

12-2012

Family Policies and Institutional Satisfaction: An Intersectional Analysis of Tenure-Track Faculty

Heather Lee Schneller

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Education Policy Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schneller, Heather Lee, "Family Policies and Institutional Satisfaction: An Intersectional Analysis of Tenure-Track Faculty" (2012). *Theses and Dissertations*. 611.

<http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/611>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu, ccmiddle@uark.edu.

FAMILY POLICIES AND INSTITUTIONAL SATISFACTION: AN INTERSECTIONAL
ANALYSIS OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

FAMILY POLICIES AND INSTITUTIONAL SATISFACTION: AN INTERSECTIONAL
ANALYSIS OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Public Policy

By

Heather Lee Schneller
University of Arkansas
Bachelor of Arts in History, 1996
Clemson University
Master of Education in Counseling and Guidance Services, 1998

December 2012
University of Arkansas

ABSTRACT

Gender and faculty career advancement have been examined with a focus on academic work environment, including faculty workloads, mentoring relationships, access to research networks, and work-life balance. Previous studies concerned with gender, employment, and care work only have considered child care. Additionally, the exploration of faculty and care work focused specifically on gender instead of examining the interaction of race and gender. To date, no study on academic work-life policies includes faculty perceptions of their importance and effectiveness nor has the faculty assessment of eldercare policy been examined in relation to career success. Guided by an intersectional perspective, this study compares responses provided by four groups of faculty: African American women, African American men as well as white women and white men. Toward this end, I use data from the 2008 and 2009 Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction survey collected by the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE). First, I examine faculty perceptions regarding the importance of family policies as related to career success, the effectiveness of family policies at the institution, and the level of satisfaction with work-life balance. Second, I examine the extent to which departmental and institutional support for care work affects the faculty member's overall satisfaction with the institution. The findings indicate that there are significant differences in policy perceptions within the intersectionally defined faculty groups as well as with overall satisfaction with work-life balance. African American women overwhelmingly indicate that eldercare policy is important to career success; while white women are more concerned with the importance of childcare policy. Regarding effectiveness of work-life policies, with the exception of childcare policy, the faculty groups do not differ significantly. Significant group differences emerge in faculty assessment of childcare policy with the largest proportion of white women dissatisfied with its effectiveness on

their campuses. Finally, African American men are the most satisfied with their work-life balance. Second, in contrast to my hypothesis, the analysis reveals institutional-level support for care work influences overall satisfaction with the institution more so than departmental support. Also, women are more satisfied than men, and being married has a negative effect on satisfaction.

The findings suggest care work still matters in relation to a faculty member's career advancement. Institutions should create clear guidelines regarding policy use related to caregiving activities. These guidelines should encourage both men and women to use these policies for activities not related to childcare but also for broader care issues. Creating an automatic "opt-in" policy could assist in transforming a culture that has historically had a bias in using family policy. Further, race and gender must be considered when constructing policies to address career balance concerns. Not all policies affect people the same way, and depending on what type of care, child or elder, the challenges will be unique to the social location of the faculty member.

This dissertation is approved for recommendation
to the Graduate Council.

Dissertation Director:

Dr. Anna Zajicek

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Valerie Hunt

Dr. Brinck Kerr

Dr. Michael Miller

©2012 by Heather Lee Schneller
All Rights Reserved

DISSERTATION DUPLICATION RELEASE

I hereby authorize the University of Arkansas Libraries to duplicate this dissertation when needed for research and/or scholarship.

Agreed _____
Heather Lee Schneller

Refused _____
Heather Lee Schneller

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank the source of my strength, The Divine, for providing the drive to finish this project. I didn't realize how an academic project could bring you closer to the Creator until I started the dissertation process.

I also would like to thank those that cheered me on toward the finish line. My family and friends made the journey worthwhile. To those in University Housing who could not understand why I would take vacation to work in my office on this project, but did not disturb me, I thank you for providing me the ability to be a "figment of your imagination."

To my dissertation committee members, Dr. Michael Miller, Dr. Brink Kerr, and Dr. Valerie Hunt, I appreciate your generous support throughout my time in the Public Policy program. In various ways throughout my time, you ignited my curiosity and allowed me to infuse my work experience within class assignments. Last, my utmost gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Anna Zajicek for surviving this dissertation. The snow storm of 2010 was the catalyst that got the proposal off the ground, and I appreciated the calls and feedback as we all suffered through negative degree temperatures and several feet of snow. Your support while I balanced work, family concerns, and pursuing a doctorate deserves more gratitude than I can ever express.

Finally, I am tremendously grateful for having such a supportive sister. Thank you for your unconditional love and support as I marched toward the finish line.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my “north stars” that were not able to share this day with me, but are shining down with pride. When I wanted to quit, your resonating love and belief in me kept me going.

To my late grandmothers

Helen Catherine Schneller and Willie Ray Long

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Purpose of Study and Conceptual Foundations	4
Overview of Methods and Family Policy Options	5
Selected Family Policy Options	5
<i>Paid or unpaid research leave</i>	6
<i>Paid or unpaid personal leave</i>	6
<i>Stop-the-clock policies</i>	7
Significance of the Outcomes	7
Chapter Summary	8
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORITICAL FRAMEWORKS	10
Introduction	10
Gender and Race-based Inequalities in Higher Education	10
Job model versus Gender Model	11
Studies Using Job Model	13
<i>Academic workplace: women only studies</i>	13
<i>Academic workplace: women and men (without race comparison) studies</i>	14
Research Using the Gender Model	17
<i>Faculty paid work/family management: women only studies</i>	17
Socialist Feminist Theory	19
<i>Guiding explanatory factors</i>	20
<i>Faculty paid work/family management</i>	22

Intersectionality Theory	27
<i>Historical context</i>	28
<i>Guiding assumptions</i>	28
<i>Simultaneity</i>	28
<i>Multiplicative experiences</i>	29
<i>Academic workplace: African American women only studies</i>	30
<i>Academic workplace: African American men only studies</i>	33
<i>Academic workplace: women and men (with race comparison) studies</i>	35
Research Hypotheses	40
<i>Hypotheses Related to Question One</i>	40
<i>Hypotheses Related to Question Two</i>	41
Chapter Summary	41
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN	44
Introduction	44
Secondary Data Analysis	45
Institutional Type and Sample	46
<i>Survey Information</i>	46
<i>Survey Participants</i>	47
Data Protection and Institutional Review Board Approval	49
Survey Questions: Policies and Practices	50
Overall Satisfaction	51
Data Analysis	52
<i>Kruskal-Wallis test</i>	53
<i>Mann-Whitney U test</i>	53

<i>Linear Regression Analysis</i>	53
Chapter Summary	54
CHAPTER FOUR: EMPIRICAL FINDINGS	55
Introduction	55
Demographic Variables	55
Findings for Research Question One	57
<i>Policy importance-Paid and unpaid research leave</i>	58
<i>Policy importance-Paid and unpaid personal leave</i>	60
<i>Policy importance-Childcare</i>	62
<i>Policy importance-Stop-the-clock</i>	64
<i>Policy importance-Eldercare</i>	66
<i>Policy importance-Modified Duties</i>	68
<i>Policy effectiveness</i>	70
<i>Overall satisfaction</i>	73
Findings for Research Question Two	75
<i>Hypothesis One</i>	77
<i>Hypothesis Two</i>	79
Chapter Summary	81
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	83
Introduction	83
Major Findings	83
<i>Policy perception similarities and differences</i>	87
<i>Overall work-life balance satisfaction</i>	89

<i>Department support's influence on overall satisfaction</i>	90
Intersectional Analysis	92
Policy Implications	93
Limitations to Study	96
Recommendations for Future Research	98
REFERENCES	100
APPENDIX A	109
APPENDIX B	110

LIST OF FIGURES

Table 1 Rank frequency	56
Table 2 Tenure-track appointment type frequency	56
Table 3 Frequencies by race/ethnicity and gender regarding the importance of paid or unpaid research leave	59
Table 4 Z-scores and p-values for Mann-Whitney test regarding the importance	59
Table 5 Frequencies by race/ethnicity and gender regarding the importance of paid or unpaid personal leave	61
Table 6 Z-scores and p-values for Mann-Whitney test regarding the importance	61
Table 7 Frequencies by race/ethnicity and gender regarding the importance of childcare	63
Table 8 Z-scores and p-values for Mann-Whitney test regarding the importance	63
Table 9 Frequencies by race/ethnicity and gender regarding the importance of stop-the-clock for parental or other family reasons	65
Table 10 Z-scores and p-values for Mann-Whitney test regarding the importance	65
Table 11 Frequencies by race/ethnicity and gender regarding the importance of eldercare	67
Table 12 Z-scores and p-values for Mann-Whitney test regarding the importance	67
Table 13 Frequencies by race/ethnicity and gender regarding the importance of modified duties for parental or other family reasons (e.g., course release)	69
Table 14 Z-scores and p-values for Mann-Whitney test regarding the importance	69
Table 15 Frequencies by race/ethnicity and gender regarding the effectiveness of childcare	72
Table 16 Z-scores and p-values for Mann-Whitney test regarding the effectiveness	72
Table 17 Frequencies by race/ethnicity and gender regarding satisfaction with the balance between professional time and personal or family time	74
Table 18 Z-scores and p-values for Mann-Whitney test regarding overall satisfaction	74
Table 19 Descriptive statistics for Model 1: mean and proportion of variables	75
Table 20 Descriptive statistics for Model 2: mean and proportion of variables	75
Table 21 Model 1: Determinants of workplace satisfaction	76

Table 22	Model 2: Determinants of workplace satisfaction: Interacting race and gender	77
Table 23	Variable Correlations: Model 1	80
Table 24	Variable Correlations: Model 2	80
Table 25	Frequencies: Faculty member married or had a partner	110
Table 26	Frequencies: Do you have any children or other dependents?	110
Table 27	Frequencies: What is your annual salary?	110
Table 28	Frequencies: Faculty Groups by Academic Area	111
Table 29	Frequencies: Faculty Groups by Age	112

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Research on gender inequality in the academy seems to concentrate on specific aspects of the academic work-life experiences, such as mentoring and socialization concerns (Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Ellemers van den Heuvel, de Gilder, Maass, & Bonvini, 2004; Reynolds, 1992), and differential treatment within the academic organization (Allan, 2003; Milem, Berger, & Dey, 2000; Ropers-Huilman, 2000). Other studies concentrate on family's influence on women's career progression (Armenti, 2004; Barbezat & Hughes, 2005; Mason & Goulden, 2002, 2004a, 2004b; Perna 2001, 2005; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004, 2005; Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006).

While this literature provides important insights into the gendered nature of the academic workplace, it can also be criticized for inadvertently reproducing the following five trends. First, the research on work-life management usually views "work" and family interactions as a "problem" solely for women. In this context, the balancing of these two spheres is seen as a woman's issue (Colbeck, 2006; Jacobs & Winslow, 2004; Mason & Goulden, 2002, 2004a, 2004b; Probert, 2005; Sax, Hagedorn, Arrendondo, & Dicriss III, 2002; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). In reality, however, care work is a concern for both men and women. For faculty to be successful in their work environment, both men and women need adequate support in meeting family care work responsibilities (Fox, 2010). Ultimately, both men and women are confined by ideology concerning the ideal worker and ideal parent (Lewis & Humbert, 2010). These socially constructed roles create gendered assumptions related to the public sphere of work as the primary concern for men and the private sphere of care work relegated to women.

Second, much of the research defines family care work only in terms of childbearing/childrearing issues (see Mason & Goulden, 2002, 2004a, 2004b; Perna 2001, 2005; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004, 2005; Wolf-Wendel & Ward 2006). As a result, faculty experiencing other forms of care work, such as eldercare, are not adequately represented in the literature. With eldercare emerging as an issue, there is little known about the interface between eldercare and the academic work life, including the extent of eldercare responsibilities faculty may have and policy effectiveness in that area.

Third, gender identities, expectations, and division of labor, including care work responsibilities, are shaped by interacting social relations, yet race/ethnicity is ignored in this area of research. We must acknowledge that how women and men actually experience the academy will differ due to the complexity of occupying multiple social locations defined by both their race/ethnicity and gender (Allen, 1998; Allen, Epps, Guillory, Suh, Bonou, & Hammarth, 2000; Cooper, 2006; Gregory, 1999; Guidry, 2006; Guillory, 2003; Heggins, 2004; Hendricks, 1996; Johnson-Bailey & Cervero, 2004; Renzulli, Grant, Kathuria, 2006; Smith & Calasanti, 2005).

Fourth, many institutions of higher education create policies designed to assist faculty with family care work issues that go beyond federally mandated policies (Hollenshead, Sullivan, Smith, August, & Hamilton, 2005). Within the literature, some attention has been paid to the implementation process (Richman, Civian, Shannon, Hill, & Brennan, 2008; Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006) as well as efforts to transform a workplace that historically has ignored family care work issues into a workplace that supports the experiences of men and women managing both their academic career and family responsibilities. Hollenshead et al. (2005) examined the nature of policy use specifically examining the number of policies offered, availability to research

faculty, formal versus informal policy, and what dependent type qualified for the use of work-life policies. However, instead of addressing faculty directly, Hollenshead et al. (2005) surveyed administrators with human resources responsibilities.

Fifth, in examining how these policies are perceived, one must consider how organizational actors respond to policy mandates across different structural levels. In particular, Bird (2010) hypothesizes that (1) faculty are embedded in their departments and then in universities; (2) work and care work policies come from the university level; but (3) departmental cultures and practices regarding those policies influence the overall experience more so than the institution. Bird's (2010) premise that universities are "incongruous bureaucratic structures" emphasizes the importance of examining how organizational actors respond to policy mandates across different structural levels. Specifically, Bird (2010) asserts that universities are unique organizations in that their "decentralized decision-making structures and high levels of departmental and personal autonomy result, often unintentionally, in patchy flows of information about formal university policies and procedures across levels of the university" (p. 6).

In fact, in several studies, faculty members reported fearing negative consequences for using work-life policies (e.g., Hollenshead et al. 2005; Shockley & Allen, 2010). Further, Bailyn (2003) asserts that gendered assumptions related to the division of labor are embedded in the institutional context and influences policy use. Thus, the departmental culture can contribute to faculty career trajectories in the utilization of family policies by men and women faculty members (Fox, 2008). Policy implementation gaps surrounding what the institutional policy states and what a department chair decides to allow can create departmental cultures that are contrary to the overall institution's culture (Lewis & Humbert, 2010).

Purpose of Study and Conceptual Foundations

The purpose of the study is to first examine faculty perceptions related to the importance and effectiveness of policies designed to address balancing academic work-life concerns and family responsibilities. Second, I examine faculty satisfaction with the balance between professional time and personal or family time. Last, I explore the extent to which the overall satisfaction with the institution is affected by faculty members' perceptions of institutional and departmental support for care work in relation to specific social markers (e.g., race, class, and gender) indicating social location. The following research questions guide my study:

1. For tenure track faculty occupying intersectional locations, specifically race and gender, are there differences regarding:
 - a. The perceived importance of family policies as related to career success?
 - b. The perceived effectiveness of family policies at the institution?
 - c. The level of satisfaction with work-life balance?
2. Does the overall satisfaction with the institution vary by a faculty member's race, salary, gender, dependent status, marital status as well as perceptions regarding institutional and departmental support for family responsibilities?

The premise behind these questions expands the scope of previous studies and policy-related literature. First, the research design includes both men and women. As stated in the introduction, many of the extant studies tend to examine the interaction of work and family care as a "woman's problem". Second, the literature regarding African Americans in the academy demonstrates faculty experiences differ across various intersectional locations. Third, in addition to uncovering faculty differences regarding their assessment of workplace family-related policies, I also examine their overall satisfaction with work-life balance. Last, I explore if the overall satisfaction of faculty is affected more by their perceptions of departmental or of institutional support for family care work, incorporating how social location affects perceptions.

To address these issues, I use the following theoretical constructs to organize and conduct this study. First, I use Feldberg and Glenn's (1979) analysis of the models used to study the

nexus of gender, gainful employment, and family to organize my literature review. Their classical work provides a model I use to assess the studies important to my project. Second, because this study examines issues related to the balance of work and family care work responsibilities, socialist feminist theory is used to hypothesize differences in how faculty perceive their work-life balance. The main premise is that the division of labor, specifically unpaid work, is a cause of inequality for women. Last, intersectional theory, asserts that individual workplace and family experiences differ based on their social location within the intersecting gender and race structures. How faculty members assess the usefulness and effectiveness of policy will depend on what social location they occupy.

Overview of Methods and Family Policy Options

This study will use data collected from the 2008 and 2009 administration of the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey. The survey assesses faculty experiences related to areas central to career success. I will use the secondary data set related to questions regarding: work and home, and demographic information related to marital status, age, salary, dependent status, race, and gender. While there are additional policies assessed by the COACHE survey, I will only examine six policies directly linked to assisting faculty that perform care work activities.

Selected Family Policy Options. Regarding the policies selected to be included in this analysis, Ryan and Kossek (2008) define work-life policies as “any organizational programs or officially sanctioned practice designed to assist employees with the integration of paid work with other important roles such as family, education, or leisure” (2008, p. 295). Even though the U.S. policies are designed to be gender neutral, the gendered division of labor in the private sphere seems to be perpetuating gendered decisions regarding the taking of such leave. Specifically,

more women are taking leave to attend to family management issues (Berggren, 2008; Kelly et al., 2008; Ryan & Kossek, 2008). Regardless of who actually utilizes work-life policies, universities and colleges across the United States offer various programs and policies that assist employees and address institution-specific concerns. These broadly defined work-life policies that I further discuss include paid or unpaid research leave, paid or unpaid personal leave, and stop-the-clock policies.

Paid or unpaid research leave. The first type of research leave related to this category, modified duties, allows faculty to negotiate a reduction in contractual obligations without penalty in compensation or benefits (AAUP, 2001). The period of modified active service is usually not counted toward leave. Typically, the modified duty policy allows faculty to reduce teaching and service loads, and continue working on research projects and publications. The second type of leave related to this category, flexible work arrangements, exists under the premise that the faculty work-life is one that is arranged based on contractual requirements, department chair expectations, and one's personal research agenda (Sullivan, Hollenshead, & Smith, 2004). This entails working with one's department chair to ensure that position expectations are being met in concert with the faculty's care work needs.

Paid or unpaid personal leave. For personal and/or family issues requiring leave that might occur in a faculty member's career, the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) may be used to assist in negotiating time for addressing these issues (AAUP, 2001). This federal policy requires businesses with 50 or more employees to grant employees up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave during any 12-month period for the following: birth and first-year care of a child; adoption or foster placement of a child; the care of a child, spouse, or parent with a serious health condition; or the serious health condition of the employee. Additionally, if the employee is

caring for a qualified next of kin that has been seriously injured due to military service, they qualify to take up to 26 weeks of leave (Department of Labor, 2012).

Furthermore, there are various campus-level leave policies for faculty use such as short term leave. In some instances, short term leave extends sick leave to situations where faculty are caring for an ill family member in cases not covered by FMLA. Another instance of using short term leave would be for situations involving the unavailability of childcare or eldercare services. There are also longer-term leave options that can be used for family care. At some universities, faculty may be granted an extended unpaid leave of absence for child rearing as well as caring for an ailing family member.

Stop-the-clock policies. Finally, faculty choosing to have children or to care for an ailing parent can be disadvantaged in their academic career because their pause does not keep them on “track.” Specifically, “institutions should adopt policies that do not create conflicts between having children and establishing an optimal research record on the basis of which the tenure decision is to be made” (AAUP, 2001, para. 22). Utilizing a policy, such as stop the clock, allows a faculty member to extend the time in which they are required to produce work for the tenure dossier.

Significance of the Outcomes

This research project is theoretically significant because it reveals the complexity of work-life policies in relation to how one experiences the academic workplace. Additionally, it will shed light on policy assessments expressed by faculty occupying intersectionally defined locations. For instance, the policy concerns expressed by African American women and men faculty are often not examined or even considered when studying inequality in the academy. The majority of literature involving women faculty approaches gender as a monolithic category,

and presents a singular experience. Similarly, much of the care-giving literature examines women with children only. This study will be one of the first to examine both race and gender simultaneously in regards to balancing academic work-life with family management responsibilities. Moreover, I will intentionally explore eldercare policy in addition the other family-related concerns covered under federal and campus policy provisions. I anticipate recommending specific policy strategies that will guide campus administrators in assisting faculty struggling for integration of both work responsibilities and of family management concerns.

My study will differ from others in that I will examine faculty perceptions directly regarding *the importance* and *effectiveness* of paid or unpaid research leave, paid or unpaid personal leave, stop-the-clock for parental or other family reasons, childcare, eldercare, and modified duties for parental or other family reasons (e.g., course release). Many instances throughout the literature, faculty perceptions regarding morale (Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002) and work-life satisfaction (Lease, 1999; Rosser, 2004) have been examined in addition to understanding what policies exist at universities regarding care work (Hollingshead et al., 2005; Sullivan, Hollingshead, & Smith, 2004). This study will be a first in examining how faculty perceive policies that are designed to assist them in balancing academic work demands with family management responsibilities. Indirectly, the broader issue undergirding this study is how the academic workplace treats those who have family care work.

Chapter Summary

Chapter One provides an introduction to the issue regarding faculty integrating work-life management specific to policy concerns. An overview of methods and family policy options

details the specific approach to examining the research questions. Last, significance of outcomes emphasizes the intersectional aspect to this study.

Chapter Two draws attention to the literature relevant to examining the academic work-life and work/family management issues. More importantly, the complexity of the academic workplace in addition to gender and race-based inequalities in higher education are considered in this chapter. The theoretical premises used to construct the research methodology, in addition to the research hypotheses, are included in this chapter.

Chapter Three provides an outline of the research design used in exploring the research questions. The problem and purpose of the study are discussed as well as issues surrounding secondary data analysis. Detailed description related to survey, institutional type and sample, survey participants, and data protection are included. The tests used to examine the data are discussed in this chapter as well.

Chapter Four contains the findings, including the review of demographic variables as well as a presentation of the findings as they relate to specific research questions.

Chapter Five provides the conclusions and recommendations from the findings. Major findings are presented, and the contribution to intersectional analysis is discussed as well. Policy implications are considered, and limitations to the study are posed along with recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Introduction

In this section, I discuss the theoretical and empirical considerations guiding my study. First, using Feldberg and Glenn's (1979) distinction between the "job model" versus "gender model" approaches to the study of work, I review and critique extant literature relevant to examining the work/family management-related experiences of college faculty.¹ Considering the complexities that faculty work encompasses, particularly the lack of formal work hours, studies focusing on academic workplace are essential to framing this project. Next, to address deficiencies of extant literature, I discuss two theories-- socialist feminist theory and intersectionality theory -- and examine selected empirical studies associated with these two theoretical approaches. Also, I review literature specific to care work issues regarding elder care. I begin this review by briefly discussing the nature and the extent of the gender and race-based inequalities in higher education.

Gender and Race-based Inequalities in Higher Education

Over the years, several elements of faculty work-related activities have been researched to identify reasons as to why white women, African American women, and African American men do not succeed in higher education institutions, especially at research-intensive schools, at the same rate as white men. The problem's scope can be gleaned from the data describing faculty representation by gender and race. A recent report from The National Center for

¹ Given that this project focuses primarily on care-giving effects on faculty experiences, the studies I include pertain specifically to higher education.

Educational Statistics² (2011) details a total of 1,371,390 full time instructional faculty members working at degree-granting institutions within the United States. According to this report, white men make up a plurality of the faculty with 41.3%, and white women account for 34.4% of the faculty positions. African American men account for 2.8%, and African American women comprise 3.6% of faculty. In all, white men constitute a large number of faculty members, across faculty ranks, followed by white women.

Current gender research posits differing explanations as to why inequality continues. Specifically, following the so-called “job model” (Feldberg & Glenn 1979), one strand of research focuses on workplace-related gender differences. These gender differences, such as committee service, student advising, and productivity rates, are perpetuated through new faculty socialization processes. Another strand of research falls under the so-called “gender model.” This strand of research examines how family responsibilities that many female faculty have influence their experiences in the academic workplace. Importantly, neither the job model nor the gender model appear to provide an adequate account of the experiences of faculty of color. Thus, after discussing how the two strands of research based on these two models approach the gender differences, I introduce intersectional theory and review select research on gender and race-related differences in faculty experiences at the institutions of higher education.

Job model versus Gender model. Over thirty years ago, Feldberg and Glenn (1979) observed that the studies of women’s and men’s work experiences utilized different approaches depending on whose experiences they examined. Studies of men used the “job model” which assumed that work was men’s primary focus (Feldberg & Glenn, 1979). Under this model,

² Figures taken from Table 246. Employees in degree-granting institutions, by race/ethnicity, employment status, control and type of institutions and primary occupation: Fall 2007

disparities in men's work experiences were seen as the source of differences in worker satisfaction, attitudes, and orientations.³ The problem with this approach is that it assumes that men do not have any family and/or caregiving related responsibilities. In addition, by not examining the interactions of both paid and unpaid work in men's lives, unpaid men's work is seen as not being "real work."

In contrast, researchers interested in explaining women's experiences within the workplace used an approach that focused on private-public interactions in women's lives. Within this so-called "gender model," women's experiences in the workplace were "treated as derivative of personal characteristics and relationships to family situations" (Feldberg & Glenn, 1979, p. 526). Given the shortcoming of these two approaches, Feldberg and Glenn called for a more integrated approach that would examine women's and men's paid work and unpaid work in the context of inclusively defined work experiences. The main problem with the gender model is that it both subsumed women's workplace experiences to their family-related experiences and assumed that women were more committed to taking care of their family than to their paid employment (Yee & Schultz, 2000).

Since Feldberg and Glenn's (1979) path breaking account work-related research has undergone two significant changes. First, the job model-based approach is now being used to examine the workplace experiences of both women and men. Second, while the gender-model is still more likely to be used to understand women's work experiences, in recent years we have seen more studies that use the integrated model to compare and contrast women's and men's workplace experiences.

³ Feldberg and Glenn (1979, p. 527) assert that the "job model" examines occupational socialization, class/status of occupation, social relations at work.

As I discuss later, my research applies an integrated model to examining the satisfaction of women and men faculty with work-life policies. However, before I review the integrated approach, I first discuss studies of faculty experiences that fall under the job-model⁴ and the gender-model approaches to understanding the experiences of women faculty.

Studies Using Job Model

Academic workplace and women only studies. Many earlier studies examining women faculty point to the nature of their professional activities and mentoring networks (e.g. Cawyer, Simonds & Davis 2002; Chandler 1996; Dodds 2005; Ropers-Huilman 2006). For example, women are often asked to serve on committees and commissions dealing with gender and minority issues. Although participating in such endeavors may benefit women faculty by exposing them to the operation of academic settings, it takes away from other career aspects such as research and teaching (Bird, Litt, & Wang, 2004). Moreover, while men and women start out with a similar rank and pay (Valian, 2005), women's service contributions tend to be undervalued, influencing subsequent pay and position disparities (Barbezat & Hughes, 2005).

The gendering of professional activities is sometimes attributed to the fact that women and men may not have the same professional mentoring experiences. In particular, women appear to be disadvantaged in finding mentors that are like them (Chandler, 1996). As a result, many women who do have mentors report being mentored by both women and men (Dodds, 2005). In this context, women who report participating in several mentoring relationships appear to have better access to research networks (Ropers-Huilman, 2006) and receive more assistance in learning the written and unwritten rules governing the faculty position than women who report

⁴ Here, the job model refers to studies that focus, for instance, on examining the socialization process for faculty. It is important to note that this model does not take into consideration how paid-work/family management issues can influence workplace experiences.

participating in fewer mentoring activities. Also, the mentoring relationships provide social support as well as teaching moments (Cawyer, Simonds, & Davis 2002). These teaching moments concern balancing academic roles as professor and researcher, and/or providing important insights into the history of the department and university. When women do not have access to these relationships to the same extent as men do, they are likely to experience social isolation.

Although these studies of women's experiences in the academic workplace provide important insights, the one shortcoming is that they include women only. As a result, they do not provide a direct comparison between women and men faculty experiences. The second shortcoming is the tendency to ignore the public-private interaction concerning labor, and how this can influence experiences within the workplace.

Academic workplace and women and men (without race comparison) studies. The research included in this section addresses problems inherent in women-only studies by including samples of both women and men faculty members. These studies provide an insight into the actual gender differences in how women and men experience various aspects of faculty life.

For instance, in their climate study, Bronstein and Farnsworth (1998) found that women experienced more disadvantages than their male counterparts. Specifically, women respondents reported more demeaning and intimidating behaviors from colleagues. Both women and men reported experiencing little support from the department; however, men reported being able to rely on mentors for assistance. The findings also suggest women's "exclusion from departmental political matters, and input into processes that can improve their situation, such as faculty

searches” (p. 574). Bronstein and Farnsworth (1998) conclude that the lack of support from the department was more detrimental to women in relation to career success.

Gender differences in self-confidence can also be a factor in career progression. Vasil (1996) focused on self-efficacy beliefs, which she defined as people’s own confidence in their ability “to perform successfully a given behavior” (p. 104). Based on 199 responses from men and 200 responses from women, Vasil (1996) found men academics reporting significantly stronger self-efficacy beliefs for social process skills than their female counterparts. Importantly, Vasil (1996) also found significant gender differences with regard to the influence of self-efficacy on research productivity specifically regarding self-promotion skills. Further, women reported feeling less confident than men in situations involving politics and they also felt a lack of power in shaping the written and unwritten rules governing the academic work-related activities. Vasil (1996) concludes that perceptions of self-efficacy do not develop in a vacuum but rather are influenced by experiences within the academy. Although Vasil’s (1996) study compares women and men faculty, her research focuses on work-related factors underlying faculty attrition. Therefore, her study remains limited by the shortcomings of the job-model approach.

The National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) has been used by various researchers following the job-model approach in examining issues regarding the academic work-related activities. Barbezat and Hughes (2005) use this secondary data set to examine the gender pay gap in academia. While my study does not address pay gap issues, their results suggest that institutional type is related to gender differences with regard to productivity. Specifically, Barbezat and Hughes (2005) find, “[. . .] women at research institutions have larger deficits in observable productive

characteristics relative to men when compared to the other types of institutions” (p. 638).⁵ The inferences that can be made from these findings are that the experiences of women differ from those of men, and there are factors existing at research institutions that contribute to the observable productivity differences between women and men.⁶

Gender career differences within the job-model approach are also examined by West and Curtis (2007). Using data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) survey, West and Curtis (2007) find women faculty were less likely than men to hold full-time positions, and when women did occupy full-time positions they were underrepresented in tenure track positions. Also, women did not attain senior faculty status at the same rate as men. Again, the empirical evidence suggests that women and men do not experience the academy the same way.

Using the 1999 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF), Toutkoushian and Conley (2005) find that men are more likely to be employed at a Research I or II institutions, have more work experience, more research publications, and hold full professor rank. Additionally, Toutkoushian and Conley (2005) noted that women are clustered around the assistant professor rank, and have a greater representation at Masters I or II institutions. Important to my study, compared with their female counterparts, junior male faculty are more likely to experience mentoring by a senior faculty member and have more publications. This idea supports the premise that departmental level experiences create institutional disparities.

⁵ In this study, refereed articles, non-refereed articles, chapters/review, texts/monographs, and other publications were used to measure productivity.

⁶ Barbezat and Hughes found that male-female gap in observed productive characteristics was larger at research institutions compared to liberal arts and master’s level institutions.

Studies classified under the “job model” approach to examining workplace differences between women and men faculty address specific concerns regarding socialization, departmental support, and mentoring. Family management concerns were not discussed in this section of the literature and not included as a factor in analyses of career differences. The next section explores how studies using the “gender model” examine the nature of unpaid work.

Research Using the Gender Model

The “gender model” supposes that care work is mainly a woman’s issue. That is, any work difficulties are tied to her care work responsibilities. Many individuals with family management concerns rarely use family policies. The lack of use can be related to the premise that these policies were created only to assist working women. The fallacy in applying this model to studying women and care work is that men’s experiences are neglected. The following studies conceptualize care work as being directly related to career differences between women and men faculty.

Faculty paid work/family management: women only studies. Probert (2005) addresses the question of male advantage in the academy in the context of human capital differences. Specifically, after reviewing survey data and conducting focus groups with women faculty, Probert (2005) asserts that gender differences in career outcomes are linked to the way households organize the division between paid and unpaid work rather than to the occupational structures in the academy hindering women. While Probert’s (2005) study suggests that differences start with the issue of the division of labor in the household, she neglects to address how division of labor spills over into the academic work environment and affects organizational experiences. Further, this study does not include focus groups with male faculty and fails to address race/ethnic differences.

The flexible nature of the academic work-related activities and how academic work integrates with family life is one of four themes formulated by Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2004). Interviewing 29 junior women faculty from research extensive universities, Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2004) confirm that the majority of women in their study were responsible for taking care of the children and housework. While respondents reported experiencing joy in their professional roles, they also talked about a need to watch the biological clock. Specifically, these women talked about planning the tenure process to allow the time to have children. The Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2004) study is relevant to my research in that they included female faculty from research extensive institutions. However, I will expand their women-only, gender-model approach and theoretical framework to include white men, African American women and men as well as eldercare issues.

Messages that are passed down through the organizational socialization process, especially messages regarding when women should have children, can potentially affect family-forming patterns. In a qualitative study using the gender-model approach and involving in-depth interviews with 19 women faculty at different career stages, Armenti (2004) explores their career decisions. Three findings emerge from the interviews. First, taking time off from work for childbirth and childcare can be harmful to career progression. Second, if family leave or tenure clock related-benefits are offered by institutions, female faculty fear using these benefits because they may be “perceived as having a lesser commitment to their careers and a greater commitment to their children” (Armenti, 2004, p. 228). Third, having children before tenure can reduce the likelihood of being awarded tenure. Armenti (2004) concludes that the institutional structure of research universities leads to women’s experiences of marginality “primarily as a result of having to conform to the male model of life in academy, which can be defined as devoting most

of one's time to her or his career and pursuing work-related activities unencumbered by family commitments" (p. 228).

In all, studies using the gender model take into account gender role socialization regarding the division of household labor. Public-private interactions regarding caregiving labor are seen as more of an issue for women than for men. Siltanen and Stanworth (1984), assert that only examining women's, not men's, experiences in relation to "family and personal life" (p. 97) leads to a failure in representing the full extent of how paid work/family management concerns affect all. The shortcomings of studies relying on the gender model are addressed by the socialist-feminist theory and research that uses the integrated model to studying women's and men's job experiences.

Socialist Feminist Theory

The main theoretical foundation of socialist feminism comes from Marxist feminism. In the early versions of Marxist feminism, the cause for gender oppression is directly linked to the issue of class. Specifically, men protect their position within the capitalist system through the oppression of women so that they maintain or make gains in class. Acker (1999) theorized that, in examining class issues, the ideal worker was based on men's work, completely ignoring women's experiences of paid and unpaid labor. By "focusing on economic relations between capitalist and worker at the most abstract level, Marxist feminists derived class from these relations, as well as class positions and class boundaries" (Acker, 1999, p. 46). Acker (1999) further asserts:

In the political economy of housework debate, theorists argued that unpaid housework creates value by reproducing the labor power of works in both present and future generations, and that this value is appropriated by capitalists. Thus, women's work contributes to surplus value and profit (pp. 46-47).

Socialist feminists expanded this view by asserting that class, race, and gender create an interrelated influence on women's oppression (Holvino, 2008). The idea that women take on multiple roles, such as caretakers within the private sphere of family is central to socialist feminism.

Guiding explanatory factors. Because there are various theoretical considerations within the socialist feminist literature, I utilize Sokoloff's (1988) two statements that are relevant to this project to summarize the socialist feminist approach to women and work in a patriarchal capitalist society. First, socialist feminists believe women's domestic labor is essential to capitalism and beneficial to men as a group. That is, the work of caregiving responsibilities specific to running domestic operations is relegated to women in the household. Second, all forms of reproduction are central to the socialist feminist analysis of wage labor:

Not only do women cook, clean, mend clothes, shop, make doctors' appointments, build egos, bear children, nurture, and so forth in the home for no pay; there are also paid to sew, clean, type, nurture, build egos, give affection, make coffee, protect bosses, provide sexual services, nurse, and teach in the market (Sokoloff, 1988, p. 128).

Hence, women, because of gender-specific responsibilities, are assigned household production and upkeep. In addition, as a result of a gender spill-over effect women are also expected to perform gender specific paid-work tasks. The relegation of women to nurturing tasks perpetuates the private sphere of care work in the public sphere of labor. The premise that both women and men experience work-family interactions while women continue to be responsible for unpaid domestic labor and child care, underlies the studies that compare women's and men's experiences in negotiating the academic workplace and the issues regarding balancing family as well.

Using data from the 1996 University of Michigan's Faculty Work-Life Questionnaire, August (2005) examined if women have a higher rate of retention as compared to men. Further, August (2005) investigated what constructs contribute to departure, in addition to analyzing these differences by academic rank. Important to my study, August (2005) suggested that by examining women only, we can provide insight into women's experiences. However, we cannot show whether and how their experiences differ from men's. She found that the rate of attrition is higher for women than for men, but both men and women were more likely to leave due to not experiencing a satisfactory balance between their work and personal lives. In addition, August (2005) found that other factors also contributed to faculty thoughts about leaving the academy. These factors included belief that their career progress was hindered by organizational barriers, such as perceived high workload, level of departmental influence, and not feeling valued as a scholar. Accounting for gender, organizational experiences— not feeling valued or accepted by peers—and exclusion from opportunities to collaborate with other departmental faculty members were more important for women's than for men's willingness to leave the academy. August (2005) concluded that departmental experiences, such as clear communication of expectations from the chair, collaborative opportunities for research and publication, and acceptance by one's peers, influence faculty decisions to stay.

Because my study specifically examined faculty satisfaction with policies regarding the balance of paid employment-related activities and care-giving responsibilities, Lease's (1999) study on work-related stress is also relevant. While the majority of climate studies report gender differences in faculty experiences, this study did not affirm the prevailing supposition that work-related stress impedes the academic career and could be considered an outlier when compared to other studies. Examining the experiences of tenure-track faculty at three universities within the

Southern region of the United States, Lease (1999) found no significant differences in the amount of support men and women faculty reported receiving. Although women faculty report having more responsibilities at home than men, Lease (1999) does not detect any significant differences hindering women in the pursuit of an academic career. Further, Lease (1999) concludes the results do not suggest the need for interventions assisting faculty in balancing the academic work-related activities. However, it is important to note that Lease (1999) reported that the divergent findings could be attributed to employing a different measurement construct in addition to utilizing self-reported data.

Faculty paid work/family management. Colbeck (2006) explored the issue of work-family integration through interviewing and conducting observations of 13 faculty members (seven women and six men) in various ranks and disciplines. According to Colbeck (2006), because of the fluid nature of the work environment, work and family roles are not mutually exclusive. Specifically, some faculty members integrate work and family roles by simultaneously engaging in one activity that meets both types of goals. For example, one faculty member in this study reports discussing research over lunch with her husband who is also in the same field. Others multi-task, often completing employment-related tasks while completing personal role obligations. Another multitasking example cited is reading papers while attending a child's practice session. With regard to gender differences, Colbeck (2006) suggests that men participants spend slightly more time on work and less on family activities than the women participants. Women respondents also reported that their time allotment was ideal whereas men stated they wanted to spend less time on work. Overall, Colbeck (2006) notes that neither higher education research nor the faculty members themselves realize the extent of the "boundary blurring," i.e., the integration and/or flexibility between the work and family roles.

Given this, Colbeck's (2006) study presents valuable information concerning the issue of role integration. Specifically most instances of this blurring are not noticed by those integrating both academic work and family management responsibilities.

Mason and Goulden's (2002, 2004a and 2004b) research concerning the issue of balancing work and family responsibilities uses the Survey of Doctorate Recipients (SDR) (NSF 2004) and the University of California Work and Family Survey which includes survey responses of 4,459 UC system faculty. In the first of the three studies, Mason, and Goulden (2002) explore "if babies matter" with regard to the academic career progression. Based on their analysis of the SDR, Mason and Goulden (2004) conclude men are more likely to achieve tenure than women if they have "children younger than six [...] at the time of career formation" (p. 89).

Next, using data from the SDR and the UC faculty survey, Mason and Goulden (2004a; 2004b) formulated two concerns regarding gender and family formation. First, one in three women, who take the tenure-track position before having a child, will become a mother. Second, women who achieve tenure are more than twice as likely as their male counterparts to be single 12 years after earning a Ph.D. More alarming were gender differences in the reported hours spent on caregiving, housework, and professional responsibilities. Women faculty with children reported spending approximately 101 hours per week on these activities; whereas men with children reported that they spent 88 hours per week (Mason & Goulden, 2004b, p.98). Mason and Goulden (2004b) concluded, "caregiving activities take up a substantial portion of the time that women faculty with children devote to these activities, 35 percent of total hours, possibility to the detriment of their professional careers..."(p. 98).

Using data from the 1995 Survey of Doctoral Recipients, Stack (2004) examined the relationship between gender and productivity and the influence of children on faculty

productivity. While findings from Stack's (2004) study suggest that children are not a strong predictor of productivity, there is a gendered pattern of productivity (p. 891). Specifically, women with young children tend to have a lower level of productivity compared to men. At the same time, Stack (2004) noted that the number of hours worked is a stronger predictor of productivity than "having children". In interpreting the findings, Stack (2004) reiterates that women are still expected to be primary care-givers, which means that they may tend to "subordinate their paid work role to that of the care giver" (p. 915). "The findings reported here indicate that women with young children are at a disadvantage. The productivity of such women may suffer from a handicap due to child care responsibilities" (Stack, 2004, p. 916).

Exploring family-related "pull factors," such as marriage, children, and aging parents, Hagedorn and Sax (2003) ask if these factors influence overall faculty job satisfaction. Using data from the 1995-1996 Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey, they found several differences in how women and men experience pull factors and career, with women faculty report being more stressed, less satisfied and more likely to interrupt their career in comparison to men. Specifically, four percent of men reported interrupting career for health or family reasons while 25% women have reported such interruptions. The researchers conclude, "[. . .] it appears that the stressful journey to tenure may be especially rocky for women. Juggling multiple responsibilities at home and on the job may be especially taxing on the group" (Hagedorn and Sax, 2003, p. 74).

Using data from the 1998-1999 HERI Faculty Survey, Sax, Hagedorn, Arredondo, and Dicriss III (2002) examined if marriage, children, aging parents, and other faculty-related factors influence research productivity. Contrary to the majority of research regarding paid-work/family management concerns the findings suggest that family constraints do not predict faculty research

productivity. The authors note that “while our findings characterize many faculty women as overextended, managing to balance the demands of home, children, and a productive academic career, this study suggests that family-related factors do not interfere with scholarly productivity” (Sax et al, p. 438). While my study does not focus on productivity, this study remains relevant because it suggests that the work-family policies are important in terms of faculty ability to balance their work-family responsibilities.

Jacobs and Winslow (2004) used the 1998 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty to examine the faculty work week. Faculty that worked longer hours were less satisfied with their career. However the researchers found that the longer work week contributed to more publishing. Additionally, marital status affects men’s career dissatisfaction. For example, men who have wives that stay at home are more satisfied than men whose wives work for pay outside the home. Moreover, men whose wives are also faculty members report a higher level of dissatisfaction because both are working long work weeks. Interestingly, Jacobs and Winslow (2004) found little marital effect for married women. They attributed this finding to the scarcity of unemployed husbands represented in the data. However, they also noted:

the lack of an effect of marital and parental status appears to be due to a combination of the facts that questions did not elicit information about overall stress levels and that professors in these roles reduce the hours they devote to their academic work, especially by cutting back once they reach sixty hours per week (Jacobs & Winslow, 2004, p.124).

Overall, the findings seem to suggest that success in the academic career is related to being able to work a sixty-hour-per-week schedule.

Using the 1993 NSOPF data, Perna (2001) researched the relationship between family responsibilities and employment status of college and university faculty. In this study, Perna (2001) found women were more likely to hold full-time, non-tenured positions relative to men.

Also, while men seem to benefit from marriage, women are disadvantaged by marital and parental status. According to Perna (2001), sex differences continue to exist in employment status after controlling for race, family responsibilities, human capital and structural characteristics.⁷

In a more recent study, Perna (2005) continued to examine the issue of how family ties affect (marital and parental status) tenure and promotion. Perna (2005) noted that women, in general, are more than likely than men to have never been married, be separated, divorced, or widowed. Given this finding, Perna (2005) suggested that individual campuses and departments should examine the extent to which existing policies, practices, and cultural norms support the ability of women and men faculty to assume and manage family ties.

Perna (2005) highlighted departmental influence over how a faculty member manages balancing work and family responsibilities. A department's formal and informal implementation of policy (Allen, 1998; Bird, 2010; Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998) can determine a faculty member's success in managing both academic work and caregiving concerns. Bird (2010) asserted that, "academic departments establish norms of appropriate faculty performance in teaching, research and departmental service. Faculty members commonly create their own departmental governance structures and play central roles in hiring new faculty and determining curricula" (p.4). The ability to create departmental practices cause disjunctures (p. 6) between what may be formal university policy and informal departmental practices. Bird (2010) discussed the specific concerns related to using formal university policies governing work-life

⁷ While Perna's (2001) research on the relationship between family responsibilities and employment status among college and university faculty includes race in the analysis, she uses it only as a control variable. Because race is not central to the analysis, I excluded this study from the intersectional studies.

balance practices. While the university may create avenues to allow faculty to perform care work, the “informal departmental norms and practices” (p. 7) may impede the ability to use such policies. Bronstein and Farnsworth (1998) also suggested that the academic workplace climate is determined by how the department operates both formally and informally, which influences faculty satisfaction and career trajectories. Despite the importance of academic departments in faculty lives, Allen (1998) concludes that academic workplace studies neglect to consider how the department influences career success. Building on Allen’s (1998) concern and Bird’s (2010) insight, the current study examines whether faculty job satisfaction is influenced more by departmental or university support for family-workplace balance.

Overall, in most instances, the working mother is usually the target of research. By examining the issue of work/family management, the issue of giving birth and taking care of younger aged children dominate the literature for these women. Racial/ethnic differences among caregivers have received limited attention as well (Neal, Chapman, Ingersoll-Dayton, & Emlen, 1993). Departmental influences on faculty careers have been discussed by some researchers (Allen, 1998; August 2005; Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998; Probert, 2005), but the results are mixed and the importance of university versus departmental support for family-work balance has not been explored. Equally important, studies related to the interaction of gender and race in the lives of African American faculty are missing from the literature in relation to work/family management. In fact, many of the studies reviewed thus far control for race, but do not consider individuals occupying multiple social locations.

Intersectionality Theory

Holvino (2008) contended, “when studying the intersections of race, gender, and class and organizations from a socialist feminist framework, we must ask the questions such as, ‘who

cleans for the cleaning lady who cleans for the managerial women and how did it come to be that way?” (p.11). This premise supports the subsequent theoretical perspective guiding my project: intersectionality theory.

Hancock (2007) asserted the term “intersectionality” refers to both theory and approach to conducting research. Specifically, research that “emphasizes the interaction of categories of difference (including but not limited to race, gender, class, and sexual orientation)” (p. 64).

Collins (1999) further explains the connection between oppression and institutions, “the construct of intersectionality references two types of relationships: the interconnectedness of ideas and the social structures in which they occur, and the intersecting hierarchies of gender, race, economic class, sexuality, and ethnicity” (p. 263). Thus, the intersection of gender, race, and class is integral in examining the experiences of diverse faculty members negotiating paid-work/family management issues.

Historical context. The theory of intersectionality grew out of the work of Black feminists whose ideas allowed for an expansion of feminist thought. The experiences of African American women were at the center of analyses (Brewer, 1993). The problem of only examining gender as an exclusive category is that the analysis marginalizes women and men who are multiply burdened (Crenshaw, 2000). Landry emphasized, “just as we interact with one another as members of a particular race, gender, and class, so do the systems of racism, patriarchy, and capitalism in tandem” (2007, p. 2).

Guiding assumptions. Landry (2007) summarized two main intersectional assumptions, which guides my intersectional analysis.

Simultaneity. Individuals do not experience race and gender as separate entities. Specifically, as stated by Zinn and Dill (1996; as quoted in Landry 2007):

People experience race, class, gender, and sexuality differently depending upon their social location in the structures of race, gender, and sexuality. For example, people of the same race will experience race differently depending upon their location in the class structure as working class, professional managerial class, or unemployed; in the gender structure as female or male; and in structures of sexuality as heterosexual, homosexual, or bisexual (p.11).

Multiplicative experiences. Landry (2007) builds on Zill and Dill's (1996)

multiracial feminist "manifesto" to define the second intersectional assumption stating that race, class, and gender are embedded together and operate together to produce social experiences. As Zinn and Dill (1996; as quoted in Landry 2007) initially outline:

Multiracial feminism emphasizes the intersectional nature of hierarchies at all levels of social life. Class, race, gender, and sexuality are components of both social structure and social interaction. Women and men are differently embedded in locations created by these cross-cutting hierarchies. As a result, women and men throughout the social order experience different forms of privilege and subordination, depending on their race, class, gender, and sexuality. In other words, intersecting forms of domination produce both oppression and opportunity (p.12).

The concern surrounding much of the inequality research in the United States is that when race or gender are examined, the research examines only the context of white women or Black men (Brewer, 1993).

Empirical studies reviewed in this section also illustrate intersectional assumptions. African American professors have to negotiate issues surrounding race and gender. While African American women lack social connections and experience more service work with students (Cooper, 2006; Gregory, 1999; Guillory, 2003), African American men contend with specific racial and gender stereotyping from students and fellow faculty members (Guidry, 2006). Reports of having research validated by a white colleague to having more service-related hours are reported by many experiencing what they deem as a "hostile environment" (Guidry, 2006).

Guidry (2006) shared his experience as a tenured African American man working at a predominately white institution (PWI). Guidry (2006) noted he was not at an advantage because of his gender because it is not a singular experience. He experienced his race along with his gender, and the unique social location he holds shaped his experiences. While he might not have the same experiences of an African American man in a “blue-collar” position, he still experienced discrimination. The absence of examining race, in addition to balancing paid-work and family, supports the notion that mostly white experiences are explored in examining balance issues.

Academic workplace: African American women only studies. Similar to white women, African American women faculty also experience unequal socialization, expectations, and reward systems. Additionally, the intersections of racism and sexism create unique aspects of African American women’s experiences, including isolation and invisibility. Moreover, African American women often navigate a racist and sexist environment where they are not privy to the “unwritten rules” necessary for professional success.

For instance, Hendricks (1996) investigated the experiences of African American women faculty at major research universities. Based on survey responses from approximately 300 African American women faculty, Hendricks (1996) concluded that 1) mentors and role models play an important role in professional success, and 2) some African American women faculty do not have the knowledge of how to successfully engage their professional roles. Specifically, some African American women faculty in Hendricks’s (1996) study were unaware of how to appropriately distribute their time and efforts on research, teaching, and institutional service. Hendricks (1996) attributed this to the lack of formal mentoring ties. The respondents also reported critical career experiences, such as having to work twice as hard because of race and

gender. Furthermore, one respondent mentioned receiving an average evaluation for performance that she perceived as being identical to that of a white male colleague who received an honor evaluation. The respondents also identified the institutional structures, such as the financial resource-appropriation process, as a barrier to success. Specifically, many of the African American women faculty in this study cited the lack of research support funds as a hindrance to their academic success.

Social isolation has been reported as having an important effect on African American women's faculty careers, including personal career satisfaction and productivity. The research on academic identities, institutional location, and professional satisfaction of African American women faculty conducted by Guillory (2003) provides an insight into isolation. Guillory (2003) interviewed 40 African American women faculty of different ages, ranks, disciplines, and employed at various academic institutions. She finds that working in a supportive professional environment increases professional satisfaction. Although Guillory's (2003) main objective was to examine the effects of professional identity and institutional location on professional satisfaction, she also provided details of African American women faculty experiences regarding the academic work-related activities.

Specifically, both teaching-oriented academics and research-oriented academics experience social isolation based on being one of the few African American women professors within the department. The respondents noted being inundated with mentoring responsibilities for students of color because of the lack of African American faculty. They also discuss their invisibility within the academy due to racism and sexism that they experience as African American women faculty. In this regard, one of Guillory's (2003) respondents observed that if a

white man and an African American woman were working on the same project, the white man was more likely to receive recognition from it than the African American woman.

Although African American women faculty work in environments that isolate them and ignore their research contributions, Gregory (1999) found that tenure status was the primary factor influencing whether these women stayed within the academy. Gregory's (1999) research was supported by surveying the 384 members of the Association of Black Women in Higher Education. Based on 182 responses, Gregory (1999) concluded that African American women faculty reported they were more likely to have extra committee service, a higher teaching load, and be less engaged in research activities. Further, African American women reported not being included in research networks, which excluded them from activities contributing to mobility and enhancing their academic reputation.

Gregory (1999) also noted that the respondents identify personal and family responsibilities as being the greatest obstacles for career success. In addition, Gregory (1999) reported some related issues “[. . .] such as child or spouse not wanting to relocate, personal interests, not wanting to leave older parents or relatives, lack of financial and household support, and the inability to accept added responsibility due to multiple role sets” (p. 92) as other barriers specifically related to family balance issues. In all, Gregory (1999) concluded that African American women faculty who achieve tenure status despite these barriers expresses significant job satisfaction.

Yet, as the studies reviewed in this section suggest, for African American women faculty, getting tenure is an arduous task. In this context, Cooper's (2006) study is especially informative. Specifically, based on interviews with nine African American women faculty, Cooper (2006) constructed a narrative detailing how they successfully negotiated the tenure

process. Cooper (2006) affirmed previous findings that African American women faculty report experiences of invisibility and isolation. The participants also reported being asked to perform more institutional service (i.e. serve on more committees) than their white peers, and are also expected to be the ““minority faculty role model”” (p. 29). As a result, they often mentor both majority and minority students at a higher rate than their white and male counterparts. Cooper (2006) asserted that African American women were the least satisfied with work-related activities.

Although the four studies discussed here focus on different aspects of African American women faculty experiences, they all emphasize how these experiences are shaped by racism as well as sexism within the academy. In all, African American women faculty experience unequal recognition for projects comparable to their peers (Guillory, 2003; Hendricks, 1996). African American women faculty reported mentoring and advising more students than their counterparts due to the lack of representation within the faculty ranks (Cooper, 2006; Gregory 1999). And, the probability of finding a mentor of the same race and gender is low, and informal information about the “unwritten rules” to succeeding in the academy does not get passed down (Cooper, 2006; Hendricks, 1996).

Academic workplace: African American men only studies. The volume of studies specifically addressing how African American men faculty experience the academic work-related activities is minimal. I examine two articles:⁸ one is an autobiographical narrative and the second is a program evaluation. The findings seem to support that mentoring is significant in successfully navigating the complexities of the academic work-related activities.

⁸ Due to the specific search terms used to generate studies for review and a limited time period, I only received two articles concerning African American men and academic work-related activities.

First, Guidry (2006) described challenges he faced as an African American man in a faculty position at a predominately white research university. His autobiographical narrative detailed how he contended with racial and gender stereotyping not only from students but also from fellow faculty members. Further, Guidry exposed the experience of racism from students, specifically in the course evaluation process, but also with the prevalence of the “privilege of white male scholarship” (p. 169). He related his experiences to the broader institutional culture, and suggested that “[. . .] faculty of color must be trained to deal with racism that they will inevitably face at a majority institution” (p. 170). Specifically, a faculty member of color at a predominately white institution will deal with racism not only in the context of the classroom but also within the structural characteristics of the institution.

Heggins (2004) expanded on the importance of mentoring in his program evaluation examining the effectiveness of a program designed to address the issues and challenges of preparing African American men for the faculty position. Based on the findings,⁹ he contended that the socialization process for new faculty communicates what is expected in relation to research and teaching, but that the mentoring relationship with a senior faculty member was critical in shaping their academic identity. Further, Heggins (2004) asserted that by establishing a relationship with a senior faculty, African American men could increase professional development and expand awareness of the academic culture.

Both studies suggest that having a mentor is vital, and can assist African American men in navigating a hostile environment. The findings also support conclusions from other studies reviewed in that mentoring relationships for junior faculty affect retention and tenure rates

⁹ through semi-structured interviews with six African American men Ph.D. candidates at different institution types

(Clark, S.M., & Corcoran, M., 1986; Cooper, 2006; Glazer-Raymo, J. 1999; Johnson-Bailey and Cervero, 2004). There is little known about how African American men negotiate work and family balance issues. Additionally, African American men's policy needs in how they manage care work are not represented in the literature.

Academic workplace: women and men (with race comparison) studies. Systematic disadvantages become more evident when researchers employ methods examining the simultaneous experience of race and gender. The literature included in this section consists of studies that not only examine race and gender, but also studies that examine how simultaneously experiencing race and gender affects one's academic career.

The mentoring relationship chronicled in personal narratives of a mentor/mentee faculty pair provides an example of how a cross-cultural relationship within the academy can assist in navigating what Johnson-Bailey and Cervero (2004) describe as a labyrinth. This labyrinth is “[. . .] a hostile and unaccepting environment for many minority faculty” (p. 14). One example of the hostility Johnson-Bailey and Cervero (2004) discussed pertains to minority faculty and research agendas. They reported that if a minority faculty member has race and or gender as a research agenda item, usually a majority faculty member's support is needed for its validation as academically relevant research. An unequal value assigned to and the scrutiny over research agendas focused on race and gender can cause minority faculty members to experience general opposition for advancement within the academy.

The academic organizational experience can differ due to a person's social location, and the findings from a survey of three private institutions and three public institutions infer that the academic work-related activities favors whites over non-whites, and that African Americans were more likely to work at less prestigious institutions. Allen, Epps, Guillory, Suh, and

Bonous-Hammarth (2000) established that African American faculty are systematically disadvantaged compared to whites, and elite racism within the academy creates this environment. While some studies report minority faculty spend more time on administrative tasks and committee work, Allen et al. (2000) found no statistically significant differences in service hours between races.

However, they note differences related to the nature of service work. More African American women and men and white women report serving on committees strictly related to diversity issues. Further, informal counseling responsibilities with students were more overwhelming for African American women and men. With issues of progressing at a research institution, white men had the advantage in research-time commitments and research productivity, having half a day or more per week to devote to the aforementioned activities. However in reporting the number of articles published, African American women had the highest percentage (50%) of respondents reporting publishing five or more articles. Still, the findings suggest that the variances in work-related activities experiences are embedded in institutional context and the academy's cultural expectations. There seems to be different patterns in the organizational experiences for faculty members that differ by race and gender.

Smith and Calasanti (2005) surveyed full-time, tenure-track university faculty at five public, doctoral granting universities in a state located in the mid-Atlantic region. Although the response rate was low, 29%, Smith and Calasanti (2005) were able to conclude that Asian-Americans felt more institutionally isolated than whites. When examining race and gender interactions, Asian-American women experienced the most institutional isolation, but African American women experienced greater social isolation. For men, all reported more social isolation, as well as more institutional isolation, than white men. However, on average, women

reported more isolation than men. This can be indicative of how “organizations tend to base policies and expectations on the experiences of white men who set up procedures policies and the like that ‘make sense’ to them” (p. 324). Smith and Calasanti (2005) discussed the inconclusiveness of their study stating, “While our data are not conclusive, they reinforce the importance that we not assume that either gender or race is most important or only have additive effects” (p.328). The salient contribution of this study relevant to my research design is that Smith and Calasanti (2005) explored differences as well as similarities among racial and ethnic groups and by gender.

Finally, Allen’s (1998) examination of ethnic and gender differences within faculty workload and productivity provides further support for my study in that Allen (1998) stated that the extant literature neglects, “[. . .] the interactions between external constituencies and internal bureaucracies and academic communities” (p. 26). Yet, to truly examine racialized and gendered academic careers, the departmental influences should not be glossed over, especially because the differences are shaped by the institutional characteristics of university settings: “Understanding the structure and dynamics of career patterns require scientific knowledge of the operation of academic institutions and their components” (p. 26).¹⁰ Specifically, Allen (1998) maintained that research should consider how the institutional patterns, including structural dynamics of “informal norms, social capital, or cultural stimuli” (p. 37), influence the organizational experience. Although my study does not directly address issues raised by Allen (1998), it attends to the importance of contextual/institutional factors by examining if faculty satisfaction with family-work balance is influenced more by the university or departmental support for

¹⁰ Given the importance of institutional characteristics, in my study I control for institutional type via the study design. Specifically, I am examining the faculty experience at land-grant research universities only.

balancing work and family responsibilities. Also, building on Allen's (1998) ideas, as well as other studies exploring gender and racial/ethnic differences, I ask if for faculty occupying intersectional locations differences exist regarding the perceived importance of family policies for career success, the perceived effectiveness of family policies at the institution, and the level of satisfaction with work-family balance.

Public-private interactions within the academic workplace emerge in this section of literature. This structural context creates differing experiences for African American women, African American men, and white women as compared to white men. Moreover, the differing experiences spill over into care work, especially regarding elder care.

With the accelerating growth of the older population in the United States, the Agency on Aging reports that "65 and over population will increase from 35 million to 40 million in 2010 (a 15% increase) and then to 55 million in 2020 (a 36% increase for that decade)" (U.S. Department on Health and Human Services, 2011, p. 1). Walker (2008) posited the aging population will create new challenges because the baby boomers are expected to live longer, spend more years in retirement, and incur higher medical bills than the previous two generations. At the same time, eldercare benefits have failed to keep pace with other employee assistance programs because little is known about the policy needs central to this issue (Shoptaugh, Phelps, & Visio, 2004).

The studies reviewed specific to eldercare concerns provide insights into this emerging area of interest as well as into the interactions of gender and race/ethnicity. First, researchers note that eldercare responsibilities tend to be gender specific (Finley, 1989; Gopalan & Brannon, 2006; Grundy & Henretta, 2006; Rosenthal, Martin-Matthews, & Keefe, 2007; Starrels, Ingersoll-Dayton, Dowler, & Neal, 1997). Women are more likely to provide direct care services to their elder parents with activities such as bathing, dressing, and preparing meals.

Men are more likely to engage in activities related to managing the care indirectly by dealing with financial concerns and supervising hired assistants (Finley, 1989; Gopalan & Brannon, 2006; Rosenthal, Martin-Matthews, & Keefe, 2007). Thus, women experience elder care differently than men do because of the differing roles (Raschick & Ingersoll-Dayton, 2004). At the same time, how African American women and men navigate gender-based division of labor, including the caring for elders, may differ from how whites traditionally divide household labor and/or engage in eldercare.

For instance, Dilworth-Anderson et al. (2005) noted that while generally African American families are more egalitarian and flexible in gender/family roles than white families, because of social class differences, not all African American families can adhere to socialized cultural values. Individuals with more financial resources may be more flexible in meeting a parent's need (Rosenthal, Martin-Matthews, & Keefe, 2007). Although the social class position of the academic faculty would not necessarily limit the ability of African American faculty members to meet their parents' needs other factors may come into play. Turner, Wallace, Anderson, and Bird (2004) found that, because of racism and discrimination, racial/ethnic minorities tend to have an inherent distrust of hospitals and nursing homes. In this context, family and church are the two sources of eldercare being used within the African American community (Chadiha, Rafferty, & Pickard, 2003; Turner et al., 2004).

The academic worklife is one that is arranged based on contractual requirements, department chair expectations, and one's personal research agenda. In this instance of balancing care work, department chairs and deans should be cognizant of the specific needs of individual faculty members. However, in many instances, the policy options for faculty are limited or

dictated by the faculty member's department chair. The hypotheses developed as a result of this literature review are outlined in the section below.

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are proposed regarding the differences in the faculty assessment of the importance of family policies for career success, the effectiveness of these policies at their institutions, and the overall faculty satisfaction with work-life balance:

Hypotheses Related to Question One.

- i. African American women tenure track faculty members will rate policy importance higher than other tenure track faculty members.
- ii. White men tenure track faculty members will rate policy effectiveness higher than other tenure track faculty members.
- iii. White men tenure track faculty members will have a higher level of satisfaction with work-life balance than other tenure track faculty members.

The hypotheses are constructed from previous findings suggesting women experience disadvantage in the academic workplace (Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998; West & Curtis, 2007). Moreover these findings also suggest that African American women need additional assistance in navigating the workplace due to overt sexism and racism within the academy (Guillory, 2003; Hendricks, 1996). Policy use can be limited due to the lack of mentors in addition to the lack of informal departmental knowledge for both white and African American women (Chandler, 1996; Cooper, 2006; Dodd, 2005). Last, men are more likely to be satisfied with balancing both work and personal obligations (Hagedorn & Sax, 2003; Jacobs & Winslow, 2004). Additionally, the hypotheses contribute the body of literature examining race and gender simultaneously, and provides additional information related to how individuals experience the academic work life.

Hypotheses Related to Question Two.

- i. Highly paid white men will have higher levels of overall satisfaction.
- ii. Faculty satisfied with departmental support for family responsibilities will have higher levels of overall satisfaction.

The first hypothesis is based on the premise that white men are better able to negotiate the academic workplace because of advantages gained in mentoring relationships (Johnson-Bailey & Cervero, 2004; Vasil, 1996) and also in family formation (Jacobs & Winslow, 2004; Perna, 2001). Thus, white men would have a higher level of overall satisfaction than both African American men and women in addition to white women. The last hypothesis for question two is associated with Bird's (2010) premise that universities create "incongruous bureaucratic structures" that impede policy from being implemented in a consistent manner throughout the university. Specifically, because faculty are embedded within their department, we should expect that departmental-level implementation of an institutional policy will influence the overall satisfaction with the institution. Hence, if a faculty member is satisfied with how the department supports a person with a family-related issue, then this should have a greater effect on the overall satisfaction with their institution than the university-level support.

Summary

Themes within this body of literature highlight the autonomous nature of the academic work environment. While there is flexibility within the work environment, the expectations do not match the issues present in the literature. Women are still disadvantaged because of gendered expectations embedded in the workplace. Specifically, women faculty are more than likely saddled with stereotypes of caring, and expected to do more care work with students than men within the department. Women are more likely to interrupt their careers for care-giving

responsibilities, and are overall disadvantaged in that women perform more paid and unpaid work than men. Additionally, the sparse representation of the integrated approach to examining how both women and men experience work, regarding the balance of paid-work and family management concerns, ignores men's concerns about care work.

Moreover, within the integrated approach, there are also specific gaps within the literature that need to be addressed. First, there is a dearth of studies addressing how African American faculty, both men and women, balance work-related activities and care-giving responsibilities. If race is considered in previous work, it is treated as a categorical variable that is used as a mere control. I posit that race and gender should be analyzed with emphasis on the interaction. Hence, faculty policy assessments and satisfaction levels will be examined in relation to their intersectional social locations with regard to how they will negotiate balancing work-related activities in addition to care-giving responsibilities. For instances where an interaction term was not significant, individual variables were included in the analysis.

Second, the literature lacks specific analyses of policy assessment with regard to work-related activities and care-giving balance issues outside of children and childrearing responsibilities. Two studies examining eldercare and childcare issues did not include detailed discussion of the eldercare findings in the conclusions. Eldercare presents a unique set of challenges for individuals such as increased medical concerns and skilled care requirements. To date, there are no studies examining patterns in how members of intersectionally defined faculty groups assess policies related to the family/work interactions specific to eldercare issues.

Chapter Three includes a discussion of the research design with an explanation of the proposed methodology, and details institutional type and survey information. Specifically, I explain the statistical tests used to analyze the data. Also, I outline the criteria for institutional

type and how that relates to the sample. I also address concerns related to secondary data analysis.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

Based on the literature review, it appeared that many studies examining how faculty with care work responsibilities experience the academic workplace reinforce the premise that care work is only an issue for women faculty who try to balance family responsibilities. However, gender norms governing household roles are changing, and with more married women entering the work force, men are taking on more unpaid work responsibilities (Sayer, 2005). Despite the fact that the extant literature documented policies targeting faculty with children, little is known regarding policies targeting eldercare. Examining the faculty's assessment of the policy choices created to ameliorate work-life imbalance issues was central to the first research question of this study.

1. For tenure track faculty occupying intersectional locations, specifically race and gender, are there differences regarding:
 - i. The perceived importance of family policies as related to career success?
 - ii. The perceived effectiveness of family policies at the institution?
 - iii. The level of satisfaction with work-life balance?

Policy recommendations in the literature for individuals struggling with balance concerns incorporated solutions such as paid or unpaid research leave, paid or unpaid personal leave, and stop-the-clock policies. However, there is little research regarding *faculty assessment of the effectiveness and importance* of work-life policies. I examine both the perceived importance and the perceived effectiveness of work-life policies for intersectionally defined groups of faculty members employed at research institutions.

Furthermore, the broader intent of this study was to explore how the academic workplace is viewed by the faculty who have family-related care work responsibilities. Specifically, I examine to what extent, if any, faculty satisfaction with meeting both work and family obligations differed by race¹¹ and gender. I also examine racial, gender, and dependent status-related variations in faculty members' perceptions of the importance and effectiveness of institutional policies designed to assist faculty with care work responsibilities. Last, I explore the extent to which the overall satisfaction with the institution is affected by faculty members' perceptions of institutional and departmental support for care work. While family-work policies are created at the institutional level, faculty members using these policies are evaluated by and immediately accountable to their academic departments. Consequently, the second research question examines if the overall satisfaction with the institution is more affected by the perceptions of departmental or institutional support for care giving.

2. Does the overall satisfaction with the institution vary by a faculty member's race, salary, gender, dependent status, marital status as well as perceptions regarding institutional and departmental support for family responsibilities?

Secondary Data Analysis

This study analyze data collected by The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Kiecolt and Nathan (1985, p. 47) suggested that secondary data can be applied to “studies designed to [. . .] examine phenomena comparatively, or to replicate and/or extend previous studies” (Hyman, 1972 as cited

¹¹ I use intersectionality theory to disengage from using a universal explanation of gender and race/ethnicity. Due to the complexity of analyzing how the individual aspect of race/ethnicity and gender link to create a unique experience, I limited the analysis between African American men and women and white men and women.

by Kiecolt & Nathan, 1985). One advantage (Hofferth, 2005; Kiecolt & Nathan, 1985) of using secondary data is the saving of resources whether that is time or expense. Also, in many instances, the secondary data sets have a large sample size that enables the researcher to analyze subgroups (Hofferth, 2005). The data derived from such surveys are of a higher quality (Thomas & Heck, 2001), and allow the researcher to “uncover aspects of a research problem that requires elaboration, groups that need to be oversampled, grounds for hypothesis revision, and the need to refine and improve existing measures” (Hyman, 1972 as cited by Kiecolt & Nathan, 1985, p. 11).

Institutional Type and Sample

How a faculty member experiences one’s department is indirectly tied to campus characteristics (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004), especially to the classification of one’s institution as research intensive, which will influence the time spent on teaching, research, and service. The Carnegie Foundation created a classification system in 1973 to emphasize institutional diversity of U.S. higher education (McCormick & Zhao, 2005). For the purposes of my project, I utilize information from the most current Carnegie classification system. The “RU/VH”-research universities with “very high research activity” and “RU/H” -research universities with “high research activity” represented institutions that have awarded at least 20 research doctoral degrees during the given year.¹²

Survey Information. The specific survey data used in my study comes from the 2008 and 2009 Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey. This survey assessed pre-tenure faculty experiences related to areas that are central to career success. The survey participants were

¹² For more information regarding the classification system, please see: <http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/basic.php>

derived from COACHE member institutions.¹³ All pre-tenure, tenure-track faculty with at least one year of service were invited to participate. For the purpose of this study, I only analyze data from research universities because these institutions have disparities in overall faculty representation regarding race and gender in relation to their overall population representation. There were also lagging rates in publishing in addition to tenure awards among faculty groups differing by race and gender (Barbezat & Hughes, 2005; Perna, 2005; Toutkoushian & Conley 2005). Additionally, research conducted regarding gender differences in faculty work experiences highlighted disparities for those with care work responsibilities (Armenti, 2004; Probert, 2005; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004).

Survey Participants. The initial COACHE dataset had 15,100 cases from the years 2005 through 2009. I narrowed the cases down to ones that were relevant to this project. First, I included eldercare policy in the analysis, and this inclusion restricted the year range to the 2008 and 2009 surveys. Second, because I examine only research institutions, I include cases that were categorized in “very high research activity” and “high research activity.” Last, I exclude cases not relevant to my intersectional analysis.¹⁴ In all, this sample comprises of 3,142 cases.

The composition of the total number of cases (N=3,142) consisted of 49.7% white men (N=1,561) followed by white women at 43.3% (N=1,359). African American men make up only 2.8% of the cases (N=88) while African American women made up 4.3% (N=134). The majority of respondents identify as assistant professors (N=2,958). While 83 respondents declined to indicate whether or not they had children or other dependents, 56.7% (N=1780)

¹³ “To date, 149 four-year colleges and universities have joined COACHE” (COACHE, 2010). Institutional types include baccalaureate, master’s/doctoral, and research institutions.

¹⁴ The following were excluded from the analysis: Asian, Asian American and Pacific Islander (16.3% of respondents); Hispanic or Latino (4.5%); multiracial (1.3%); American Indian or Native Alaskan (.8%) and other (.7%)

responded that they had some type of dependent. Although the survey did not contain a question explicitly asking if the respondent had a spouse or partner, a question did ask about spouse or partner through a question targeting information about the household employment situation. As reported in Table 25, only 11.6% of the respondents replied that they did not have a spouse or partner.

To present a better description of the respondent composition, I include the respondent academic area code as defined by COACHE. The compilation was divided into 12 academic areas, and Table 28 represents the total breakdown by faculty groups and academic areas. Reporting on the top three academic areas by faculty groups, both white men and white women were somewhat clustered in Social Sciences. For white men, the second highest academic area was Engineering/Computer Science/Math/Statistics, and for white women it was Humanities. The third academic area for white men was Humanities and for white women it was Medical Schools and Health Professions. Conversely, African American men's highest academic area cluster was Engineering/Computer Science/Math/Statistics, second Education, and last Business. For African American women, Education was the first academic area followed by Social Sciences and then Other Professions.

The survey asked respondents to indicate what year they were born, and to present these data I created five age categories as represented in Table 29. The age range for the professors in this dataset varied among the intersectionally defined groups. As reported in Table 29, 54.9% of white men and 52.4% of white women reported being between the ages of 35 to 44 while only 13.5% of African American men and 4.0% of African American women indicated being between 35 to 44. Both African American men and African American women were represented at a

higher percentage in the 45 to 54 and in the 55 to 64 age category than white men and white women.

Last, Table 27 reports that the annual salary of these respondents was clustered around \$45,000-\$59,999 (N=945) at 30.1% and \$60,000-\$74,999 (N=974) at 31.0%. Only six percent of respondents indicated that they made \$120,000 or above (N=189).

Data Protection and Institutional Review Board Approval

COACHE required all researchers follow a set of requirements that ensured the survey data are protected. To meet these requirements, the Graduate School at the University of Arkansas provided technological assistance that included installing encryption software and removing networking privileges from the computer used for data analysis. Also, in agreement with the COACHE guidelines, the data were stored in a locked office in a locked drawer.

Prior to sending the data protection plan to COACHE, I submitted the research proposal to the University of Arkansas Institutional Review Board (IRB), requesting permission to use this secondary data set. The proposal was approved on November 29, 2010. The approval letter is included in the appendix.¹⁵

¹⁵ COACHE required the following statement to be included in all presentations, papers, published articles, and other written materials using this data set:

The author acknowledges that the reported results are in whole or in part, based on analyses of the COACHE Data Set. These data were collected as part of a multi-site survey administration and supported by funds from participating colleges and universities and made available to the author by the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education. This (presentation/paper/article/chapter/document) has not been reviewed or endorsed by COACHE and does not necessarily represent the opinions of COACHE staff or members, who are not responsible for the contents.

The completed dissertation will be sent to COACHE for informational purposes as part of the data protection plan.

Survey Questions: Policies and Practices

Important to this study was the examination of racial and gender differences in the perceived importance and effectiveness of work-life policies to the success of intersectionally defined groups of faculty. The COACHE survey questions regarding policies and practices at the institution were located in two sections with the first section asking about the “importance or unimportance of policy to your success,” and the second section asking about the “effectiveness or ineffectiveness of policy at your institution.”

In section IV of the survey, Policies and Practices, the questions were designed to assess perceptions regarding the importance and effectiveness of faculty policies and practices COACHE deemed common at colleges and universities. The questions were arranged with a topical header, “Policy/Practice.” Two scales, the first measuring policy importance and the second measuring policy effectiveness were positioned below the question. The first scale, *importance*, used a five point Likert response item rating “5-very important, 4-important, 3-neither important nor unimportant, 2-unimportant, and 1-very unimportant.” The second scale, *effectiveness*, allowed participants to a) indicate whether the policy is offered at their institution, and b) indicate if the policy is not applicable to their individual situation or they are not aware of it. The five-point Likert response item rating was as follows: “5-very effective, 4-effective, 3-neither effective nor ineffective, 2-ineffective, 1-very ineffective.” “Not offered at my institution” was rated as an eight, and “I don’t know/not applicable” was rated as a nine. The following policy options from this section are used in the analysis:

IV.8. Paid or unpaid *research* leave

IV.9. Paid or unpaid *personal* leave

IV.13. Childcare

IV.15. Stop-the-clock for parental or other family reasons

IV.17. Elder care

IV.19. Modified duties for parental or other family reasons (e.g., course release)

I also examine the responses to question 37, “how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the balance between your professional time and your personal or family time?”

Overall Satisfaction

Last, I used the question regarding the overall satisfaction with their institution in my examination of Bird’s (2010) premise that departmental support for care work would have more influence than institutional support on the overall satisfaction. Bird (2010, p. 4) asserted that departments set the norms for productivity and work life expectations rather than the institution. This ultimately leads to “disjunctures” at the university and departmental level of what is formally expected at the institutional level and what is informally required by the department. While the institution might have a formal policy created to assist faculty in balancing work and family concerns, departmental culture might influence policy use, thus dissuading a faculty member from using it. Although many factors, such as collegiality and access to resources, may influence overall satisfaction, the main goal of this analysis was to determine if the satisfaction with institutional support and departmental support, in relation to having and raising children accounts for significant variance in overall satisfaction.

The second set of COACHE questions used in this project allows the participant to rate their individual level of agreement or disagreement with a list of statements. Participants are allowed to decline to answer (rated as 98) or not applicable (rated as 9). The statements are rated on a five point Likert response item ranging from “5- strongly agree, 4- somewhat agree, 3- neither agree nor strongly agree, 2-somewhat disagree, and 1-strongly disagree.” The following

questions are used to examine the faculty perceptions of the congruence between departmental and institutional expectations:

35a. My institution does what it can to make **having children** and the tenure-track compatible.

35b. My institution does what it can to make **raising children** and the tenure-track compatible.

35c. My departmental colleagues do what they can to make **having children** and the tenure-track compatible.

35d. My departmental colleagues do what they can to make **raising children** and the tenure-track compatible.

The last question focused on faculty satisfaction with their work environment, and was rated with the following Likert response item rating, “5- strongly satisfied, 4- somewhat satisfied, 3- neither satisfied nor strongly satisfied, 2-somewhat dissatisfied, and 1-strongly dissatisfied.” Participants were allowed to decline to answer (rated as 98) or not applicable (rated as 9). The subsequent question assists in examining issues related to satisfaction and congruence:

45b. All things considered, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your **institution** as a place to work?

Data Analysis

The purpose of this study is to compare faculty responses to selected questions from the COACHE survey in regards to answering the previously stated research questions. First, I examine faculty responses with respect to the importance and effectiveness of selected policies. Second, I compare the differences of overall satisfaction with work-life balance. Third, I

examine if departmental satisfaction with having and raising children influences overall institution satisfaction. I employ the Kruskal-Wallis test, the Mann-Whitney *U* test, and multiple regression to answer my research questions. Further, the analyses were conducted in SPSS Version 18.0.

Kruskal-Wallis test. The Kruskal-Wallis test determines whether there were differences between samples and “to see if there are differences among them that are too large to attribute to sampling error” (Glass & Hopkins, 1996, p. 411). Glass and Hopkins (1996) noted that in most instances the results of the ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis tests do not differ to a great degree, however Kruskal-Wallis was chosen due to the issues regarding normality and group size.

Mann-Whitney *U* Test. The Mann-Whitney *U* test is used to examine the differences between intersectionally defined faculty if the Kruskal-Wallis test indicates that there are differences within the groups. This test was used to determine how each specific group differed among the four groups analyzed. Again, there was an assumption that the distribution is not normal (Glass & Hopkins, 1996), and due to unequal group sizes and normality concerns, this test was appropriate to compare two groups.

Linear Regression Analysis. A regression procedure is employed for the last research question because this analysis examined if the overall satisfaction is influenced by indicators of social location as well as perceptions regarding institutional and departmental support for care work regarding having and raising children. The selection of variables was guided by the literature review (Pedhazur, 1997), and the results were specific to this dataset. Generalizability is not the goal for this analysis. The goal is to examine Bird’s (2010) premise regarding departmental influence on satisfaction.

Summary

This chapter outlined the proposed rationale for exploring the research questions through the application of three statistical analyses to data collected by the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. The chapter also discussed the appropriateness of the research questions, the proposed hypotheses, and information related to the survey population, and survey questions used to derive the data. The following chapter presents the results of the empirical analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR

EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to identify and compare faculty perceptions of (1) the importance of family policies in relation to career success and (2) their effectiveness at the institution, and (3) faculty overall satisfaction with work-life balance. In addition, I examine faculty overall satisfaction with the institution to establish if it varies by race, class, gender, dependent status, and married status, in relation to the faculty assessment of institutional and departmental support for family responsibilities.

I identify questions from the COACHE pre-tenure faculty survey regarding perceptions of policies used by faculty members with family care concerns. Descriptive statistics across all policy questions are calculated and tests of statistical significance are performed using the Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney *U* tests. All quantitative data analyses are conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 18.0. When the Kruskal-Wallis is performed, the alpha level is set at .05 and the Bonferroni corrected *p* value .005. I employ the Mann-Whitney *U* test as a follow up to significant Kruskal-Wallis results to examine pairwise differences within the intersectionally defined faculty groups. I use multiple regression to examine the variance in the overall satisfaction by a set of variables culled from the literature. This chapter reports and discusses the results of the study by research question and related hypotheses.

Demographic Variables

The dataset used in this analysis comes from the 2008 and 2009 COACHE surveys and only includes “very high research activity” and “high research activity” institutions. Further, I

only examine demographic cases that are relevant to my intersectional analysis: white women and men and African American women and men. The analysis omits the following faculty groups: Asian, Asian American and Pacific Islander represented (16.3% of respondents); Hispanic or Latino (4.5%); multiracial (1.3%); American Indian or Native Alaskan (.8%) and other (.7%). The total number of cases (N=3,142) is comprised of 49.7% white men followed by white women at 43.3%. African American men only account for 2.8% of the cases and African American women for 4.3% of the sample. Accordingly as reported in Table 1, most of the respondents are assistant professors. Further as represented in Table 2, the majority of respondents indicate this is their first time tenure-track appointment (see Table 1 and Table 2), in addition the majority report being married and having some type of dependent.¹⁶

Table 1 Rank frequency

Rank	Count	%	Cumulative %
Instructor/Lecturer	1	0.0%	0.0
Assistant Professor	2958	94.1%	94.2
Associate Professor or Assistant Professor (Conditional)	161	5.1%	99.3
Professor (or "Full Professor")	8	0.3%	99.6
Other	14	0.5%	100.0

Table 2 Tenure-track appointment type frequency

Is this your first tenure-track appointment?	Count	%	Cumulative %
No	542	17.3%	17.3
Yes	2584	82.2%	100.0
Total	3126	99.5%	
Decline to answer	16	0.5%	
Total	3142	100.0%	

¹⁶ The survey asks if the faculty member has any children or other dependents.

Findings for research question one

Research question one: For tenure track faculty occupying intersectional locations, specifically race and gender, are there differences regarding:

1. The perceived importance of family policies as related to career success?
2. The perceived effectiveness of family policies at the institution?
3. The level of satisfaction with work-life balance?

Research question one is evaluated using questions from the Policies and Practices section of the COACHE survey. The main survey questions for this part of the analysis are related to six family leave policies existing at many campuses across the United States: paid or unpaid *research* leave, paid or unpaid *personal* leave, childcare, stop-the-clock for parental or other family reasons, elder care, and modified duties for parental or other family reasons (e.g., course release). Using a five-point Likert response item rating, the respondents rated the importance of each of the six policies in relation to career success and as well as their effectiveness at the institution. The additional survey question included in this analysis asks faculty to rate their satisfaction with balance between their professional time and their personal or family time.

Since the groups fail to meet ANOVA assumptions for equality of variance and have unequal numbers, I conduct the Kruskal Wallis analysis. Because this analysis involves more than two groups, I perform follow up tests, specifically the Mann-Whitney *U* test¹⁷, to examine pairwise differences between the four faculty groups.

¹⁷ Regarding the results for the Mann-Whitney *U* test, Scanlan (retrieved, July 2012) states that Z-scores judge the significance of group differences in ranks. If rank distributions are identical, then the Z-score will equal 0. If the Z-score is positive, the sums of the ranks of group 2 are

With the exception of eldercare policy, the majority of the faculty from all intersectional groups find the work-life policies important. The intersectional groups differ, however, in the proportion of the faculty in each group that consider the policies to be very important or important, on the one hand, or unimportant or very unimportant, on the other.

Policy importance--Paid and unpaid research leave. As reported in Table 3, over 77% of faculty rate the first policy in this section, paid and unpaid research leave, as “important” or “very important.” Of the four intersectional groups, the highest percentage of African American women (88.3%) rate this policy as important. White women and African American men virtually tie in the percentage of respondents that think the policy is “important” or “very important” (83.3% and 83.2% respectively). Last, although similar to the other groups, the majority of white men (71.4%) rate this policy as “important” or “very important,” the policy importance to this group significantly differs from all other intersectionally defined. The findings in Table 4 indicate the other differences (African American women, white women, and African American men) are not significant. This policy option allows faculty to concentrate on research and publication projects and reduce committee service and teaching load (AAUP, 2001) while attending to other responsibilities (Colbeck, 2006). However, in line with the hypothesis, African-American women are likely to consider paid or unpaid research leave policy to be important to their career success. African American women affirming the importance of this policy could be interpreted as the need for formal policy due to social isolation, and the lack of informal knowledge related to succeeding in the academy (Cooper, 2006; Hendricks, 1996).

greater than group 1. A negative Z-score indicates that the sums of the ranks for group 1 are greater than group 2 (p. 7).

Table 3 Frequencies by race/ethnicity and gender regarding the importance of paid or unpaid research leave

Faculty Groups	Very Unimportant		Unimportant		Neither Important or Unimportant		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White men	24	1.6%	76	5.1%	327	21.9%	580	38.8%	486	32.6%	1493	100%
White women	7	0.5%	36	2.7%	178	13.4%	452	34.1%	651	49.2%	1324	100%
African American men	1	1.2%	3	3.6%	10	12.0%	33	39.8%	36	43.4%	83	100%
African American women	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	13	10.1%	45	34.9%	70	53.4%	129	100%
Total	32	1.1%	116	3.8%	528	17.4%	1110	36.6%	1243	41.0%	3029	100%

Kruskal-Wallis test: $\chi^2(3)=112.22, p<.001$. African American women (M rank=1778.53); white women (M rank=1662.42); African American men (M rank= 1587.23); white men (M rank= 1357.48)

Table 4 Z-scores and p-values for Mann-Whitney test regarding the importance of paid or unpaid research leave

Faculty group comparisons	Z-score	p-value
White men/white women	-9.84***	.000
White men/African American men	-2.49*	.013
White men/African American women	-5.89***	.000
White women/African American men	-0.87	.386
White women/African American women	-1.52	.127
African American men/African American women	-1.74	.082

*** $p<.001$, ** $p<.01$, * $p<.05$

Policy importance--Paid and unpaid personal leave. Evidence in Table 5 implies that fewer faculty find this policy option as important as research leave, however 61% of all faculty respondents rating this policy as “important” or “very important.” With regard to the intersectionally defined faculty groups, about 50% of white men viewed this policy as “important” or “very important,” and 36.6% rated it “neither important or unimportant.” As a group, African American men were more likely than white men to rate this policy as important or very important (64%) followed by white women (71%), and African American women (80%). As reported in Table 6, the faculty group comparison indicates statistically significant differences, with the African American women most likely to consider the personal leave policy to be important to their career success. This finding supports the hypothesis. As previously stated, because African American women experience both racism and sexism within the academy (Gregory, 1999; Guillory, 2003; Hendricks, 1996), formal policy could be seen as an instrument in negotiating academic work responsibilities and balancing family concerns.

Table 5 Frequencies by race/ethnicity and gender regarding the importance of paid or unpaid personal leave

Faculty Groups	Very Unimportant		Unimportant		Neither Important or Unimportant		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White men	47	3.2%	159	10.7%	543	36.6%	539	36.3%	196	13.2%	1484	100%
White women	14	1.1%	65	5.0%	300	22.9%	542	41.4%	388	29.6%	1309	100%
African American men	3	3.6%	5	6.0%	22	26.2%	38	45.2%	16	19.0%	84	100%
African American women	0	0.0%	3	2.3%	23	17.8%	59	45.7%	44	34.1%	129	100%
Total	64	2.1%	232	7.7%	888	29.5%	1178	39.2%	644	21.4%	3006	100%

Kruskal-Wallis test: $\chi^2(3)=205.12, p<.001$. African American women (M rank=1863.00); white women (M rank=1709.06); African American men (M rank= 1519.48); white men (M rank= 1290.02)

Table 6 Z-scores and p-values for Mann-Whitney test regarding the importance of paid or unpaid personal leave

Faculty group comparisons	Z-score	p-value
White men/white women	-13.36***	.000
White men/African American men	-2.55*	.011
White men/African American women	-7.62***	.000
White women/African American men	-2.12*	.034
White women/African American women	-1.98*	.048
African American men/African American women	-3.09**	.002

*** $p<.001$, ** $p<.01$, * $p<.05$

Policy importance--Childcare. In relation to the results reported in Table 7, the importance of childcare policy for faculty members' careers, approximately 54% of faculty rated this policy as "important" or "very important." Close to 61% of white women and 58% of African American women rated this policy as "important" or "very important." In Table 8, the contrast of faculty groups are evident. Below 50% of African American men and white men rated this policy as "important" or "very important." Examining the group differences, it is important to first note that the significant differences between groups were based on gender only. Specifically, white men differed with African American and white women, and so did African American men. Although in contrast to what I hypothesized, the highest percentage of faculty that rated this policy as important were white women. Yet, the difference between white women and African American women was not statistically significant. Based on this, it appears that child-related caregiving work is still a main concern for women (Probert, 2005).

Table 7 Frequencies by race/ethnicity and gender regarding the importance of childcare

Faculty Groups	Very Unimportant		Unimportant		Neither Important or Unimportant		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White men	191	13.0%	204	13.8%	375	25.5%	391	26.5%	312	21.2%	1473	100%
White women	166	12.7%	113	8.7%	235	18.0%	272	20.9%	518	39.7%	1304	100%
African American men	8	9.9%	9	11.1%	25	30.9%	22	27.2%	17	21.0%	81	100%
African American women	9	7.1%	16	12.6%	28	22.0%	19	15.0%	55	43.3%	127	100%
Total	374	12.5%	342	11.5%	663	22.2%	704	23.6%	902	30.2%	2985	100%

Kruskal-Wallis test: $\chi^2(3)=75.81, p<.001$. African American women (M rank=1669.73); white women (M rank=1627.98); African American men (M rank=1404.80); white men (M rank=1363.12)

Table 8 Z-scores and p-values for Mann-Whitney test regarding the importance of childcare

Faculty group comparisons	Z-score	p-value
White men/white women	-8.30***	.000
White men/African American men	-.51	.613
White men/African American women	-3.92***	.000
White women/African American men	-2.43*	.015
White women/African American women	-.57	.568
African American men/African American women	-2.23*	.025

*** $p<.001$, ** $p<.01$, * $p<.05$

Policy importance—Stop-the-clock. Table 9 reports close to 72% of respondents felt this policy was “important” or “very important” to their success. Analysis revealed significant differences among intersectionally defined faculty groups. Specifically, almost 87% of African American women faculty members responded that this policy was “important” or “very important” to their career success, followed by 81% of white women, 73% of African American men, and 62% of white men.

Consistent with the hypothesis as reported in Table 10, the percentage of African American women who rated this policy as important is highest of all faculty groups. Although the majority of white men indicated this policy is important, the percentage of white men rating this policy as important is significantly lower than that of the other faculty groups. At the same time, compared with men, both African American and white, a higher percentage of women, both African American and white, rated this policy as important.

Table 9 Frequencies by race/ethnicity and gender regarding the importance of stop-the-clock for parental or other family reasons

Faculty Groups	Very Unimportant		Unimportant		Neither Important or Unimportant		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White men	107	7.2%	99	6.7%	351	23.8%	611	41.4%	308	20.9%	1476	100%
White women	54	4.1%	41	3.1%	159	12.1%	454	34.6%	603	46.0%	1311	100%
African American men	3	3.5%	4	4.7%	16	18.8%	33	38.8%	29	34.1%	85	100%
African American women	5	3.8%	2	1.5%	10	7.6%	42	32.1%	72	55.0%	131	100%
Total	169	5.6%	146	4.9%	536	17.8%	1140	38.0%	1012	33.7%	3003	100%

Kruskal-Wallis test: $\chi^2(3)=238.61, p<.001$. African American women (M rank=1879.91); white women (M rank=1722.85); African American men (M rank=1528.21); white men (M rank=1270.78)

Table 10 Z-scores and p-values for Mann-Whitney test regarding the importance of stop-the-clock for parental or other family reasons

Faculty group comparisons	Z-score	p-value
White men/white women	-14.45***	.000
White men/African American men	-2.85**	.004
White men/African American women	-8.07***	.000
White women/African American men	-2.21*	.027
White women/African American women	-2.15*	.031
African American men/African American women	-3.22**	.001

*** $p<.001$, ** $p<.01$, * $p<.05$

Policy importance—Eldercare. As reported in Table 11, close to 32% of respondents felt this policy was “important” or “very important” to their success, with 59% of African American women, 40% of white women, 31% of African American men, and 21% of white men rating it as “important” or “very important.” The results reported in Table 12 indicate that these differences are significant for all groups with the exception of white women and African American men whose responses did not differ significantly. The division of labor within care work may provide some insight into the difference between the faculty groups regarding this policy choice in addition to racial differences in attending to eldercare responsibilities. Connecting back to the literature, many African American families (Turner et al., 2004; Chadiha, Rafferty, & Pickard, 2003) do not use formal systems that white families use for eldercare, and ultimately take on the individual burden of care work.

Table 11 Frequencies by race/ethnicity and gender regarding the importance of eldercare

Faculty Groups	Very Unimportant		Unimportant		Neither Important or Unimportant		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White men	260	17.8%	267	18.3%	621	42.6%	242	16.6%	68	4.7%	1458	100%
White women	149	11.6%	185	14.3%	434	33.6%	355	27.5%	167	12.9%	1290	100%
African American men	7	8.8%	18	22.5%	30	37.5%	15	18.8%	10	12.5%	80	100%
African American women	8	6.3%	15	11.7%	30	23.4%	40	31.3%	35	27.3%	128	100%
Total	424	14.3%	485	16.4%	1115	37.7%	652	22.1%	280	9.5%	2926	100%

Kruskal-Wallis test: $\chi^2(3)=145.53, p<.001$. African American women (M rank=1939.94); white women (M rank=1625.21); African American men (M rank=1511.58); white men (M rank=1306.37)

Table 12 Z-scores and p-values for Mann-Whitney test regarding the importance of eldercare

Faculty group comparisons	Z-score	p-value
White men/white women	-10.20***	.000
White men/African American men	-2.19*	.028
White men/African American women	-8.28***	.000
White women/African American men	-1.19	.234
White women/African American women	-4.27***	.000
African American men/African American women	-3.59***	.000

*** $p<.001$, ** $p<.01$, * $p<.05$

Policy importance—Modified duties. Table 13 reports that nearly 64% of faculty respondents regarded modified duties policy as “important” or “very important” with close to 80% of African American women, 74% of African American men, 73% of white women, and 55% of white men faculty agreeing that the policy was “important” or “very important” to their career success. The results in Table 14 imply that these differences are significant between the groups with the exception of African American men and white men. Since this policy supports modifying existing obligations to meet the needs arising from family responsibilities, it is potentially more important for women who must not only meet workplace responsibilities, but also responsibilities at home (Hagedorn & Sax, 2003; Probert, 2005; Stack, 2004).

Table 13 Frequencies by race/ethnicity and gender regarding the importance of modified duties for parental or other family reasons (e.g., course release)

Faculty Groups	Very Unimportant		Unimportant		Neither Important or Unimportant		Important		Very Important		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White men	103	7.1%	113	7.7%	449	30.8%	588	40.3%	207	14.2%	1460	100%
White women	51	3.9%	58	4.5%	237	18.3%	521	40.3%	425	32.9%	1292	100%
African American men	2	2.5%	2	2.5%	29	35.8%	31	38.3%	17	21.0%	81	100%
African American women	4	3.1%	5	3.9%	18	14.0%	47	36.4%	55	42.6%	129	100%
Total	160	5.4%	178	6.0%	733	24.7%	1187	40.1%	704	23.8%	2962	100%

Kruskal-Wallis test: $\chi^2(3)=183.08, p<.001$. African American women (M rank=1830.17); white women (M rank=1673.83); African American men (M rank=1445.66); white men (M rank=1282.48)

Table 14 Z-scores and p-values for Mann-Whitney test regarding the importance of modified duties for parental or other family reasons (e.g., course release)

Faculty group comparisons	Z-score	p-value
White men/white women	-12.59***	.000
White men/African American men	-1.85	.064
White men/African American women	-7.25***	.000
White women/African American men	-2.56*	.011
White women/African American women	-2.18*	.029
African American men/African American women	-3.44**	.001

*** $p<.001$, ** $p<.01$, * $p<.05$

Policy Effectiveness. Only one question related to effectiveness of the policy option at the institution showed statistically significant differences across all intersectionally defined groups. Specifically, childcare was the only policy for which the rates of positive responses differed significantly between the intersectionally defined groups and warranted an additional analysis, which I present below.

Reported in Table 15, only 19.5% of respondents indicated the childcare policy was effective at their institutions; 52% of the respondents perceived childcare policy to be “very ineffective” to “ineffective.” Additionally in Table 16, the white women’s positive response (18.8%) was significantly different from that of African American (28%) and white men’s (19.2%). At the same time, the majority (60%) of white women indicates that this policy was not effective and close to 50% of the other respondents agree that the policy was ineffective: 46% of African American women, 46% of white men, and 31% of African American men. However, a substantial percentage of African American men (41%) and white men (35%) took a neutral position on this policy, while less than a quarter of African American and white women chose this rating.

These results supported the rejection of the hypothesis that white men would most likely rate childcare policies as effective. I hypothesized the rate of positive responses would be the highest among white men because they could judge effectiveness based on access to the policy rather than utility. Theoretically, white men would have greater access to and knowledge of policies due to mentors and other institutional relationships (Cawyer, Simonds & Davis, 2002; Chandler, 1996). However, of all groups, white men were next to last in their positive responses, in addition to having the highest proportion of negative ratings of the policy’s effectiveness.

Referring back to the literature, in many cases men's marital status (Jacobs & Winslow, 2004; Perna, 2001) can affect career satisfaction. Many have a stay-at-home-spouse that can engage in care work, thus mitigating the need to use policy related to managing family care responsibilities. I did not take into account the gendered division of labor occurring within the home, regardless of policy options existing within the workplace.

Table 15 Frequencies by race/ethnicity and gender regarding the effectiveness of childcare

Faculty Groups	Very Ineffective		Ineffective		Neither ineffective or effective		Effective		Very Effective		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White men	141	24.6%	124	21.6%	199	34.7%	89	15.5%	21	3.7%	574	100%
White women	171	34.3%	128	25.7%	106	21.2%	66	13.2%	28	5.6%	499	100%
African American men	6	18.8%	4	12.5%	13	40.6%	7	21.9%	2	6.3%	32	100%
African American women	14	34.1%	5	12.2%	10	24.4%	8	19.5%	4	9.8%	41	100%
Total	332	29.0%	261	22.8%	328	28.6%	170	14.8%	55	4.8%	1146	100%

Kruskal-Wallis test: $\chi^2(3)=16.58, p<.001$. African American men (M rank=686.94); African American women (M rank=603.63); white men (M rank=600.54); white women (M rank=532.65)

Table 16 Z-scores and p-values for Mann-Whitney test regarding the effectiveness of childcare

Faculty group comparisons	Z-score	p-value
White men/white women	-3.51***	.000
White men/African American men	-1.49	.112
White men/African American women	-.19	.849
White women/African American men	-2.56*	.010
White women/African American women	-1.19	.233
African American men/African American women	-.84	.402

*** $p<.001$, ** $p<.01$, * $p<.05$

Overall satisfaction. The results in Table 17 indicate that only 40% of faculty from all groups were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their ability to balance both personal and professional responsibilities. As reported in Table 18, African American men (approximately 48%) were the most satisfied, but not surprisingly only 26% of African American women were satisfied; white men (45%) were second in their overall satisfaction, and white women (roughly 36%) were second to last. The percentages of African American and white men who were satisfied with the ability to balance personal and professional responsibilities did not significantly differ.

The low percentage of the African American women who are satisfied with their ability to balance work and family may be related to the fact that they are more likely to be isolated within the department (Smith & Calasanti, 2005), lack research networks (Hendricks, 1996), and be assigned more committee work as well as advisees (Cooper, 2006; Gregory, 1999). Overall, more African American women and white women than African American men and white men rated policies specific to the act of caregiving, childcare and eldercare, as “important” or “very important.” This may be related to the fact that both African American and white women are performing more tasks not only in the public sphere of work, but also in the private sphere as it relates to household and caregiving duties (Gregory, 2001; Probert, 2005).

Table 17 Frequencies by race/ethnicity and gender regarding satisfaction with the balance between professional time and personal or family time

Faculty Groups	Very Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Neither dissatisfied or satisfied		Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White men	123	8.3%	364	24.4%	332	22.3%	554	37.2%	116	7.8%	1489	100%
White women	165	12.7%	403	31.0%	269	20.7%	397	30.5%	68	5.2%	1302	100%
African American men	6	7.3%	21	25.6%	16	19.5%	34	41.5%	5	6.1%	82	100%
African American women	25	19.5%	42	32.8%	28	21.9%	29	22.7%	4	3.1%	128	100%
Total	319	10.6%	830	27.7%	645	21.5%	1014	33.8%	193	6.4%	3001	100%

Kruskal-Wallis test: $\chi^2(3)=57.14, p<.001$. African American men (M rank=1618.45); white men (M rank=1603.60); white women (M rank=1405.23); African American women (M rank=1206.47)

Table 18 Z-scores and p-values for Mann-Whitney test regarding overall satisfaction with work-life balance

Faculty group comparisons	Z-score	p-value
White men/white women	-6.27***	.000
White men/African American men	-.15	.877
White men/African American women	-5.16***	.000
White women/African American men	-2.24*	.025
White women/African American women	-2.58*	.010
African American men/African American women	-3.47**	.001

*** $p<.001$, ** $p<.01$, * $p<.05$

Findings for research question two

Research question two: Does the overall satisfaction with the institution vary by a faculty member's race, salary (quantitative indicator for class), gender, dependent status, being married as well as the faculty's perceptions regarding institutional and departmental support for family responsibilities?

Multiple regression was used to explore the effect of the independent variables (listed in Table 19) on the overall satisfaction with the institution as a workplace. The descriptive statistics are presented in Tables 19 and 20.

Table 19 Descriptive statistics for Model 1: mean and proportion of variables

Variable	Mean	SD	N
Satisfaction with institution as a workplace	3.66	1.01	1876
Race	.06	.24	1876
Gender	.48	.50	1876
Salary	4.59	1.80	1876
Dependent status	.70	.46	1876
Marital status	.88	.32	1876
Institutional support	.0076	.97	1876
Departmental support	-.0036	.99	1876

Table 20 Descriptive statistics for Model 2: mean and proportion of variables

Variable	Mean	SD	N
Satisfaction with institution as a workplace	3.66	1.01	1876
Race	.06	.24	1876
Gender	.48	.50	1876
Race x Gender	.03	.18	1876
Annual salary	4.59	1.80	1876
Dependent status	.70	.46	1876
Marital status	.88	.32	1876
Institutional support	.0076	.97	1876
Departmental support	-.0036	.99	1876

Regression results are reported in Tables 20 and 22.

Institutional Support and Departmental Support were composite scores created from questions 35a, 35b, 35c, 35d that asked about the support for having and raising children from

both the institutional and departmental level. I converted the values for the questions into z-scores, added the z-scores for the respective category, and divided by the number (2) of questions for each composite. Correlational analysis was conducted on all variables to examine the possibility of multicollinearity (Tables 23 and 24), and all independent variables correlated at $r \leq .70$, thus ruling out the issue of multicollinearity. Likewise, the tolerance and variance inflation factor values were in the acceptable range, and did not warrant additional testing for multicollinearity. The model was significant, $F(7, 1868) = 76.04, p < .001$. As indicated in Table 21, the variable most strongly related to overall satisfaction is Institutional Support ($\beta = .39$) followed by Annual Salary ($\beta = .12$), then Departmental Support ($\beta = .09$), Gender ($\beta = .05$), and last Marital Status ($\beta = -.04$). Race and dependent status are not significant in this model. While this regression analysis only targeted one aspect of the academic work life and balancing caregiving concerns, 22% of the variance is explained in overall institutional satisfaction.

Table 21¹⁸ Model 1: Determinants of workplace satisfaction

	Unstandardized B	SEB	Standardized β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> value
(Constant)	3.37	.09		39.29	.000**
Race	.06	.09	.02	.72	.24
Gender	.10	.04	.05	2.47	.000**
Annual salary	.06	.01	.12	5.50	.000**
Dependent status	.08	.05	.03	1.53	.07
Marital status	-.13	.07	-.04	-1.90	.03*
Institutional support	.40	.03	.39	14.83	.000**
Departmental support	.09	.03	.09	3.47	.000**

N=1876

$R^2 = .22$

Significance (*p* value) = .000*

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

¹⁸ For both models race was coded 0 for white and 1 for African American; annual salary was coded 1 to 9, 1 for less than \$30,000 to 9 for \$120,000 or above; gender was coded 0 for male and 1 for female; dependent status was coded 0 for no and 1 for yes; marital status was coded 0 for no and 1 yes

To test how race and gender interacts simultaneously, the second model adds the new variable to as an interaction term in the regression analysis, and the interaction variable is not significant. As presented in Table 22, the results are comparable to the first model, $F(8, 1867) = 66.71$, $p < .001$, and gender, salary, marital status, institutional support, and departmental support are still significant in the second model. Two hypotheses from the research question warrant further discussion.

Table 22 Model 2: Determinants of workplace satisfaction: Interacting race and gender

	Unstandardized B	SEB	Standardized β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> value
(Constant)	3.37	.09		39.31	.000**
Race	.18	.13	.04	1.34	.09
Gender	.12	.04	.06	2.66	.000**
Race x Gender	-.20	.18	-.04	-1.15	.13
Annual salary	.06	.01	.11	5.46	.000**
Dependent status	.08	.05	.03	1.53	.13
Marital status	-.14	.07	-.04	-1.99	.02*
Institutional support	.40	.03	.39	14.80	.000**
Departmental support	.09	.03	.09	3.44	.000**
N=1876					
$R^2 = .22$					
Significance (<i>p</i> value) = .000*					

Hypothesis One: Highly paid white men will have higher levels of overall satisfaction.

The salary variable is positively related to overall institutional satisfaction, however the relationship between satisfaction and salary could be due to other factors outside the scope of this study. Other researchers have found that faculty members receiving higher salaries are generally more satisfied with their respective institution (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). However, it is important to note that faculty members receiving higher salaries could also have more resources to hire additional help to assist with caregiving responsibilities. Linking back to the question regarding the importance of work-life policies for career success, a higher percentage of faculty with higher salaries, i.e., white men, might view these as not important because of the

access to this resource. Other faculty members, such as African American women, who do not possess the same social capital as her white counterpart, are more likely to view policies as important to career success while balancing work responsibilities and family concerns.

Next, while race was not a significant predictor of the institutional satisfaction, gender and salary were. This analysis was limited to university professors that work at “high research activity” and “very high research activity” institutions, and these designations are reserved for a cadre of institutions. While African American men and women were not represented in the highest salary category, there were more proportionally spread out in the higher salary levels (see Appendix B: Table 27). This intersectional analysis allowed examination of the relationships between social locations to highlight what specific differences between white men and white women.

White women were more satisfied in this model than white men, and this can be expected because gendered assumptions regarding policy use operated through satisfaction. Additionally, not being married contributed to satisfaction. While marital status was not included in the hypothesis, it was significant in determining satisfaction within the models. I found mixed results in previous studies regarding marital status. Perna (2001) found women were disadvantaged by marriage. Yet, Sax et al. (2002) found the opposite assertion. Jacobs and Winslow (2004) noted that married men were more satisfied and little change in satisfaction for married women. This finding warrants future exploration. The context in which marital status is examined can potentially influence outcomes. I used it to examine overall institutional satisfaction in relation to support for one aspect of care work. A researcher examining work-family role conflict collectively with the tenure process could find something different.

Hypothesis Two: Faculty satisfied with departmental support for family responsibilities will have higher levels of overall satisfaction.

According to the standardized betas reported in Table 21 and Table 22, faculty satisfaction with institutional support for family responsibilities, followed by salary, was the most important predictor of the overall satisfaction in this model. Based on Bird's (2010) discussion of how faculty are first embedded in their departments and then universities, I hypothesized that departmental support for such policies would influence the overall faculty satisfaction more so than the institutional support. The current analysis does not support my hypothesis. Although it indicates that departmental support is important, it also shows that institutional support for family responsibilities is more significant in predicting workplace satisfaction than is departmental support.

The gendered nature of satisfaction with institutional and departmental support for care work is demonstrated in this analysis because white men are the least satisfied with how the institution as well as the department supports care work. O'Meara and Campbell (2011) found that departmental norms influence decisions related to balancing work and family responsibilities. Bird's (2010) assertion of gendered structures was supported by Reddick, Rochlen, Grasso, Reilly, and Spikes (2011). They found that men were able to compartmentalize care work. Their respondents acknowledged that they still subscribed to traditional gender roles to "lessen strain on both work and family obligations" (Reddick, et. al, 2011, p. 7) because the work culture does not support men in achieving balance with work and family responsibilities (Reddick, et. al, 2011). My results seem to indicate that there is an issue with access to policies designed to help faculty manage work and family responsibilities. I will discuss further in Chapter Five potential reasons as to why I do not find support for this hypothesis.

Table 23 Variable Correlations: Model 1

	OS	R	S	G	D	M	IS	DS
Overall Satisfaction (OS)	1							
Race (R)	.01	1						
Salary (S)	.16***	-.001	1					
Gender (G)	-.02	.05*	-.147***	1				
Dependent status (D)	.04	.02	.09***	-.13***	1			
Marital status (M)	-.001	-.12***	.09***	-.14***	.36***	1		
Institutional Support (IS)	.45***	-.03	.12***	-.12***	.03	.06**	1	
Departmental Support (DS)	.33***	-.06*	.08***	-.07***	.04*	.05*	.61***	1

Sig (1-tailed) *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Table 24 Variable Correlations: Model 2

	OS	R	G	RxG	S	D	M	IS	DS
Overall Satisfaction (OS)	1								
Race (R)	.01	1							
Gender (G)	-.02	.05*	1						
Race x Gender (RxG)	-.03	.75***	.20	1					
Salary (S)	.16***	-.001	-.15***	-.05**	1				
Dependent status (D)	.04	.02	-.13***	-.02	.09***	1			
Marital status (M)	-.001	-.12***	-.14***	-.17***	.09***	.36***	1		
Institutional Support (IS)	.45***	-.03	-.12***	-.07**	.12***	.03	.06**	1	
Departmental Support (DS)	.33***	-.06*	-.07***	-.09***	.08***	.04*	.05*	.61***	1

Sig (1-tailed) *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Summary

In this chapter I first presented results from the Kruskal Wallis tests and *post hoc* analyses utilizing the Mann-Whitney *U* test to address a set of three questions: For tenure track faculty occupying intersectional locations, specifically race and gender, are there differences regarding:

- a. The perceived importance of family policies as related to career success?
- b. The perceived effectiveness of family policies at the institution?
- c. The level of satisfaction with work-life balance?

The analysis indicates that intersectionally defined groups differ in how they rated the importance of work-life policies for career success, their effectiveness at the institution, and how they rated their ability to balance work and professional roles. Of all groups, African American women were more likely to rate all of the policies, except for childcare, to be important to career success. Regarding policy effectiveness, the faculty groups significantly differed only in their assessment of the effectiveness of childcare policy at their respective institutions. The majority of each of the four faculty groups thought the policy was ineffective. With regard to the effectiveness of this policy, African American men were most likely to positively rate the effectiveness of this policy.

Second, this chapter reports the results of the regression analysis. This analysis was guided by the question: Does the overall satisfaction with the institution vary by a faculty member's race, class, gender, having dependents, being married as well as the faculty's perceptions regarding institutional and departmental support for family responsibilities?

The overall model (Model 1 and Model 2) was significant, and explained 22% of the variance in overall institutional satisfaction. The strongest independent variable was institutional

support, followed by annual salary, departmental support, and gender. Race and dependent status were not significant. Chapter Five presents a discussion of the findings, connections to existing literature, and contributions to the study of faculty experiences, limitations of the research, implications for policy implementation, and directions for future research.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to outline and describe the major findings, explore policy implications, and discuss recommendations for future research. This study explores faculty perceptions, specifically the importance and the effectiveness of care work policies, developed to assist faculty in managing substantive life events. Furthermore, I examine differences between African American women, African American men, white women, and white men in regards to overall satisfaction with work-life balance. Last, I consider how much of overall institutional satisfaction is influenced by social location in addition to departmental and institutional support related to having and raising children. Intersectional theory guided the formation of my research questions to more fully explore how individuals in unique social locations experience work-life issues within the academy. The major findings are reported and interpreted in the first section. I will then discuss how the findings might inform future policy implications as well as the importance of employing an intersectional approach to policy analysis. In closing, I consider limitations of this study and potential avenues for future research.

Major Findings

There were differences regarding the overall perceptions related to the importance and effectiveness of care work policies. Specifically, there were differences in policies designed to directly address concerns associated with eldercare and childcare as well as policies that assist faculty in meeting requirements of their faculty position. For example, eldercare and childcare policies are designed to assist in providing care work; whereas modified work policies, such as stop-the-clock and paid research leave, are designed to assist in the continuation of work

activities. How these policies were perceived differed across the intersectionally defined faculty groups. Overall, however, regardless of their social location, faculty were not as satisfied with the balance between work and family responsibilities, with only approximately 40% of faculty indicating they were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied.” Last, institutional support as well as departmental support regarding one type of care work, having and raising children, can play an important role in overall satisfaction with the institution.

To provide proper context for these findings, it is important to note that the nature of faculty work and their roles have not changed since the beginning of the modern era within American higher education (Blackburn, 1974; Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Schuster & Finklestein, 2006). Moreover, in spite of broader societal changes in gender relations, expectations, and attitudes, the general academic work environment¹⁹ and cultural norms continue to represent the traditional white male life course (Acker, 1990; Armenti, 2004). As a result, the academic work environment continues to create more challenges for faculty members occupying other social locations. In this context, the results of the current study suggest that there is a need to think more inclusively about policy formation.

These challenges are exacerbated by the fact that how a faculty member balances work and personal concerns is characterized by Blackburn (1974) as being more of a “way of life” as opposed to a job that can be left when office tasks are completed. Blackburn’s (1974) premise of “who a professor is” (p. 77) presupposes that faculty reallocate the way they spend work and personal time so that tasks in both areas are completed. However, given the diversity of the academic workforce, substantive life events (e.g., birth of a child, death of a spouse/partner, ill

¹⁹ I acknowledge that there are institutions more progressive than others, but as a collective, the academic work environment still operates on the white male life course.

parent) do affect faculty members in a profound manner creating different patterns of demands and challenges with regard to time allocation (Blackburn and Lawrence, 1995). In this context, it is argued (Bird, 2010) that the departmental culture regarding support for such care work influences how the faculty member will consider that reallocation of time and how satisfied they will be with their work environment. However, the results from the regression analysis show that institutional support for care work associated with having and raising children has a greater influence on faculty's overall institutional satisfaction than departmental support.

Bird (2010) is correct in addressing how normative practices are embedded into the university structure as well as how departmental support influences work satisfaction. However, I suggest that the perpetuation of not using family leave policies at the departmental level may bolster satisfaction with the institutional response to those with care work responsibilities. Institutions can set specific policies supporting care work, and leave little room for interpretation. Departments can reinforce informal practices and values (Bird, 2010) through the evaluation process and distribution of allocated resources. Faculty may view the efforts of the institution as supportive in their attempt to balance both family and work, and the department as being subversive in its implementation process of the institution's effort to provide assistance.

The overall structure of the academic institution allows for departments to develop certain unique practices that govern decision-making for that particular group (Sutcliffe & McNamara, 2001). The institution itself can be seen as a "rational organization and polity" (Bess & Dee, 2008, p. 546). The polity facet describes how departments interact within the confines of the institution. The department's decision-making environment may be viewed as political (Tierney, 2008), and this environment creates avenues where a faculty member's non-decision regarding policy use reinforces the values within the department. From these findings, I

assert that the institutional response in developing policies is seen as important to faculty. The institutional policy is seen as a programmed rational response to a life course issue. The political consequences of making the decision to use the policy exist at the department's level. Thus, the institution is viewed as supportive, and the department as barrier-laden due to the autonomy the department has to insert values and bias into the decision-making process. This environment can put a faculty member with care work concerns in a precarious decision-making situation.

Care work still matters, and perhaps matters even more now. As my study suggests, gender and race interactions create different policy needs and assessment for African American women and white women compared to African American men and white men. African American women and white women provided overwhelming support for the importance of policy directed at providing assistance with childcare and eldercare. Furthermore, both African American women (52.3%) and white women (43.7%) are dissatisfied with their overall experience balancing both work and family responsibilities. Findings from previous studies indicate that as long as women remain the primary provider of care work (Mason & Goulden, 2002, 2004a, 2004b; Perna 2001, 2005; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004, 2005; Wolf-Wendel & Ward 2006), they will disproportionately be dissatisfied with overall work-life balance.

Utilizing an intersectional approach to frame my research questions allowed me to show that not only do women and men experience the academy differently, but the intersection of race and gender allowed for the specific examination how social location influences satisfaction. African American men are the most satisfied within the faculty group, while African American women overwhelmingly support the creation of eldercare policies as it relates to career success. White women indicated strong support for policies related to childcare issues. White men significantly differed in degree of support when compared to white women and African

American women. In addition to race and gender, other factors should be considered when examining these differences.

For instance, only 60% of African American women indicated that they were married, yet 66.2% specified having a type of dependent. In comparison to African American men, 91.7% indicated they were married and 83.3% had a type of dependent. For white men, 92.7% specified they were married and 75.6% had a dependent, while 85.6% white women designated that they were married and 64.1% had a dependent. African American women were the only faculty group to be more than likely a single provider of some form of care work.

Examining the salary distribution, it is important to note that the majority of African American women fall within the middle regarding salary range and are not represented at the top level, whereas African American men have approximately 10% of respondents in the top salary category. Thus, marital status, dependent status, and salary may affect how a faculty member views overall satisfaction with work-life balance.

Policy perception similarities and differences. There were distinct differences between the intersectionally defined faculty groups regarding the importance of care work policies. Due to these distinct differences, I infer the difference could be linked to how the policy assists a person with balancing work and care concerns. More specifically, policies related to managing work such as stop-the-clock, modified duties, paid and unpaid research leave, are perceived as important to career success by the majority all faculty regardless of social location. However, policies directly linked to providing assistance with caregiving, such as eldercare or childcare, are not perceived as important by most African American and white men. With Colbeck (2006) suggesting that men spend slightly more time on work and less on personal activities than women, my findings suggest that premise remains the same.

However, in regard to policy effectiveness, the intersectionally defined faculty groups seemed to be in agreement on the effectiveness of most of the policies examined. The policy that received favorable assessment if its effectiveness from the majority of respondents was stop-the-clock. Around 67% of the faculty respondents viewed this policy as “effective” or “very effective.” The eldercare policy was rated as “neither effective or ineffective” by the majority of faculty (approximately 67%). This finding could be attributed to the faculty age distribution (see Table 29). Much is still unknown concerning the effects of eldercare on the academic career, and the responses support the need for additional research. The last three policies followed a similar rating pattern. For paid or unpaid research leave, close to 30% of the respondents felt the policy was “neither effective or ineffective.” However 32% of the respondents perceived this policy as “effective” at their respective institution. Examining responses related to paid or unpaid personal leave, 39% rated it “neither effective or ineffective,” and 30% rated it as being “effective.” For modified duties, 31% of faculty found the policy to be “neither effective or ineffective,” and 30% rated it as being effective on their campus. The last three policies rating pattern seems to indicate that the policies have been perceived as being effective by a relatively small percentage of respondents. Previous studies (O’Meara & Campbell, 2011; Reddick et al., 2011) document issues related to more senior faculty not being “seen” using such policies. Perhaps more needs to be done to increase the “visibility” of these policies designed to assist faculty in successfully balancing both work and family responsibilities.

Stack (2004) asserts that women, regardless of race, are still expected to be primary caregivers. In light of this, it is not surprising that African American women and white women perceived childcare and eldercare policies as more important to their career success than African

American and white men. Studies discussed in the literature review chapter reveal the majority of women are still performing care work (Mason & Goulden, 2004a, 2004b; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). In addition to working in an environment where men and women experience work differently (West & Curtis, 2007), women reported being more stressed due to juggling competing responsibilities at home and work (Hagedorn & Sax, 2003). In light of previous studies, my research seems to suggest a need for new policy approaches that can successfully address issues related to work-life balance.

Overall work-life balance satisfaction. The least satisfied faculty with balancing work-life balance was African American women. Cooper (2006) also found that African American women were the least satisfied with work-related activities. Not only do African American women have to deal with invisibility within the academy (Gregory, 1999; Guillory 2003), but also the differences in institutional service demands and assignments as well (Allen et al., 2000; Gregory, 1999). Only 25.8% of African American women felt “satisfied” or “very satisfied” in contrast to 48% of African American men. The paucity of satisfied African American women appears to indicate that the intersection of race and gender creates a unique experience in balancing work-life issues. Specifically, African American men are mentored more than African American women (Heggins, 2004; Singh, Robinson, & Williams-Green, 1995) and are provided more opportunities for research collaboration. Thus, these activities create advantages that are not afforded to all women in general. Because there are gender and race specific disadvantages within the academic work environment, such as white women and African American women performing more service work than their male counterparts (Barbezat & Hughes, 2005; Bird, Litt, & Wang, 2004), it stands to reason that women would be the least satisfied with work-life balance. Although, just examining this issue through the lens of gender is shortsighted. Faculty

who occupy intersectional locations experience not only racism but also sexism within the workplace in addition to differing work-life balance issues beyond just having and raising children. This unique experience will affect overall satisfaction within the academy.

While the original hypothesis stated that white men would be the most satisfied with overall work-life balance, they were actually the second most satisfied group of faculty in this study. However, the difference between African American men and white men was not statistically significant. Both African American men and white men were more satisfied with their work-life balance compared to African American women and white women. Considering their ratings on policy perceptions, in addition to these findings, the difference seems to indicate that both African American and white women may take greater effort to balance professional and personal/family activities.

Department support's influence on overall satisfaction. The academic life is characterized by (1) permeable public-private boundaries (Lucas, 1992), and (2) relatively autonomous nature of faculty work. In addition, academic departments are relatively autonomous units within the broader institutional patterns and structural dynamics of the host universities (Allen, 1998). The characteristics of academic work influence faculty experiences. In addition, faculty experiences are influenced by how their departments mediate the formal policy contexts by creating discipline and department-specific informal norms, standards, and expectations (Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998). Other factors, such as salary, can also influence the faculty member's experience (Barbezat & Hughes, 2005). Cognizant of these complexities, Bird (2010) asserted that informal departmental norms and practices can impede use of available family policies.

Importantly, other factors, such as salary, work-load, and departmental climate, can also influence the faculty member's work satisfaction. However, given the available data in my study, I was not able to control for other factors, such as time spent on household and academic work activities, that can also influence work satisfaction. The factors that I was able to consider in my examination of the influence of departmental and institutional support for having and raising children on institutional satisfaction included race, gender, salary, marital status and dependent status. From the regression analysis, I found that white men were not as satisfied as white women, and being married had a negative effect on satisfaction. However, as expected, having a higher salary contributed to higher overall satisfaction.

Departmental and institutional support contribute to overall faculty satisfaction. However, institutional support had a more significant role in the overall satisfaction. A possible explanation for this unexpected finding is that work-life policies are most likely generated and designed at the institutional level. Policy implementation occurs at varying levels, either at the college/school level and subsequently departmental; or directly at the departmental level. Regardless of where implementation occurs, departmental influence concerning policy use (Bird, 2010; Reddick, 2011; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999) will determine a faculty member's use. Hence, overall faculty satisfaction is linked to both, institutional and departmental support, with the institutional support (i.e., the actual existence of specific policies) appearing to play a larger role. Bird (2010) acknowledged more needs to be done besides creating policies. For example, providing opportunities to better understand how subtle gendered biases, especially related to caregiving work, can assist in creating a more inclusive work environment for all faculty.

Intersectional Analysis

This study contributes to the intersectional perspective by examining how one's social location influences and creates disadvantages as well as advantages related to work-life issues within institutional and departmental environments. Additionally, it is important to note that caregiving must expand beyond the gendered assumption that women are solely responsible for the care work required to maintain the household. While white women were satisfied in how the institution and department supported care work, white men were the least satisfied. Changing the normative model of faculty work, which has been largely based on the male model of work, requires developing strategies challenging traditional work patterns within the academy. An understanding that gender alone does not constitute a shared experience, and that not all care work is related to having children, can contribute to developing more inclusive options for those dealing with work-life balance concerns. Ultimately, faculty that are more satisfied with negotiating the complexities of the academic work life and personal obligations would be retained at a higher rate than those with lower satisfaction.

How the selected family leave policies were perceived in relation to one's career success differed across the intersectionally defined faculty groups. Childcare policy was important to career success of the majority of white women, whereas eldercare policy was important to the majority of African American women. When compared with white men, a higher percentage of African American men rated the importance of family policies to their success, but their percentage was lower than that of African American women. In this sample, African American women were the least satisfied with work-life balance while African American men were the most satisfied. Since intra-group differences matter, institutions must move beyond dichotomous assessments of examining only race or only gender to gain a holistic assessment of the overall

faculty experience. Departments, along with institutions, should find ways to be more inclusive to men caregivers. To change the normative experience, opening access to policy options could assist in creating a new experience within the academy regarding faculty work-life balance.

Policy Implications

Schuster and Finklestein (2006) characterize the faculty work environment as being slow to change due to the fact that “their work and their careers are at once governed and enabled by a set of values and customs that hark back to the medieval guilds of Europe, emphasizing core academic values” (p. 125). Further, the normative values of the broader scientific model are embedded in the institutional structure and counterbalance attempts at institutional transformation (Chan, 2005). The university is a system of “autonomous academic departments and professional schools” (Alpert, 1985, p. 246), and the overall mission of the university is carried out by “autonomous” faculty operating within a decentralized departmental structure. Hence, to successfully perform their mission, institutions must assure that faculty continue to engage in “successful, self-directed search for new knowledge” (Alpert, 1985, p. 247). Thus, the faculty member has to be intrinsically motivated in such an autonomous work environment. The convergence of departmental demands related to producing quality research, excellence in teaching, and performing exceptional service creates moments where faculty may feel like work responsibilities infringe on family life. This infringement leaves faculty, who want both a successful career and family life, in a system that continues to perpetuate antiquated organizational processes elevating work above all else (Lewis & Humbert, 2010).

In this context, the faculty respondents indicated that most of the policies examined, except for eldercare, were important to career success. With this survey targeting tenure-track faculty members, there is hope that the value placed on the policies associated with negotiating

care work will create an environment where both men and women, regardless of social location, will feel empowered to use such policies. Women are still disproportionately using policies in place to assist with managing work and care responsibilities (O'Meara & Campbell, 2011). Institutions should create clear guidelines regarding policy use especially considering faculty with caregiving concerns (Monroe, Ozyurt, Wrigley, & Alexander, 2008).

In relation to the organizational context, although in legal terms the U.S. care work and career-friendly policies are gender neutral, they are not necessarily perceived as such nor do they have gender-neutral effects (Gerten, 2011). For instance, care work-related policies are often seen as dealing with childcare issues alone. Also, since women are more likely to use these policies their use creates a connotation of women choosing a “mommy” track and men being committed to their career track. Both African American and white women placed more importance on policies related to childcare and eldercare than African American and white men.

To address intersectional issues regarding job-satisfaction and faculty careers suggested by this study, it may be desirable to encourage policy use by both men and women for broad care work concerns, including those not related to childcare. Not all policies affect people the same way, yet there is still an assumption of a normative (woman's) experience if one is presented with care work. For instance, those with eldercare concerns may have a different set of challenges than those with childcare responsibilities. Additionally, an extended family member, not covered by basic leave policies, might require an extended amount of assistance. Both of these situations are beyond the scope of what is considered important care work within the traditional context.

A potential disconnect exists between thought and use. More specifically, the respondents to this survey thought policies were important to their career success, however there

were mixed perceptions regarding the effectiveness on their respective campuses. I suggest that the traditional organizational values governing faculty work reinforce certain behavioral and professional norms that impede current policy use. Outdated gender beliefs continue to exist in how faculty perceive policy and rate work-life balance. Furthermore, institutions should examine underlying assumptions related to both race and gender in efforts to change the overall culture as it relates to caregiving responsibilities.

In an attempt to create an environment where both men and women can participate in caring for family concerns as well as continue being engaged scholars, new policy guidelines should be considered. Creating an automatic “opt-in” for policy usage regarding a “trigger event” could assist in creating a work environment where faculty would not experience bias in using a family policy. The trigger event could be defined as a family event causing a faculty member to take a certain amount extended leave. In addition, the institution should have clear guidelines for family events, for example events defined under the Federal Medical Leave Act. These events could be extended beyond the university staff personnel to include faculty. By empowering a faculty member to decline use of the policy option as opposed to making the faculty member hunt for such assistance, the normative experience of a faculty member denying themselves the use of such policy could change. The WorkLife Law Center at the University of California Hastings College of the Law (2011) advocates:

Designing policies as opt-out rather than opt-in sends the message that the institution expects faculty to use the policies that are made available to them. As noted above, opt out policies also avoid situations in which faculty feel uncomfortable asking their chairs for permission to use the policies (<http://www.worklifelaw.org/EffectivePracticesToRetainWomen/designParentalLeaves.html>).

Ultimately, many of the policy approaches of the past are based on outmoded conceptions of women’s social and economic roles, and create environments in which men self-select to

exclude themselves from seeking these leave options. Furthermore, by not fully examining the total experiences of intersectionally defined faculty members, we perpetuate traditional institutional and ideological dynamics that exclude those who do not share the same normative family factors. Implementing an opt-out process for leave policy would be the first step in changing the normative experience for faculty members struggling to balance both work obligations and family responsibilities.

Limitations to Study

There are several limitations to this study. First, this study used a secondary dataset and employed statistical tests that are sample specific, so to make broad generalizations would be risky. By using a secondary dataset, I also ran the risk of the intent of a question being misconstrued and interpreted to mean something different from the construct created by the original researchers (Kiecolt & Nathan, 1985).

Second, while the COACHE survey provides valuable data, it must be noted that participation in this survey is based on institutional membership in the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education. Not all institutions are invited to participate (only four year institutions are invited) and not all institutions that are invited purchase the membership (COACHE, 2011). The cost for a research, doctoral and large master's university to participate in one survey is \$20,000.00 for a three year membership and \$18,000.00 to renew membership, and the amount required for membership could be cost prohibitive for some institutions. I surmise that only institutions with the ability to allocate the appropriate resources participated, and this leads me to posit that these institutions are able to provide additional benefits to their faculty not offered at other institution types.

Third, family leave policy is specific to state policy, and even more specific to how institution-based policy addresses the leave concern. Besides Australia, the United States is the only industrialized country to not mandate paid leave for family related situations (Belkin, 2010). Further, the only federal policy mandate to address family leave policy is the 1993 Family Medical Leave Act signed into law during the first Clinton Administration. The burden has been on the states to design and pass more progressive leave policies for individuals with family management concerns. The broad representation of family leave policies in the survey limits the generalization of the importance and the effectiveness of such policies to other “high research activity” and “very high research activity” institutions. Additionally, the definitive faculty experience at a research university should not be extrapolated from this study. Research universities differ in structure and governance; and care work policies offered, as well as access to those policies, are institutional specific. However, the general insight into how faculty from this institution type view the importance of such policies that this study provides is important for developing future research initiatives.

Fourth, in examining the importance and effectiveness of family leave policies, I only used race and gender as criterion to form the faculty groups. The intent was to explore how faculty from the intersectionally defined faculty groups differed in policy perceptions using statistical tests that met data distribution assumptions. Different variables and statistical methods could produce a different outcome.

Last, I examined one dimension of incongruence between departmental and institutional expectations. Other factors may exist that perpetuate incongruence, specifically departmental leadership as well as institutional expectations.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research should concentrate on generating more information regarding adult dependents because this study defines the majority of care responsibilities in relation to children. While I was able to examine faculty policy perceptions regarding eldercare, much more needs to be done. Specifically, future studies should examine what unique problems exist for faculty who have eldercare responsibilities, in addition to exploring the effects of existing resources on faculty members with this type of care work concern. With the changing demographic landscape in the United States, many individuals will, if not already, be in the process of caring for an adult dependent. Clearly, some of the respondents thought it was important to career success, and as the baby boomer population ages and birthrates decline, this will become an issue for some faculty.

Likewise, while it was important to examine the perceptions regarding the policies designed to assist faculty in balancing work-life issues, it would also be important to examine how the time spent on activities in both spheres of work influences perception. In many instances, the research on work-life management views work as an issue only for women. From this study, women were more satisfied with the efforts put forth to assist them in balancing care responsibilities and work, but other factors could provide an additional explanation on overall satisfaction. Specifically, this analysis only included variables related to care work because the survey used in this project did not include questions directly tied to how time was spent in the private sphere of work.

Last, I was able to show how intersectionally defined faculty differed in policy perceptions, and I believe these findings could guide discussions on future policy development. Still, race and gender, in the context of examining the interaction of overall satisfaction and

support for care work, should be examined further to identify in which ways the normative experience influences the academic worklife and include examining those groups that were excluded from this study.

References

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender and Society, 4*(2), 139-158.
- Acker, J. (1999). Rewriting class, race, and gender: Problems in feminist thinking. In M. M. Ferree, J. Lorber, & B. B. Hess (Eds.), *Revisioning gender* (pp. 44-69). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Allan, E. J. (2003). Constructing women's status: Policy discourses of university women's commission reports. *Harvard Educational Review, 73*(1), 44-72.
- Allen, H. L. (1998). *Faculty workload and productivity: Gender comparisons*. The NEA 1998 Almanac of Higher Education, 29-44.
- Allen, W. R., Epps, E. G., Guillory, E. A., Suh, S. A., & Bonous-Hammarth, M. (2000). The black academic: Faculty status among African-Americans in U.S. higher education. *The Journal of Negro Education, 69*(1/2), 112-127.
- Alpert, D. (1985). Performance and paralysis: The organizational context of the American research university. *The Journal of Higher Education, 56*(3), 241-281.
- Armenti, C. (2004). Women faculty seeking tenure and parenthood: Lessons from previous generations. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 34*(1), 65-83.
- American Association of University Professors. (2001). *Statement of principles on family responsibilities and academic work*. Found online at: <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/workfam-stmt.htm>
- August, L. P. (2005). *A study of attrition among female tenure-track faculty* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Proquest Digital Dissertations. (UMI No. 3186566)
- Bailyn, L. (2003). Academic careers and gender equity: Lessons learned from MIT. *Gender, Work & Organization, 10*(2), 137-153.
- Barbezat, D., & Hughes, J. (2005). Salary structure effects and the gender pay gap in academia. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(6), 621-640.
- Berggren, H. M. (2008). US family-live policy: the legacy of 'separate spheres'. *International Journal of Social Welfare, 17*(4), 312-323.
- Bess, J., & Dee, J. (2008). *College and university organization: Effective policy and practice*. (1 ed., Vol. 2). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

- Bird, S. R. (2010). Unsettling universities' incongruous, gendered bureaucratic structures: A case study approach. *Gender, Work, & Organization*, 1-29. Advance online publication retrieved from: DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-0432.2009.00510.x
- Bird, S., Litt, J., & Wang, Y. (2004). Creating status of women reports: Institutional housekeeping as "women's work". *NWSA Journal*, 16(1), 194-206.
- Blackburn, R. T. (1974). The meaning of work in academia. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 1974(2), 75-99.
- Blackburn, R. T., & Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Brewer, R. M. (1993) Theorizing race, class and gender: The new scholarship of Black feminist intellectuals and Black women's labor. In S.M. James & A.P.A. Busia (Eds.), *Theorizing Black Feminisms: The Visionary Pragmatism of Black women* (pp. 13-30). London: Routledge.
- Bronstein, P., & Farnsworth, L. (1998). Gender differences in faculty experiences of interpersonal climate and processes for advancement. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(5), 557-585.
- Cawyer, C. S., Simonds, C., & Davis, S. (2002). Mentoring to facilitate socialization: The case of the new faculty member. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 15(2), 225-242.
- Chandler, C. (1996). Mentoring and women in academia: Reevaluating the traditional model. *NWSA Journal*, 8(3), 79-101.
- Chadiha, L. A., Rafferty, J., & Pickard, J. (2003). The influence of caregiving stressors, social support, and caregiving appraisal on marital functioning among African American wife caregivers. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 29(4), 479-490.
- Chan, A. S. (2005). Policy discourses and changing practice: Diversity and the university-college. *Higher Education*, 50(1), 129-157.
- Clark, S. M., & Corcoran, M. (1986). Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty: A case of accumulative disadvantage? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 57(1), 20-43.
- Colbeck, C. L. (2006). How female and male faculty with families manage work and personal lives. In S. J. Bracken, J. K. Allen, & D. R. Dean (Eds.), *The balancing act: Gendered perspectives in faculty roles and work lives* (pp. 9-29). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

- Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education. (2010). *The experience of tenure-track faculty at research universities: Analysis of COACHE survey results by academic area and gender*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Collins, P. H. (1999). Moving beyond gender: Intersectionality and scientific knowledge. In M. M. Ferree, J. Lorber, & B. B. Hess (Eds.), *Revisioning gender* (pp. 261-284). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cooper, T. (2006). *The sista' network: African-American women faculty successfully negotiating the road to tenure*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Crenshaw, K. (2000). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. In J. James, & T. D. Sharpley-Whiting (Eds.), *The black feminist reader* (pp. 208-38). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Department of Health & Human Services. (2011). Administration on Aging. Profile of Older Americans: 2010. Available at: http://www.aoa.gov/AoARoot/Aging_Statistics/Profile/index.aspx
- Department of Labor. (2012). Wage and Hour Division. Family Medical Leave Act. Available at: <http://www.dol.gov/whd/fmla/>
- Dilworth-Anderson, P., Brummett, B. H., Goodwin, P., Williams, S. W., Williams, R. B., & Siegler, I. C. (2005). Effect of race on cultural justifications for caregiving. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 60B(5), S257-S262.
- Dilworth-Anderson, P., Williams, I. C., & Gibson, B. E. (2002). Issues of race, ethnicity, and culture in caregiving research: A 20-year review (1980-2000). *The Gerontologist*, 42(2), 237-272.
- Dodds, D. T. (2005). Chapter 4: PETE women's experiences of being mentored into postsecondary faculty positions. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 24, 344-367.
- Ellemers, N., van den Heuvel, H., de Gilder, D., Maass, A., & Bonvini, A. (2004). The under-representation of women in science: Differential commitment or the queen bee syndrome? *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 43(3), 315-338.
- Feldberg, R., & Glenn, E. (1979). Male and female: Job versus gender models in the sociology of work. *Social Problems*, 26(5), 524-538.
- Finley, N. J. (1989). Theories of family labor as applied to gender differences in caregiving for elderly parents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51(1), 79-86.

- Fox, M. F. (2010). Women and men faculty in academic science and engineering: Social-organizational indicators and implications. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 53(7), 997-1012.
- Fox, M. F. (2008). Institutional transformation and the advancement of women faculty: The case of academic science and engineering. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education Handbook of Theory and Research* (pp. 73-103). New York: Springer.
- Gerten, A. M. (2011). Moving beyond family-friendly policies for faculty mothers. *Affilia: Journal of Women & Social Work*, 26(1), 47-58.
- Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. (1996). *Statistical methods in psychology and education* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Glazer-Raymo, J. (1999). *Shattering the myths: Women in academe*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Glover, W. F. (2006). *Navigating the academy: The career advancement of Black and White women full-time faculty* (Doctoral dissertation). Proquest Digital Dissertations. (UMI No. 3209548)
- Gopalan, N., & Brannon, L. A. (2006). Increasing family members' appreciation of family caregiving stress. *The Journal of Psychology*, 140(2), 85-94.
- Gregory, S. T. (2001). Black faculty women in the academy: History, status, and future. *Journal of Negro Education*, 70(3), 124-138.
- Gregory, S. T. (1999). *Black women in the academy: The secrets to success and achievement*. Revised and updated edition. New York: university press of America, Inc.
- Grundy, E., & Henretta, J. C. (2006). Between elderly parents and adult children: A new look at the intergenerational care provided by the 'sandwich generation'. *Ageing & Society*, 26(5), 707-722.
- Guidry, J. J. (2006). Can a brotha' get a break? Teaching on a majority white research university campus. In C. A. Stanley (Ed.), *Faculty of color: Teaching in predominately white colleges and universities* (pp. 166-174). Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Guillory, E. A. (2003). *African-American female faculty: Academic identities, institutional location, and professional satisfaction* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Proquest Digital Dissertations. (UMI No. 3133002)
- Hagedorn, L. S., & Sax, L. J. (2003). Marriage, children, and aging parents: The role of family-related factors in faculty job satisfaction. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 19(2), 65-76.

- Hancock, A. (2007). When multiplication doesn't equal quick addition: Examining intersectionality as a research paradigm. *Perspectives on Politics*, 5(1), 63-79.
- Heggins, W. J. (2004). Preparing African-American males for the professoriate: Issues and challenges. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, 28(2), 354-364.
- Hendricks, F. M. (1996). *Career experiences of black women faculty at research I universities* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Proquest Digital Dissertations. (UMI No. 9717161)
- Hofferth, S. L. (2005). Secondary data analysis in family research. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 67(4), 891-907.
- Hollenshead, C. S., Sullivan, B., Smith, G. C., August, L., & Hamilton, S. (2005). Work/family policies in higher education: Survey data and case studies of policy implementation. In J. W. Curtis (Ed.), *The challenges of balancing faculty careers and family work* (pp. 41-66). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Holvino, E. (2008). Intersections: The simultaneity of race, gender and class in organization studies. *Gender, Work and Organization*. 1-30.
- Jacobs, J. A. & Winslow, S. E. (2004). The academic life course, time pressures and gender inequality. *Community, Work, & Family*, 7(2), 143-161.
- Johnson-Bailey, J., & Cervero, R. M. (2004). Mentoring in black and white: The intricacies of cross-cultural mentoring. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 12(1), 7-21.
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intentions to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), 518-542.
- Kelly, E. L., Kossek, E. E., Hammer, L. B., Durham, M., Bray, J., Chermack, K., Murphy, L. A., Daskubar, D. (2008). Getting there from here: Research on the effects of work-family initiatives on work-family conflict and business outcomes. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), 305-349.
- Kiecolt, K. J., & Nathan, L. E. (1985). *Secondary analysis of survey data*. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Landry, B. (2007). *Race, gender, and class: Theory and methods of analysis*. Prentice Hall.
- Lease, S. H. (1999). Occupational role stressors, coping, support, and hardiness as predictors of strain in academic faculty: An emphasis on new and female faculty. *Research in Higher Education*, 40(3), 285-307.
- Lewis, S., & Humbert, L. (2010). Discourse or reality? *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 29(3), 239.

- Lucas, C. J. (1994). *American higher education: A history*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Mason, M. A., Goulden, M., & Wolfinger, N. H. (2006). Babies matter. In S. J. Bracken, J. K. Allen, & D. R. Dean (Eds.), *The balancing act: Gendered perspectives in faculty roles and work lives* (pp. 9-29). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Mason M. A., & Goulden, M. (2002). Do babies matter? *Academe*, 88(6), 21-27.
- Mason, M. A., & Goulden, M. (2004). Do babies matter (part II)? Closing the baby gap. *Academe*, 90(6), 11-15.
- Mason, M. A., & Goulden, M. (2004). Marriage and baby blues: Redefining gender equity in the academy. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 596(1), 86-103.
- McCormick, A. C., & Zhao, C. (2005). Rethinking and reframing the carnegie classification. (cover story). *Change*, 37(5), 50-57.
- Milem, J. F., Berger, J. B., & Dey, E. L. (2000). Faculty time allocation: A study of change over twenty years. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(4), 453-475.
- Monroe, K., Ozyurt, S., Wrigley, T., & Alexander, A. (2008). Gender equality in academia: Bad news from the trenches, and some possible solutions. *Perspectives on Politics*, 6(2), 215-233.
- Neal, M. B., Chapman, N. J., Ingersoll-Dayton, B., & Emlen, A. C. (1993). *Balancing work and caregiving for children, adults, and elders*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- O'Meara, K., & Campbell, C. M. (2011). Faculty sense of agency in decisions about work and family. *The Review of Higher Education*, 34(3), 447-476.
- Pedhazur, E. J. (1997). *Multiple regression in behavioral research, explanation and prediction*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Perna, L. W. (2001). The relationship between family responsibilities and employment status among college and university faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72(5), 584-611.
- Perna, L. W. (2005). Sex differences in faculty tenure and promotion: The contribution of family ties. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(3), 277-307.
- Probert, B. (2005). 'I just couldn't fit it in': Gender and unequal outcomes in academic careers. *Gender, Work, and Organization*, 12(1), 50-72.
- Ramachandran, G. (2005). Intersectionality as "catch-22": Why identity performances demands are neither harmless nor reasonable. *Albany Law Review*, 62(1), 299-342.

- Raschick, M., & Ingersoll-Dayton, B. (2004). The costs and rewards of caregiving among aging spouses and adult children. *Family Relations*, 53(3), 317-325.
- Reddick, R. J., Rochlen, A. B., Grasso, J. R., Reilly, E. D., & Spikes, D. D. (2011). Academic fathers pursuing tenure: A qualitative study of work-family conflict, coping strategies, and departmental culture. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 13(1), 1-15.
- Renzulli, L. A., Grant, L., & Kathuria, S. (2006). Race, gender, and the wage gap: Comparing faculty salaries in predominately white and historically black colleges and universities. *Gender & Society*, 20(4), 491-510.
- Reynolds, A. (1992). Charting the changes in junior faculty: Relationships among socialization, acculturation, and gender. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 63(6), 637-652.
- Richman, A.L, Civian, J.T., Shannon, L. L., Hill, E. J., & Brennan, R. T. (2008). The relationship of perceived flexibility, supportive work-life policies, and use of formal flexible arrangements and occasional flexibility to employee engagement and expected retention. *Community, Work, & Family*, 11(2), 183-197.
- Ropers-Huilman, B. (2000). Aren't you satisfied yet? Women faculty members' interpretations of their academic work. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2000(105), 21-32.
- Rosenthal, C. J., Martin-Matthews, A., & Keefe, J. M. (2007). Care management and care provision for older relatives amongst employed informal care-givers. *Ageing & Society*, 27(5), 755-778.
- Rosser, V. J. (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(3), 285-309.
- Ryan, A. M., & Kossek E. E. (2008). Work-life policy, implementation, breaking down or creating barriers to inclusiveness. *Human Resource Management*, 42(2), 295-310.
- Sax, L. J., Hagedorn, L. S., Arredondo, M., & Dicrisi III, F. A. (2002). Faculty research productivity: Exploring the role of gender and family-related factors. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(4), 423-446.
- Sayer, L. C. (2005). Gender, time and inequality: Trends in women's and men's paid work, unpaid work and free time. *Social Forces*, 84(1), 285-303.
- Scanlan, C. L. (n.d.). Introduction to nonparametric statistics. Retrieved from http://www.umdnj.edu/idsweb/idst6000/nonparametric_analysis.pdf
- Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Shockley, K. M., & Allen, T. D. (2010). Investigating the missing link in flexible work arrangement utilization: An individual difference perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 76*(1), 131-142.
- Shoptaugh, C. F., Phelps, J. A., & Visio, M. E. (2004). Employee eldercare responsibilities: Should organizations care? *Journal of Business and Psychology, 19*(2), 179-196.
- Siltanen, J. & Stanworth, M. (1984). The politics of private woman and public man. *Theory and Society, 13*(1), 91-118.
- Singh, K., Robinson, A., & Williams-Green, J. (1995). Differences in perceptions of African American women and men faculty and administrators. *The Journal of Negro Education, 64*(4), 401-408.
- Smith, J. W., & Calasanti, T. (2005). The influences of gender, race, and ethnicity on workplace experiences of institutional and social isolation: An exploratory study of university faculty. *Sociological Spectrum, 25*(3), 307-334.
- Sokoloff, N. J. (1988). Contributions of feminism and Marxism to the sociology of women and work. In A. Stromberg & S. Harkess (Eds.), *Women working: Theories and facts in perspective 2nd edition* (pp. 116-131). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Stack, S. (2004). Gender, children, and research productivity. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(8), 891-920.
- Starrels, M. E., Ingersoll-Dayton, B., Dowler, D. W., & Neal, M. B. (1997). The stress of caring for a parent: Effects of the elder's impairment on an employed, adult child. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 59*(4), 860-872.
- Sullivan, B., Hollenshead, C., & Smith, G. (2004). Developing and implementing work-family policies for faculty. *Academe, 90*(6), 24-27.
- Sutcliffe, K. M., & McNamara, G. (2001). Controlling decision-making practice in organizations. *Organization Science, 12*(4), pp. 484-501.
- Thomas, S. L., & Heck, R. H. (2001). Analysis of large-scale secondary data in higher education research: Potential perils associated with complex sampling designs. *Research in Higher Education, 42*(5), 517-540.
- Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). When work-family benefits are not enough: The influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*(3), 392-415.
- Tierney, W. G. (2008). *The impact of culture on organizational decision-making: Theory and practice in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

- Toutkoushian, R. K., & Conley, V. M. (2005). Progress for women in academe, yet inequities persist: Evidence from NSOPF: 99. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(1), 1-28.
- Turner, W. L., Wallace, B. R., Anderson, J. R., & Bird, C. (2004). The last mile of the way: Understanding caregiving in African American families at the end-of-life. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 30*(4), 427-438.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2010). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2009* (NCES 2010-013), Table 246.
- Valian, V. (2005). Beyond gender schemas: Improving the advancement of women in academia. *Hypatia, 20*(3), 198-240.
- Vasil, L. (1996). Social process skills and career achievement among male and female academics. *The Journal of Higher Education, 67*(1), 103-114.
- Walker, D. M. (2008). The United States' four deficits. *Brown Journal of World Affairs, 14*(2), 165-173.
- Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. E. (2005). Work and family perspective from research university faculty. In J. W. Curtis (Ed.), *The challenges of balancing faculty careers and family work* (pp. 67-80). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. E. (2004). Academic motherhood: Managing complex roles in research universities. *Review of Higher Education, 27*(2), 233-257.
- West, M. S., & Curtis, J. W. (2007). *AAUP faculty gender equity indicators 2006*. Washington DC: American Association of University Professors.
- Wolf-Wendel, L. E., & Ward, K. (2006). Academic life and motherhood: Variations by institutional type. *Higher Education, 52*(3), 487-521.
- Work Life Law. (2011). Best practices to retain women. Worklife Law: A Center of UC Hastings College of Law. Available at <http://www.worklifelaw.org/EffectivePracticesToRetainWomen/>
- Yee, J. L. & Schulz, R. (2000). Gender differences in psychiatric morbidity among family caregivers: A review and analysis. *Gerontologist, 40*(2), 147-164.
- Zhou, Y., & Volkwein, J. F. (2004). Examining the influences on faculty departure intentions: A comparison of tenured versus nontenured faculty at research universities using NSOPF-99. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(2), 139-176.

APPENDIX A

November 29, 2010

MEMORANDUM

TO: Heather Schneller
Anna Zajicek

FROM: Ro Windwalker
IRB Coordinator

RE: New Protocol Approval

IRB Protocol #: 10-11-297

Protocol Title: *Gender and Race Differences in Institutional Satisfaction with Work-Family Policy: The Influence of Department Support and Dependent Status*

Review Type: EXEMPT EXPEDITED FULL IRB

Approved Project Period: Start Date: 11/29/2010 Expiration Date: 11/28/2011

Your protocol has been approved by the IRB. Protocols are approved for a maximum period of one year. If you wish to continue the project past the approved project period (see above), you must submit a request, using the form *Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects*, prior to the expiration date. This form is available from the IRB Coordinator or on the Compliance website (<http://www.uark.edu/admin/rsspinfo/compliance/index.html>). As a courtesy, you will be sent a reminder two months in advance of that date. However, failure to receive a reminder does not negate your obligation to make the request in sufficient time for review and approval. Federal regulations prohibit retroactive approval of continuation. Failure to receive approval to continue the project prior to the expiration date will result in Termination of the protocol approval. The IRB Coordinator can give you guidance on submission times.

If you wish to make *any* modifications in the approved protocol, you must seek approval *prior to* implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact me at 120 Ozark Hall, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.

APPENDIX B

Table 25 Frequencies: Faculty member married or had a partner

	Not Married	%	Married	%	Total	%
White men	68	7.3%	863	92.7%	931	100%
White women	120	14.4%	712	85.6%	832	100%
African American men	4	8.3%	44	91.7%	48	100%
African American women	26	40.0%	39	60.0%	65	100%
Total	218	11.6%	1658	88.4%	1876	100%

Table 26 Frequencies: Do you have any children or other dependents?

	No	%	Yes	%	Total	%
White men	227	24.4%	704	75.6%	931	100%
White women	299	35.9%	533	64.1%	832	100%
African American men	8	16.7%	40	83.3%	48	100%
African American women	22	33.8%	43	66.2%	65	100%
Total	556	29.6%	1320	70.4%	1876	100%

Table 27²⁰ Frequencies: What is your annual salary?

	\$30,000 to \$44,999	%	\$45,000 to \$59,999	%	\$60,000 to \$74,999	%	\$75,000 to \$89,999	%
White men	5	.5%	266	28.6%	261	28.0%	177	19.0%
White women	17	2.0%	278	33.4%	298	35.8%	111	13.3%
African American men	0	0%	9	18.8%	16	33.3%	7	14.6%
African American women	0	0%	22	33.8%	26	40.0%	12	18.5%
Total	22	1.2%	575	30.7%	601	32.0%	307	16.4%

Table 27 Frequencies cont.: What is your annual salary?

	\$90,000 to \$104,999	%	\$105,000 to \$119,999	%	\$120,000 or above	%	Total	%
White men	94	10.1%	56	6.0%	72	7.7%	931	100%
White women	74	8.9%	14	1.7%	40	4.8%	832	100%
African American men	7	14.6%	4	8.3%	5	10.4%	48	100%
African American women	4	6.2%	1	1.5%	0	0%	65	100%
Total	179	9.5%	75	4.0%	117	6.2%	1876	100%

²⁰ There were no faculty members making less than \$30,000 within the dataset used in the regression analysis.

Table 28 Frequencies: Faculty Groups by Academic Area

Faculty Groups	Humanities		Social Sciences		Physical Sciences		Biological Sciences		Visual & Performing Arts		Engineering/ Comp Sci/ Math/Stats	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White men	179	12.2%	227	15.5%	109	7.5%	97	6.6%	96	6.6%	203	13.9%
White women	226	17.6%	251	19.5%	52	4.0%	75	5.8%	55	4.3%	71	5.5%
African American men	8	10.1%	12	15.2%	1	1.3%	1	1.3%	2	2.5%	15	19.0%
African American women	11	8.9%	24	19.4%	2	1.6%	4	3.2%	3	2.4%	9	7.3%
Total	424	14.4%	514	17.4%	164	5.6%	177	6.0%	156	5.3%	298	10.1%

Table 28 cont.: Frequencies cont.: Faculty Groups by Academic Area

Faculty Groups	Health & Human Ecology		Agriculture/ Nat Res/ Env Sci		Business		Education		Medical Schools & Health Professions		Other Professions	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White men	21	1.4%	105	7.2%	89	6.1%	70	4.8%	150	10.3%	116	7.9%
White women	62	4.8%	66	5.1%	53	4.1%	108	8.4%	152	11.8%	116	9.0%
African American men	1	1.3%	4	5.1%	9	11.4%	12	15.2%	6	7.6%	8	10.1%
African American women	3	2.4%	2	1.6%	6	4.8%	31	25.0%	10	8.1%	19	15.3%
Total	87	2.9%	177	6.0%	157	5.3%	221	7.5%	318	10.8%	259	8.8%

Total number of respondents: white men=1462; white women=1287; African American men=79; African American women=124

Table 29: Frequencies: Faculty Groups by Age

Faculty Groups	24 to 34		35 to 44		45 to 54		55-to 64		65 and Over	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White men	413	28.7%	790	54.9%	191	13.3%	43	3.0%	1	0.1%
White women	373	29.9%	654	52.4%	168	13.5%	50	4.0%	2	0.1%
African American men	12	15.6%	45	13.5%	14	18.2%	5	6.5%	1	1.3%
African American women	18	15.3%	59	4.0%	30	25.4%	11	9.3%	0	0.0%
Total	816	28.3%	1548	53.8%	403	14.0%	109	3.8%	4	0.1%