and experience (AAM, 2014).

Concerned with working toward making the country's art museums more representative of the growing diversity of the American people, the Mellon Foundation engaged in a demographic survey of art museum staff in the United States. The Mellon Foundation survey found relative underrepresentation of people of color on art museum staff and the preponderance of men in museum leadership positions (Shonfeld, Westerman & Sweeney, 2015). Their findings were consistent with other demographic studies in the field as well as common suspicions. Approximately 72% of art museum staffs are non-Hispanic white and 28% belong to historically underrepresented minorities, while non-Hispanic white staff continue to dominate the job categories most closely associated with intellectual and educational mission of museums (Shonfeld, Westerman & Sweeney, 2015). In aggregate, the Mellon survey found similar siloing as in other fields, finding staff to be 60% female and 40% male with many categories being gender-specific (Shonfeld, Westerman & Sweeney, 2015). Facilities management, art preparators and handlers, exhibition design and construction, IT and security are heavily male, while curators, conservators, educators, and mid-level leadership are 70% or more female (Shonfeld, Westerman & Sweeney, 2015). The Mellon researchers also found executive leadership to be approximately equally staffed male and female, however this category was expanded to include all c-suite level employees, not only directors (Shonfeld, Westerman & Sweeney, 2015).

According to museum leadership scholars, the museum director of the new millennium needs to be a leader who balances a belief in the institution and the realities of marketing, helping to create meaning and identity for others within the museum (Suchy, 2000). Therefore, museums must be clear about their functions, which requires effective assessment, management, and careful consideration of resources (Griffin & Abraham, 2000). The inertia of larger organizations, however, frequently pushes leadership to continue what is already being done, which only contributes to the resistance to change which restricts the development of a talent pool for modern museums (Griffin & Abraham, 2000; Suchy, 2000). Moreover, the siloing of museum functions encourages museum staffs to ignore the needs of the organization overall in favor of their own departmental or scholarly needs (Griffin & Abraham, 2000). According to this research, the new millennium museum should be looking for candidates fluent in transformational leadership, entrepreneurship, marketing and business acumen, as well as passion (Suchy, 2000). However, most museum career paths do not encourage enough diversity or expose their staff to management decision-making or leadership opportunities, leading few museum professionals to plan a career path (Suchy, 2000). Low pay and restricted lifestyle options as well as the limited number of positions in the sector as a whole significantly limit career-path development, as well (Suchy, 2000).

Museums and other non-profit institutions have interpreted their responsibilities in the area of diversity as limited to only one area of activity, such as collections or staffing, or restricted to a single equality issue, such as race, gender, or disability with a disregard for the interconnections and tensions between each of these areas and strands of difference (Nightingale & Mahal, 2013). Institutions struggle with respect to inclusivity in several areas: the difficulty of measuring change or progress, remaining consistent in policy and action, and in fully integrating

equity measures into strategic planning (Nightingale & Mahal, 2013). Rather than interrogating the foundations themselves, many institutions seeking to pivot their organizations toward transformational leadership practices, translate these traits onto old structures. Theorists typically state that no substantial change will occur on other facets of museum practice until staff composition becomes more diverse, as systemic changes are dependent on the support received from leadership and the access they have to decision-making processes (Nightingale & Mahal, 2013). While diversity in staffing is central, the additional challenge for many museums has been in engaging everyone in the institution, even the most reluctant to ensure coherence to identifying and removing barriers to change (Nightingale & Mahal, 2013). A holistic approach is needed to ensure long-term, sustainable change (Suchy, 2000). The case is clear and urgent, and constructive responses to it will be critical to the continued vitality of art museums as public resources for a democratic society (Shonfeld, Westerman & Sweeney, 2015).

Identifying the Research Gap

Diversity is not only an issue to encourage social responsibility of public institutions, but a practical one. Museum leadership research has found that any institution where more than half of the supervisory staff was over 45 years of age would see significant change in the next 5-15 years (Ackerson & Baldwin, 2006). Despite the significant percentage of women in pipeline roles like curatorial work, women remain scarce in director roles at large institutions (Stanfill, 2016). Executive recruitment at these very large institutions matters, most saliently because cultural sector institutions have influence over what is seen, and in turn, what the public values and remembers (Stanfill, 2016). Though many previously suggested that merely increasing the number of women in the field would automatically remove the barriers to female advancement,

this has been proven false (Ackerson & Baldwin, 2016). Research has shown that while creating space for the historically marginalized is an important first stage, it does not yield necessary systemic change for a more diverse leadership staff (Moore, 2016).

While gender balance at all levels is the goal, the field needs to address issues like poor compensation, lack of research and documentation, and reluctance to create an innovative internal culture in order to achieve this goal (Schwarzer, 2007). Research has shown women tend to work their way up the ladder through training, apprenticeship, and on the job experience, while men are more likely to vault up to higher-paid positions like department head or director (Schwarzer, 2007). This results in putting men with less experience and training in charge of underpaid women with more experience and training (Schwarzer, 2007). Moreover, boards of trustees' unwillingness to invest financially in diverse leadership ultimately feed this dysfunctional system (Schwarzer, 2007). In these cases, museums are advocating significant value up front, while employees are struggling backstage (Ackerson & Baldwin, 2016).

A burgeoning body of empirical research has found that museums have social value and that such institutions have an obligation to be of service to their communities (Sandell and Nightingale, 2013; Weil, 1999). It is believed that as museums serve their communities, they are therefore obliged to contribute toward a more just, equitable, and fair society including the elimination of systems of inequality within museological practice (Weil, 1999). In order for museums to contribute to the social value of their communities, they must become representative of those communities. Kaywin Feldman, director of the Minneapolis Art Institute noted in a speech at the AAM annual conference in 2016, that as a field, we are stronger, healthier, and more relevant the more diverse we are in every possible way (Feldman, 2016). Without equitable

workplaces, museums cannot expect to create equitable programming and exhibitions, or inclusive collections (Van Damme et al, 2016).

The complex and interdisciplinary research bodies around this topic have revealed that across all sectors, women seem to be underutilized in executive leadership positions, and this underutilization will have consequences for companies as the Baby Boomer generation retires. Much of the research seems to indicate the dearth of women in leadership is partially due to a series of unconscious biases about women's ability or fitness to lead—most notably, the work-family conflict bias. This is despite research suggesting that traditionally feminine leadership styles are frequently found to be more effective in the 21st century work environment. Feminist leadership styles rose in response to these barriers as a way to circumnavigate the power structures keeping women from executive roles. Frequently called the glass ceiling, these barriers persist but can be more specifically attributed to leaks in the leadership pipeline whereby women are siloed out of line positions and out of the running for leadership promotions. These challenges are found as a complex combination of double binds, such as navigating work and family responsibilities, as well as organizational culture and resistance to female leadership. Ultimately, the literature reveals that while women have made significant contributions to the museum field, making great strides toward inclusion, gender parity at the most powerful and well-funded institutions remains elusive.

In order to further understand the process of acquiring executive leadership roles for women in museums, research will need to be conducted to dissect the revelations of recent survey data. What we know is that women are not promoted as quickly or as often as their male counterparts across all fields and that they are overall paid less. We know that gender diversity and equity in positions of leadership contributes to diversity and equity in organizations,

increasing social value. The gap in this information lies in in-depth information about the experiences and career paths of the specific women who have made it to leadership positions as well as what can be done in the future to promote equity in these positions. The purpose of the following research is to investigate the pipeline toward executive leadership positions in medium to large public non-profit art museums for women. This will be addressed by discovering trends and patterns in career trajectory and professional experiences for women who have reached these positions.

Chapter 3: Methods

Research Purpose

The purpose of this study is to investigate the pipeline toward executive leadership (CEO/Executive Director) positions in medium to large public non-profit art museums for women. This will be addressed by discovering trends and patterns in career trajectory and professional experiences for women who have reached these positions. This was examined through four research questions:

1. Where did the path toward leadership positions begin for these women?
2. What were the barriers to achieving a leadership position?
3. What was beneficial along the way?
4. How does their career path inform how they lead?

Research Design

In order to further understand the gender gap in art museum directorships, this research aims to explore the experiences of women in leadership positions in their own words. Previous survey studies have provided ample numerical data with which to frame this study, but the numbers effectively flatten the experiences of the individual leaders. In order to obtain a richness and depth that is lacking within the current literature, this research was framed as a phenomenological study. This design was most effective as it made it possible to "describe the lived experiences of individuals about a phenomenon as described by participants" (Creswell 2013, p. 14).

A phenomenological study allowed the investigation to dovetail from the previous survey research conducted by AAMD in 2014 which offered inspiration and as well as justification for

the parameters. A smaller scale, in-depth examination allowed for the women themselves to speak about their experiences and for their voices to be acknowledged. Additionally, this allowed the research to pointedly study the budget range where AAMD found the most striking drop in female directors.

Subject Selection & Recruitment

Potential participants were first identified via the Association of Art Museum Directors and American Alliance of Museums directories. Women who currently hold positions as directors of art museums located in the United States were then selected as possible participants. Women were further designated based on their museum's status as public, non-profit institutions that were not directly affiliated with a university. Participants were narrowed based on their museum's operating budget, within a range of $10-$30 million, with an attempt to gather a balance above and below $15 million. Selections were made based on regions in the United States, seeking a roughly even representation from various geographic areas. Additionally, some participants were specifically targeted who had previously written about or been interviewed about the issues of gender diversity in museums or have been singled out as particular leaders in the field.

Based on these criteria, approximately 40 potential participants fell within the parameters for consideration. The potential participants were then contacted using channels publicly available on the museum's website, typically email, and asked if they would have any interest in being interviewed [See Appendix A]. Those who responded were sent an informational form about the study and an interview time was scheduled, primarily in contact with an executive or administrative assistant [See Appendix B]. In some cases, participants asked to see the interview

questions either as a sample or in their entirety prior to the conversation. Participants consented to and reviewed all attributed quotes, pursuant to Internal Review Board approval. In total, 15 directors participated from the West Coast, the Southeast, Midwest, and Mid-Atlantic regions.

Data Collection

Current art museum directors participated in in-depth, semi-structured interviews that ranged in length from 25 to 65 minutes. These interviews focused on the personal experiences of each director, in their career paths and as a leader in an art museum. Interviews were conducted over an eight-week period in February and March of 2017. The conversations focused on a 20-question interview guide highlighting topics such as personal and educational background, talent pipeline, leadership traits, barriers to leadership, responsibilities and impacts of leadership roles, and the big picture of women in art museum leadership [See Appendix C]. These discussions were predominantly conducted via recorded telephone conversation, with one conducted in-person.

Data Analysis

Interviews were coded via the iOS app TapeACall© with the participant's consent. The recordings were then transcribed verbatim with the aid of NVivo© transcription software. A coding matrix was developed using the four research questions as a guide [See Appendix D]. Additionally, paradigms informed by the literature were used to guide the emergence of trends and patterns. For example, leadership paradigms from the literature identify certain characteristics that inform leadership styles and shape effective leadership practices. The coding matrix was predominantly influenced by research by Goleman (2000), Elesser & Lever (2011),

Carli & Eagly (2007a), and Beeson & Valerio (2012). These studies illuminate the characteristics as well as the contexts in which women are most successful in the pipeline toward leadership positions.

Limitations

Sample diversity was valued when seeking institutions. Participants represented a variety of budgets within the chosen range, geographic locations, as well as ages and tenure length in a leadership position. Given the scope of the study and the short time available, only 15 women were interviewed. For this reason, it was decided to focus on a fairly narrow range of institutions for this study. Certainly a richer understanding of the challenges to diversity in museum leadership could be gained by including other museum disciplines or a focus on ethnic-specific organizations. Both sample size and scope limit the generalizability of the study's results, but they do add to our understanding of the gender gap in art museums in the US at this time.

Chapter 4: Analysis

Description of Sample

Participants for this study live and work in a variety of regions in the United States with four coming from the West Coast; three from the Midwest; five from the South; and three from the Mid-Atlantic. The female directors included in this study also represent institutions with budget sizes of $10-$30 million: with six participants at $10 million, four between $11 and $14 million, and five at $15 million and above. These institutions also represent several disciplines of art museum: six institutions are encyclopedic art museums, four are American or European fine arts, three are multi-disciplinary, and two are Contemporary art museums. The directors vary in the length of time they have been in their current directorship, with four having been in their position less than five years, six between five and ten years, and five at more than ten years. [See Appendix E for a full list of participants and their institutions.]

Findings

The goal of this research was to investigate the pipeline toward executive leadership (CEO/Executive Director) positions in medium to large public non-profit art museums for women. The phenomenon was addressed through discovering patterns and trends in career trajectory and professional experiences for women who have reached executive-level roles. Five research questions frame the study's findings.

Research Question 1: Where did the path toward leadership begin for these women?

The first research question was addressed in several ways. Participants were asked about their educational backgrounds and their positions before becoming director; what drew them to their current organization as well as what drew them to museum work to begin with; and how they came to be in a leadership role and whether leadership had been part of their prior career trajectory. Broadly speaking, interview participants were drawn to the field by a love of art and objects and that the path toward leadership positions varied widely. While their leadership roles evolved both organically and strategically, significant education and experience contributed greatly to their success. Fundamentally, these women feel that it is important to have an impact in their museums and their communities.

Almost everyone mentioned a love of their subject matter, art, artists, or objects in their discussion of what drew them to museum work. Five specifically mentioned leaving academic art history because of their desire to work with physical art objects, while four discussed wanting to support artists and their work.

> "I became very disillusioned with working with images rather than objects and I found that a museum career allowed me to continue working with objects and their creators, but also work in art history, so it was a good combination of interests and skill sets."
>
> Judy O'Toole

Others were drawn to museums through their subject area, which varied from photography to architecture to archaeology. Interestingly, four participants attributed their interest to experiences in early life with family members as a driver for their interest in pursuing museums professionally. One participant noted that her work was more likely to have an impact on the community in a museum rather than in academic art history.

Education is a cornerstone of the pipeline toward executive leadership positions, but the participant's education backgrounds varied. Largely, the women had some kind of art historical

background, ranging from four with Master's degrees, four with full doctorates, and four who hold an incomplete or all but dissertation PhD. Others came via alternate routes, with degrees in American Studies, English, and Architecture. Two participants hold only Bachelor's degrees. Three hold Museum Studies degrees and three others have done further leadership or business training.

Two thirds of the participating directors had been directors in their previous institutions. The final five had most recently been deputy directors and curators. University museums and galleries are prime training grounds for aspiring directors, as a third of the participants had significant experiences as either curators or directors in these organizations and two more as interns. While the majority of these women came to leadership positions via curation, two came through development and leadership tracks.

Whether setting their targets on the field or in their individual institutions, more than half these directors specified having a positive impact in their communities as the reason they came to their current institutions.

> "I think that there are individuals that just want to get along and there are individuals that want to make a difference. I think that I wanted to make a difference."
>
> Lial Jones

Additional reasons included feeling an institutional fit or alignment either in values, location, or subject matter and a desire to make a strategic career move. Almost all of these women were recruited for their position, and many noted this as the initial driver behind their move.

The path toward leadership positions for these women has been varied. While a third of those interviewed had always been interested in pursuing some kind of leadership position, another third felt it was an organic evolution over time.

> "Then I naturally became part of some major decision making processes for the museum and other nonprofit organizations. I believe that philosophy and strategic thinking really needs to start from the top, so I was interested in paving the way to better institutions."
>
> Dr. Julie Decker

Conversely, three felt that they had to be asked before they considered it, and one had never considered the possibility of being in a leadership role until much later in her career.

Research Question 2: What were the barriers to success in achieving a leadership position?

Literature suggests that while the pipeline for well-educated, talented, able women is abundant, it must be leaking in places to account for the dearth of women in top positions. This discussion centered on questions about the participants' greatest challenges in achieving leadership positions and whether they felt these obstacles were impacted by their gender. Additionally, conversations explored their responses to these obstacles and how they found their way around them. Evidence suggests that significant leadership barriers focused on how the participant's gender interacts with other factors such as age or sexuality; organizational resistance to change; and the subtle biases they have observed. Participants' tenacity and willingness to "play the game" emerged as common responses to these barriers, with only one participant noting a desire to change the rules of the so-called game.

Thirteen of the fifteen participants cited boards of trustees or communities being resistant either to the change they were bringing, to their leadership or to their expertise as a significant barrier. Six of those specifically cited a lack of managerial training as barriers for them. Five discussed the institution or individual's reticence to acknowledge their expertise as a barrier and four noted resistance to change either from within the organization or from outside. For many, this was coupled with gender and age-related biases.

> "I looked young—I was young. Even though I had the leadership capacities and had a more all-encompassing view toward the museum and was always good at fundraising and all of that. It took a while—I had to prove myself longer in order make that leap."
>
> Participant

Other impediments cited were lack of mentorships or network contacts and family-related challenges.

The barriers experienced by women in museums tend to reflect subtle or indirect biases. Eleven women attributed their barriers to these biases either from boards of directors or others within their institutions along the way. Subtle biases took the form of observations of expectations placed on the female leaders that stood in stark contrast against what had been expected from their colleagues. Three women noted indirect gender discrimination in how the biases affected the climate in their institutions.

> "[Museum boards] really have this internal idea of the museum director and it's always a handsome man with grey hair and a PhD who condescends to them in speaking lofty discursions on art history."
>
> Kaywin Feldman

Unconscious biases were noted by four participants and focused on the tokenization of female leaders and the systematic privileging of male leadership. There were also instances of overt gender discrimination described by participants.

> "When I first came to the portrait gallery one of my staff members, a man, said to me—and they'd only had male directors before, they'd had two interim that were women but not full directors—he said to me at one point, "I've noticed that you never make a decision."
>
> Participant

In these cases, six women noted instances where either they themselves or others around them had been shut down by male colleagues, experienced blatant workplace sexism, or witnessed the gender gap in their pay scale.

> "There's of course that situation when there's a group discussion, and women don't get called on as much or they attribute the good point to you made to the man who spoke just after you. That definitely happens. How do you come back from that and point it out without being called a bitch?"
>
> Dr. Kimerly Rorschach

Women of a slightly older generation were more likely to point out the sexist nature of these occurrences, while women of a younger generation were more likely to only notice the pay gap, subtle gender dynamics or be surprised at the persistence of gender discrimination.

> "It wasn't until I was director that I was able to compare it to the previous director who was male and you notice different ways of interacting."
>
> Dr. Julie Decker

When responding to these issues, the general response from participants was to be tenacious. The majority of participants cited toughness and perseverance as their response to the barriers they faced, these participants cited having to work twice as hard to be taken seriously.

> "It takes a lot to manage being in a position where no matter how successful you are, people are not prepared to acknowledge your expertise."
>
> Hope Alswang

Additionally, building a good team to help these women achieve success was repeated by four participants.

> "I also think that it's really critical in this kind of job to make sure you have people around you who will tell you the truth."
>
> Nannette Maciejunes

This also entailed learning how to "play the game" and navigate the realities of their particular contexts.

> "Figure out how it is that men interview and interview like a man, dress the part, you just have to play the game, because otherwise you just aren't going to get hired."
>
> Kaywin Feldman

Several also mentioned trial and error as their response to barriers, constantly learning and trying to find new solutions to problems. Finally, two noted how important it had been to address problems head on with those involved and how that had worked for them, particularly with their boards of directors.

Research Question 3: What was beneficial in their career paths?

The literature also contends the importance of mentorships and role models in not only developing leadership skills but in creating important networks. This portion of the conversation focused on whether or not participants felt they had mentors in their careers; what skills or traits they found to make an effective leader; and how to develop those skills. Consistent with the literature, the participants placed great importance on mentorship, whether they themselves had had strong mentors or not. Additionally, they noted that transformational or collaborative leadership styles were most effective and that they could certainly be learned in conjunction with innate abilities.

While only five participants felt they had very clear mentors, all expressed the great importance of mentors. Many iterated a profound gratitude for those who helped them, while others noted a desire to have had more direct mentorship.

> "It's hard to even begin to say how grateful I am to mentors. I don't think I knew how to seek a mentor but I know people have done me so many professional and personal favors that I think I stand on the shoulders of many people."
>
> Dr. Susan Edwards

Five participants felt that while they had not had one clear mentor, many people assisted and encouraged them along the way. The last third had found no mentors or guides at all. While most tended to note that this was due to a general unwillingness of colleagues to help; others also

found that they didn't know how to find mentors; that they didn't feel they needed one at the time; or that they never found someone who they matched with.

> "I wouldn't say that I had one mentor who was the guiding light throughout, for better or for worse. But there have been many who can help you in different ways and then you want to pay that forward…and help other people when you are in a position to do that."
>
> Dr. Kimerly Rorschach

Two also found that while they did not have direct mentors, they had found role models whose leadership they used as a learning tool.

Participants discussed several traits that contribute to successful leadership, which largely reflects what the literature defines as the transformational leadership style. These traits include collaboration, communication, teamwork, self-awareness, compassion, inclusivity, open mindedness, and adaptability. Also, strongly noted in relation to museum work were clarity of vision for the organization, management skills, perseverance, fundraising skills, and a focus on community and audience. These skills were largely believed to be skills they grew over time, through hard work, observing others, and personal experience.

> "I think back at the outset it was really trying to prove that you had the same qualities as a man in terms of affect and skill set. Whereas I think as time has gone by, there is an appreciation for how women manage. The difference in a collaborative environment versus a hierarchical environment."
>
> Susan Taylor

Many noted that they had innate abilities and affinities for these skills, but that like a muscle, their abilities grew over time with experience. Six participants discussed watching other leaders as an important way to grow their skills and three focused on the training they received in school and another three highlighted books that were impactful in their own development.

Research Question 4: How does their career path inform how they lead?

Questions in this section of the conversation focused on how interviewees feel their career paths impacted their leadership style, whether they feel pressure to change their style, and how they see their role in their institutions in contrast to their male colleagues. These questions sparked some of the broadest range of responses, but made very clear how seriously the participants consider the undertaking of their leadership roles.

> "Those of us who are thinking about this are committed to providing those opportunities for women we work with, or young students like yourself…I think that will certainly help over time."
>
> Dr. Kathleen Jameson

Themes that emerged from these interviews included the desire to coach their staff and set them up for success, as well as an awareness of gender dynamics that can make navigating the workplace more difficult for women.

A unifying trend among these women is their desire to provide mentorships and professional development to their staffs, with twelve out of sixteen participants mentioning this as a significant goal.

> "I think professional development is very important for everyone. I think it does a lot for morale too. So I really believe in it. We don't have a lot of money for it but we stretch our pennies as much as we can to give that to the staff at all levels."
>
> Lynn Zelevansky

Five discussed the personal confidence they gained by overcoming obstacles and four went so far as to note that their paths impacted their awareness of and their approach to systemic issues. A few also indicated that they perceive their approach to the work differently because of their experiences.

While almost a third said that they do not feel pressure to change their style or that they would not change to fit a mold, another third noted that they do feel the need to "play the game" at times or navigate a gendered double bind.

> "Particularly because I looked so young and I became a director so young, I wore business suits from the age of 28 to 45. You know those really ugly suits…I wore them purely to play the game because I wanted to remove the concern about gender and age. The day I turned 45, I gave every single suit away and I haven't worn one ever since."
>
> Kaywin Feldman

One participant noticed this only early on in her career but has since seen these dynamics subside. Four participants felt that while they lead differently based on the context or situation, they did not feel this was due to gender dynamics but instead a trait of a good leader.

Although most of the participants were hesitant to stereotype their male colleagues, each of them recognized that there might be differences in leadership style along gender lines. Overall, these women discussed seeing themselves as more collaborative and more team-oriented than their male counterparts.

> "There's also a kind of humanity that is really important to share with staff that I find that particularly junior level staff across all departments need…There's a desire to engage more informally, so being mindful of what's happening at all levels of the organization and taking the time to take note, to walk around, to encourage, to help give context, is really meaningful…I don't know if a lot of men take time to do that."
>
> Participant

Two indicated a focus on impact in the community and another two discussed their desire to be more casual or less hierarchical with their staffs, a trait they suggested may not be of high importance for male directors.

Research Question 5: What does the future look like for women in museum leadership?

The final portion of our conversation focused on the future of women in leadership, particularly on what institutions can do to encourage more women into executive leadership

roles; whether the needle has moved on these issues; and what advice they have for women interested in pursuing leadership roles. Here, the women were very concerned with the hiring systems that are keeping other women from executive roles, including boards of directors and search committees. As the literature suggests, the participants stressed the importance of finding mentors and role models. However, they were split on whether the field, and society more broadly, are moving in more favorable directions for women leaders.

When discussing what could be done to decrease the gender gap in large art museums directorships, two-thirds of the participants discussed the need for change in board structure or composition, and for these bodies to address the implicit bias that keeps women out of executive roles.

> "I can't separate the fact that you only see the gap at the leadership level and it doesn't exist elsewhere in the organizations…I think the bias is that they see the CEOs as being the person who needs to raise the money, who needs to be the public face of the organization, who needs to make business decisions, who needs to make business deals and I think there is a bias that men are better at that."
>
> Dr Julie Decker

Four women specifically called out the inherent bias they have noticed in the hiring process and two also called attention to the need for search committees and recruiters to also address the gap.

> "You have to have people who are comfortable with women in leadership roles, and that has not always happened."
>
> Kim Sajet

Participants also discussed the need for more flexibility and family accommodations, for museums to look critically at the kind of requirements they place on their executives and who that might inherently exclude. A few brought up the need for boards and search committees to be more inclusive as far as educational background and to place more emphasis on their managerial skills and outcomes rather than the candidate's previous position or their degree.

> "I think institutions should be open to and can be open to more than the traditional curatorial pathway. It's interesting because what I've seen within AAMD is that a lot of the female directors have also come the curatorial track, but some have now come more through a different pathway of either administrative and business side, or the education side. So I think institutions and boards being more open to different kinds of experience would help."
>
> Lori Fogarty

Eight participants talked about the importance of creating a leadership pipeline that is encouraging and conducive to women leaders through coaching and professional development efforts.

The women interviewed were split as far as their view on whether the field, as well as society, is making progress on these issues. Four either said no, or that they felt we had moved backward; six said yes, we are trending toward progress; two felt it was an uneven or regional shift. Two suggested that the issue required much wider social change to force real systemic shifts within the field. Overall, many are concerned with the feminization of museums, noting the common trend for fields to experience a reduction in pay and respect when there are more women present. Additionally, several brought up the need for diversity at all levels, meaning a focus on gender balance at entry and mid-level as well as top positions.

The advice the participants had for women seeking museum leadership focused on three central themes: determination and confidence; self-awareness; and mentorship. Across the board, participants suggested that being determined and confident in your abilities was essential to success.

> "I think it's really just the courage to step forward and be considered for it. I think a lot of us talk ourselves out of those positions."
>
> Judy O'Toole

Six also called attention to the importance of self-awareness, particularly in knowing your own values, remembering why it's important and finding organizations that share those values.

> "Know why you want to do something. Know what your core values are, and be true to them…You need to understand what gives you pleasure and understand that there are days that are really hard but if you know why you're doing what you're doing, you can get through them. And you need to celebrate your successes."
>
> Lial Jones

A third of the participants reiterated the importance of finding mentors and colleagues who can encourage and offer advice or assistance. Maintaining openness and curiosity for the world and the field came up in the conversation, as did a need to remember the importance of remaining engaged in the impact you and your organization can make.

Summary of Findings

These findings demonstrate that while women enter museum leadership for a variety of reasons and from many backgrounds, clear trends emerge that help to characterize the gender gap in art museums. These female executives were drawn to the field primarily by a love of art and objects, believing this to be a way to make a significant impact on the field and their communities. Their experiences reveal that the path toward leadership positions varies widely, but certainly requires a significant amount of education and experience to be successful. Leadership roles evolve organically or strategically, which suggests that for many women, leadership is not a primary objective but once offered, becomes appealing. Overall, the experiences of these women illustrates that gender interacts with other forms of identity, including age and sexuality to further complicate the barriers one might face. Because of a remaining resistance to change and subtle biases in many organizations, tenacity and hard work is a unifying occurrence among thee museum directors.

In order to mitigate these barriers, participants placed great importance on mentorship, and transformational or collaborative leadership styles. Unsurprisingly, because of the emphasis on the value of mentorships, participants stressed their desire to coach their staff and set them up for success. Participants recognized the many kinds of barriers that keep women out of executive roles and their place as leaders in alleviating those challenges. By that same token, the women interviewed were simultaneously very concerned with the hiring systems that keep other women from executive roles, including boards of directors and search committees. However, they were split on whether real progress has been achieved.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

Survey studies undertaken by the Association of Art Museum Directors (AAMD) in 2014 and 2016 strongly suggest the presence of a significant gender gap at the executive level of large art museums. This research was intended to engage with the experiences of women in institutions with the same budgetary profile as the AAMD-identified gap. Interview questions were designed to discover trends and patterns in career trajectories to further understand the pipeline toward leadership positions for women in museums. Fifteen women from across the United States were interviewed and their responses were coded emergently, informed by leadership literature.

Findings from these interview conversations suggest that while the path toward museum leadership varies, the experiences of women seeking leadership roles are similar in significant ways. The desire to make an impact is a strong theme throughout the responses, as is the desire to remove barriers for others in the field, particularly as it relates to diversity and equity. Another strong theme that emerged is the importance of and further need for mentorship and coaching. Due to the array of challenges women face when pursuing leadership, participants indicated a significant amount of determination and tenacity required to achieve executive roles. However, participants highlighted how gender does not operate in a vacuum, but rather interacts with other identities, such as age, race, and sexuality. On the same note, responses indicate a strong need to address inherent biases against women's leadership within organizations, particularly on boards of directors.

A variety of factors influence the glass labyrinth to museum leadership. The increase in the number of female art museum directors at smaller or University art museums suggests that women are making inroads but the persistent dearth of them at larger institutions is an indicator

of further issues to address. Lack of mentors and opportunities, cultural norms around women in family life, as well as the indication that inherent biases and structural barriers persist begins to strengthen the understanding of what keeps women out of executive roles, and perhaps what can be done about it.

Not only are women more likely to bear the majority of household labor, but in the case of art museum directorships, they are also required to shoulder a huge amount of off-hours work and travel. Very few women in executive leadership, coupled with a lack of family leave policies may serve as a signal to entry and mid-level women that either women are not welcome in leadership or that they will have to choose between work and family. These perceptions may also feed into existing biases perpetuated by board members and search committees about women's commitment to their organizations and their fitness to lead. It also punctuates that while the field may not be doing enough to coach and champion future leaders, regardless of gender, the lack of mentorship significantly impacts gender diversity.

Increased awareness and understanding of the gender gap allows both individual museum professionals as well as professional organizations to begin taking action to counteract the potential causes. Emphasizing the importance of professional development and mentorship and continued conversations about realistic ways to create work environments that are conducive to work-life integration are both important parts of that conversation. On a systemic level, there are larger issues that institutions and professional organizations could take on to shrink the gap. However, these findings suggest that there may be much bigger problems, like inherent bias and a problematic structure of museum governance. Museums alone cannot combat societal issues, systemic misogyny or sexism.

If museums are to become more community and audience-focused and tout their place as relevant organizations with social value, the field will need to address equity in both its staff as well as exhibitions, collections, and programs. This is particularly precarious at the executive level because it is the boards of directors, not museum professionals, who select executive leaders. To fully understand the root causes and how to combat the gender gap, more research will need to be done in this area. Due to the scope and timeline of the study, it was necessary to query only one strand of difference in art museum leadership: gender. Further studies might open the scope to consider race or sexual orientation, for example, as museums struggle with all forms of diversity. Additional studies may also seek to broaden the data by interviewing more women directors as well as boards, search committees, and recruiters. Likewise, it may be productive to interview women in pipeline positions about their current trajectories into museums leadership.

Questions remain about how the imbalance of power, governance, and funding in museums affects executive hiring practices. Executives are foundational to organizational culture that make critical choices about whose art, history, and culture is considered worthy of collecting and exhibiting, and how that is done. While increasing the diversity of executive leadership will not inherently solve all of an organization's problems, it will lead the institution in a progressive direction. Organizations communicate their values in a variety of ways, including whom they choose to hire. By placing emphasis on internal diversity, institutions can communicate their commitment to gender equity. Art museums are poised to be leaders in this capacity, becoming an example to other museums and nonprofits, for the ways to enhance equity and access within their own walls.

References

Aaronson, S., Cajner, T., Fallick, B., Galbis-Reig, F., Smith, C., & Wascher, W. (2014). Labor Force Participation: Recent Developments and Future Prospects. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, *2014*(2), 197–275.

Administration, S. S. (2012). *Annual Performance Plan for FY 2012*. Social Security Administration. Retrieved from https://www.ssa.gov/agency/performance/2012/APP%202012%20508%20PDF.pdf

American Alliance of Museums, & New Knowledge Organization Limited. (2014). *2014 National Comparative Museum Salary Survey*. American Alliance of Museums.

Baldwin, J., Ackerson, & Anne (Eds.). (2016). *Leadership Matters*.

Baldwin, J. H., & Ackerson, A. W. (2006). Who's next? Research predicts museum leadership gap. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, *21*(4), 349–352.

Beeson, J., & Valerio, A. M. (2012/9). The executive leadership imperative: A new perspective on how companies and executives can accelerate the development of women leaders. *Business Horizons*, *55*(5), 417–425.

Blau, F. D., & Kahn, L. M. (2016, January). *The Gender Wage Gap: Extent, Trends, and Explanations*. National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w21913

Carli, L. L. (1999). Gender, Interpersonal Power, and Social Influence. *The Journal of Social Issues*, *55*(1), 81–99.

Carli, L. L., & Eagly, A. H. (1999). *Gender effects on social influence and emergent leadership*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Carman, J. G., Leland, S. M., & Wilson, A. J. (2010). Crisis in leadership or failure to plan? *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, *21*(1), 93–111.

Catalyst. (2007). Damned or doomed - catalyst study on gender stereotyping at work uncovers double-bind dilemmas for women. *Women in Management Review*, *22*(8). https://doi.org/10.1108/wimr.2007.05322hab.001

Chin, J. L. (2008). Visions and Diverse Voices. In J. L. Chin, B. Lott, J. Rice, & J. Sanchez-Hucles (Eds.), *Women and Leadership: Transforming Visions and Diverse Voices* (pp. 1–19). John Wiley & Sons.

Cresswell, J. W. (2003). Research design: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods approaches. *Thousand Oaks, California, Sage Publication, Inc*.

Debebe, G. (2011). Creating a safe environment for women's leadership transformation. *Journal of Management Education*, *35*(5), 679–712.

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). Women and the labyrinth of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, *85*(9), 62–71, 146.

Eagly, A. H. (2007). *Through the labyrinth : the truth about how women become leaders*. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press.

Eisner, S. (2013). Leadership: Gender and executive style. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, *78*(1), 26.

Ellison, S. F., & Mullin, W. P. (2014). Diversity, Social Goods Provision, and Performance in the Firm. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, *23*(2), 465–481.

Elsesser, K. M., & Lever, J. (2011). Does gender bias against female leaders persist? Quantitative and qualitative data from a large-scale survey. *Human Relations; Studies towards the Integration of the Social Sciences*, *64*(12), 1555–1578.

Feldman, K. (2016, May). *Women's Locker Room Talk: Gender and Leadership in Museums*. Presented at the American Alliance of Museums Annual Meeting, Washington DC.

Gan, A. M., Voss, Z. G., Phillips, L., Anagnos, C., & Wade, A. D. (2014). The Gender Gap in Art Museum Directorships. Association of Art Museum Directors. Retrieved from http://www.operaamerica.org/content/about/WON/genderGap.pdf

Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, *78*(2), 4–17.

Griffin, D., & Abraham, M. (2000). The Effective Management of Museums: Cohesive Leadership and Visitor-Focused Public Programming. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, *18*(4), 335–368.

GuideStar Compensation Report, 2013. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.guidestar.org/downloadable-files/2014CompReport-sample.pdf

Hoobler, J. M., Lemmon, G., & Wayne, S. J. (2011/7). Women's underrepresentation in upper management: New insights on a persistent problem. *Organizational Dynamics*, *40*(3), 151–156.

Hymowitz, C., & Schellhardt, T. D. (1986). The glass ceiling: Why women can't seem to break the invisible barrier that blocks them from the top jobs. *The Wall Street Journal*, *24*(1).

Jacocks, C. W. (2012). Making it up as you go- the socially constructed improvisation of women's organizational leadership.pdf. In E. L. R. Annette Holba (Ed.), *Communicative understandings of women's leadership development : from ceilings of glass to labyrinth paths* (pp. 155–177).

Jamieson, K. H. (1995). *Beyond the Double Bind: Women and Leadership*. Oxford University Press.

Kirton, G., & Healy, G. (2012). “Lift as you rise”: Union women’s leadership talk. *Human Relations; Studies towards the Integration of the Social Sciences*, *65*(8), 979–999.

Klenke, K. (2004). *Women and Leadership: A Contextual Perspective*. Springer Publishing Company.

Koenig, A. M., Eagly, A. H., Mitchell, A. A., & Ristikari, T. (2011). Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms. *Psychological Bulletin*, *137*(4), 616–642.

Lysa, H. (2012). *Inclusive Leadership Through a Feminist Lens*. Presented at the 2012 LEAP Conference, University of Idaho. Retrieved from https://www.uidaho.edu/~/media/Files/orgs/Staff%20Affairs/LEAP%20presentations/Feminist%20Leadership%20Powerpoint%20Presentation%20%20Heather%20%20Lysa.ashx

Madden, M. E. (2007). Strategic Planning: Gender, Collaborative Leadership, and Organizational Change. In *Women and Leadership* (pp. 192–208). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Martell, R. F., & Desmet, A. L. (2001). A diagnostic-ratio approach to measuring beliefs about the leadership abilities of male and female managers. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(6), 1223–1231.

McKee, G., & Froelich, K. (2016). Executive succession planning: barriers and substitutes in nonprofit organizations. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/apce.12129/pdf

Moore, P. A. (2016). *The Inclusive Museum Movement*. American Alliance of Museums. Retrieved from http://www.aam-us.org/docs/default-source/museum/museum_novdec2016_informationplease.pdf?sfvrsn=0

Nightingale, E., & Mahal, C. (2013). The heart of the matter: integrating equality and diversity into the policy and practice of museums and galleries. In R. Sandell & E. Nightingale (Eds.), *Museums, Equality and Social Justice* (pp. 13–37). Routledge.

Noland, M., Moran, T., & Kotschwar, B. R. (2016). Is Gender Diversity Profitable? Evidence from a Global Survey. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2729348

Orr-Cahall, C. (1994). The Impact of the Future on Museums: Societal and Technological Changes. In Preparation for the Future. In J. R. Glaser & A. A. Zenetou (Eds.), *Gender Perspectives: Essays on women in museums*. Smithsonian Institution Press.

Powell, G. N. (2011). The gender and leadership wars. *Organizational Dynamics*, *40*(1), 1–9.

Reich, R. B. (1995). *Good for Business: Making full use of the nation's human capital*. Department of Labor; Federal Glass Ceiling Commission. Retrieved from https://www.dol.gov/oasam/programs/history/reich/reports/ceiling.pdf

Rosener, J. B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, *68*(6), 119–125.

Sandberg, S. (2016, September 27). Sheryl Sandberg: Women Are Leaning In—but They Face Pushback. *WSJ Online Article*. wsj.com. Retrieved from http://www.wsj.com/articles/sheryl-sandberg-women-are-leaning-inbut-they-face-pushback-1474963980

Sandell, R., & Nightingale, E. (2013). Introduction. In R. Sandell & E. Nightingale (Eds.), *Museums, Equality and Social Justice* (pp. 1–10). Routledge.

Schonfeld, R., Westermann, M., & Sweeney, L. (2015). Art Museum Staff Demographic Survey. *The Andrew M. Mellon Foundation*.

Schwarzer, M. (2007). Women in the temple-Gender and leadership in museums. *Museum News*, *86*(3), 56–64.

Stanfill, S. (2016, October 19). Taking On the Boys' Club at the Art Museum. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/19/opinion/taking-on-the-boys-club-at-the-art-museum.html

Stryker, S., & Whittle, S. (2006). *The Transgender Studies Reader*. Taylor & Francis.

Suchy, S. (2000). Grooming new millennium museum directors. *Museum International*, *52*(2), 59–64.

Tierney, T. J. (2006). *The Nonprofit Sector's Leadership Deficit*. The Bridgespan Group. Retrieved from http://imap.wildforeverfuture.org/downloads/Leadership_Deficit_White_Paper.pdf

Trethewey, A. (1999). Disciplined bodies: Women's embodied identities at work. *Organization Studies*, *20*(3), 423–450.

Treviño, V., Giraud Voss, Z., Anagnos, C., & Wade, A. D. (2017). *The Ongoing Gender Gap in Art Museum Directorships*. Association of Art Museum Directors. Retrieved from https://aamd.org/sites/default/files/document/AAMD%20NCAR%20Gender%20Gap%202017.pdf

Van Damme, M., Dickey, M. A., Ferey, J., Mukund, S., Putz, L., Baldwin, J. H., & Ackerson, A. W. (2016). A Call for Gender Equality in the Museum Workplace. In J. H. Baldwin (Ed.), *Women|Museums: Lessons from the Workplace*. Mystic, CT. Retrieved from https://leadershipmatters1213.files.wordpress.com/2014/12/gemmplatform-1.pdf

Virick, M., & Greer, C. R. (2012). Gender diversity in leadership succession: Preparing for the future. *Human Resource Management*, *51*(4), 575–600.

Weil, S. E. (1999). From Being about Something to Being for Somebody: The Ongoing Transformation of the American Museum. *Daedalus*, *128*(3), 229–258.

Weisul, K. (2004). The Bottom Line on Women at the Top; Advocacy group Catalyst's surprising new study shows that gender diversity in exec ranks and financial performance are linked. *Business Week Online*.

Yabusaki, A. S. (2008). Diverse Feminist Communication Styles: Challenges to Women and Leadership. In J. L. Chin, B. Lott, J. Rice, & J. Sanchez-Hucles (Eds.), *Women and Leadership: Transforming Visions and Diverse Voices* (pp. 55–69). John Wiley & Sons.

Yee, L., Thomas, R., Krivkovich, A., Finch, A., Kutchner, E., Cooper, M., … Konar, E. (2016). *Women in the Workplace 2016*. LeanIn.org. Retrieved from https://womenintheworkplace.com/

Appendices

Appendix A: Description of Recruitment Email

Email points included the following:

- Data collector's name and affiliation;
- Purpose of the study;
- Voluntary nature of participation
- Participation involves a 30-60 minute interview that will be recorded; only the research team will hear these recordings;
- Subject's responses will be attributed to them along with their role and their institution; subjects may be quoted but will be allowed to review any quotes prior to publication;
- Name and contact information of lead researcher and advisor

Appendix B: Study FAQ Sheet

Understanding the Gender Gap in Art Museum Directorships

Kathryn Dawson
University of Washington
Museology Graduate Program

Purpose:

The purpose of this study is to investigate the pipeline toward executive leadership positions in medium to large public non-profit art museums for women by discovering trends and patterns in their career trajectory and professional experiences.

What I'm hoping to learn:

- Where does the path toward leadership positions begin for female museum leaders?
- What are the barriers to achieving a leadership position for women in museums?
- What is beneficial along the path toward leadership positions for women in museums?
- How does the particular career path of female museum directors inform how they lead?

Your involvement:

You will be asked to participate in one 45-60 minute recorded interview. I am hoping to schedule the interview in February or March of 2017, depending on your availability. The interview may be done by phone or video call, depending on your preference and technological access. I will contact you for further approval if I elect to use a direct quote in my final report.

Contact information:

Kathryn Dawson (Lead researcher)
dawskat@uw.edu
425.417.1964

Angelina Ong (Advisor)
aong@uw.edu

Appendix C: Interview Guide

Consent Script:

I am asking you to participate in a research study that is part of my Master's Thesis work at the University of Washington in Seattle. The purpose of this research is to understand the gender gap in Art Museum Directorships by investigating the pipeline toward leadership positions in museums for women.

Your participation is voluntary. Refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits, and you may discontinue participation at any time. I would like to attribute your responses directly to you and your institution in my study results. As such, this interview will be recorded. I will give you the opportunity to review any direct quotes before publication. If you have any questions now or in the future, please contact me or my advisor.

Do you have any questions? Do you agree to participate in this interview?

Let's begin.

Tell me a little bit about your current role at INSTITUTION,
Background

What is your job title, and how long have you been in this position?

What drew you to this organization?

I would like to go back and get some context on how you got to where you are today,
Path toward leadership (Talent pipeline)

What was your role/institution before your current position?

What is your educational background?

What led you to museum work?

At what point did you decide to pursue a leadership role?

I'm interested in what you think helped you get to and stay on your path,
Opportunities in achieving a leadership position (Traits)

What role have mentors played in your career?

If none/little, why do you think that is?

What traits have you found make an effective leader?

How have you developed those traits?

[What helped you learn what it means to be a leader; expand]

Conversely, I'm sure there have been obstacles along the way,

Barriers to achieving a leadership position (Obstacles)

What have been your greatest challenges as a leader? (family, institutional)

How did you respond to these obstacles?

To what extent do you think gender played a role in these barriers?

Why/why not?

Career path informing leadership style (Leadership roles)

Do you feel the challenges you faced impact you as a leader?

Do you feel pressure to lead in a particular way?

Do you see your role as a leader differently than male leaders?

I'd like to zoom out a little bit and get your thoughts on the big picture of women in museum leadership,

Big picture

What do you think institutions can/should do to encourage more women into leadership roles?

Do you feel the needle has moved at all on these issues, either in the field or in society more broadly?

What advice do you have for women seeking leadership positions in museums?

Appendix D: Coding Matrix

RQ1: Where did the path toward leadership positions begin for these women?							
What drew you to this organization?	Impact- 8	Recruitment- 6	Institutional fit- 6	Strategic career move- 5			
What was your role/institution before your current position?	Director- 6	Univ. museum director- 4	Deputy director- 2	Curator- 3			
What is your educational background?	BA- 2	MA art history- 4	MA other- 2	PhD art history- 4	PhD ABD- 4	Business/ leadership training- 3	
What led you to museum work?	Subject area- 6	Supporting artists- 4	Objects- 5	Family connection- 4	Impact- 1		
At what point did you decide to pursue a leadership role?	Never thought about it- 1	Evolved from other roles- 6	Always wanted to- 5	Was pushed/asked- 3			
RQ2: What were the barriers to achieving a leadership position?							
What have been your greatest challenges as a leader?	Gender- 6	Age- 2	Managerial- 6	Resistance to change/ leadership- 4	Expertise- 5	Boards of trustees- 1	Mentorship- 1
	Family- 1	Network/ contacts- 1					
How did you respond to these obstacles?	Tough- 8	Team building- 4	Play the game- 3	Talk about it- 2	Trial and error- 4		

To what extent do you think gender played a role in these barriers?	Generation- 3	Internal bias- 4	Subtle- 8	Overt/direct- 6	Indirect- 3		
Why/why not?	Generation- 1	Internal bias- 2	Subtle- 8	Overt/direct- 3	Surprise- 1		
RQ3: What was beneficial along the way?							
What role have mentors played in your career?	No mentors- 5	Colleagues- 2	Many helped- 5	Role models- 2	Clear mentors- 5		
If none/little, why do you think that is?	Didn't need- 2	Never found one- 1	Unwilling- 4	No matches- 1	Don't know- 1		
What traits have you found make an effective leader?	Self-awareness- 6	Collab./ Communication 11	Teamwork- 11	Vision- 9	Resources - 5	Audience Community - 2	Determined/ Perseverance - 5
	Understand context- 2	Adaptable- 2	Humanity/ Compassion - 4	Management/ People skills- 8	Inclusive/ Open minded- 4		
How have you developed those traits?	Experience - 11	Reading- 3	Innate- 8	Training- 3	Innate traits develop over time- 2	Watching others- 6	
RQ4: How does their career path inform how they lead?							
Do you feel the challenges you faced impact you as a leader?	Mentorship /Profess. dev.- 12	Doesn't change- 2	Personal confidence- 5	Systemic changes- 4	Approach to work- 3	Awareness- 4	

Do you feel pressure to lead in a particular way?	No- 2	Won't change to fit a mold- 2	Play the game- 2	Only early on- 1	Situational - 4	Navigate double bind- 3	
Do you see your role as a leader differently than male leaders?	Collaborative- 7	Impact- 2	Team- 5	Casual- 2	Recognize differences- 2	Maybe not gender-related- 4	
What advice do you have for women seeking leadership positions in museums?	Mentoring- 5	Confidence- 4	Determination- 5	Openness- 2	Self-awareness/ Values alignment- 6	Community/ impact- 2	
RQ5: What does the future look like for women in museum leadership?							
What do you think institutions can/should do to encourage more women into leadership roles?	Not sure- 1	Search committees- 2	Boards- 10	Pipeline/ coaching- 8	Feminization of field- 3	Social change- 2	Family accomodations- 4
	Inherent bias- 4						
Has the needle moved on these issues?	Yes- 3	No- 2	Gone backwards- 2	Social change- 2	Getting better- 3	Uneven/ regional- 2	

What advice do you have for women seeking leadership positions in museums?	Mentoring- 5	Confidence- 4	Determination- 5	Openness- 2	Self-awareness/ Values alignment- 6	Community/ impact- 2	

Appendix E: List of Participants

West/Northwest:

- Dr. Kimerly Rorschach of the Seattle Art Museum in Seattle, WA ($26m, encyclopedic, 4.5 years)
- Dr. Julie Decker of the Anchorage Art Museum in Anchorage, AK ($10m, multi-disciplinary, 3.5 years)
- Lori Fogarty of the Oakland Museum of California in Oakland, CA ($15m, multi-disciplinary, 11 years)
- Lial Jones of the Crocker Museum of Art in Sacramento, CA ($10m, encyclopedic, 17 years)

Midwest:

- Nannette Maciejunes of the Columbus Museum of Art in Columbus, OH ($21m, 19th-20thC American/European, 14 years)
- Olga Viso of the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis, MN ($21m, contemporary, 9.5 years)
- Kaywin Feldman of the Minneapolis Institute of Art in Minneapolis, MN ($30m, encyclopedic, 9.5 years)

Southeast:

- Dr. Kathleen Jameson of the Mint Museum of Art in Charlotte, NC ($10m, American, 7 years)
- Dr. Susan Edwards of the Frist Center for Visual Art in Nashville, TN ($13m, Global/Contemporary art center, 13 years)
- Susan Taylor of the New Orleans Museum of Art in New Orleans, LA ($12m, encyclopedic, 6 years)
- Hope Alswang of the Norton Museum of Art in West Palm Beach, FL ($10m, American/European Painting/Photography, 7 years)
- Marianne Richter of the Columbus Museum in Columbus, GA ($12m, American art & history, 2 years)

Mid-Atlantic:

- Kim Sajet of the Smithsonian National Portrait Gallery in Washington DC ($11m, American, 4 years)
- Judith O'Toole of the Westmoreland Museum of American Art in Greensburg, PA ($10m, American, 24 years)
- Lynn Zelevansky of the Carnegie Museum of Art in Pittsburgh, PA ($10m, encyclopedic, 7 years)