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This study investigates approximately 200 women tenure-track faculty members’ experiences with and perceptions of issues surrounding work and family issues in higher education at public comprehensive institutions in the Midwest. This study identified what women tenure-track faculty members at comprehensive universities who self-identify as caretakers perceive as normative experiences and expectations regarding work and family and the extent to which these perceptions differ from self-reported behaviors. In addition, the results reveal the extent to which women faculty members believe they experience cognitive dissonance and/or feelings of alienation regarding their understandings of work and family norms at their comprehensive institutions of higher education. Finally, the findings illustrate how women’s experiences with balancing work and family in higher education relate to elements of job satisfaction. Specifically, the less comfortable women faculty caretakers are with family talk at work in general, the less satisfied they are with their role as faculty member overall, the less satisfied they are institutional support to balance work and family, and the less satisfied they are with job security and potential for promotion. Each of the six hypotheses related to social norms theory revealed that women faculty believe their experiences with balancing work and family in higher education represent the minority of women faculty experiences, when in reality, their experiences are actually representative of the majority of self-reported women’s experiences with balancing work and family.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Work and family issues are on the conscience of educators and administrators in higher education (Wolf-Wendel, 2006). The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (2001) has asserted that “the lack of a clear boundary in academic lives between work and family has, at least historically, meant that work has been all pervasive, often to the detriment of family” (p. 2). Research on policy and practice has suggested a disconnect between “policies written and policies used” (Kirby & Krone, 2002), meaning employees have policy entitlements which (on face value) are available for balancing work and family; however, they often go unused when needed (Hochschild, 1997). Kirby (2000) explored workplace communication among organizational members regarding the implementation of work/family policies. Kirby found that employees receive mixed messages about work and family policies from supervisors, resulting in organizational members having to make “personal judgment calls” when deciding whether or not to take advantage of the policies.

Statement of the Problem

Jacobs and Gerson (2004) claimed that “good policy depends on an accurate analysis of the source of the problem” (pp. 6-7); however, research on work and family policies suggests these policies do not work because they are not used. Work and family conflict literature offers two primary reasons why policies go unused: (a) stigmatizing norms and (b) colleague control. Maslach (2005) explained that there are negative repercussions for taking advantage of work and family policies. Hochschild (1997) referred to these negative repercussions as unstated costs. These unstated costs or negative repercussions are socialized stigmas that Kirby and Krone (2002) argued stem from colleagues and supervisors viewing use of work/family policies as abusing employee entitlements. Kirby and Krone (2002) revealed that colleagues often control
other colleagues’ use of family leave rights by discursively structuring work and family policies as something employees take advantage of (or abuse), as opposed to rights they are entitled to use.

Scholars focusing on work and family issues have strongly stated that work and family balance/conflict is a women’s issue (Perna, 2001). In response, the AAUP (2001) called for administrations to scrutinize policies and practices in higher education that structurally limit women faculty’s access to balancing work and family on an institutionalized level. Only approximately 31% of women faculty have children (Perna), but demographics of newly hired faculty suggest that an increasing number are likely to want to have children (Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006). Feminist and communication scholars alike have suggested that these statistics have resulted because the history and tradition of an academic life that is male and childless has continued to pose barriers for women as they seek to gain entry and advancement in the academy (Wolf-Wendel & Ward).

Purpose and Significance of Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate women tenure-track faculty members’ experiences with and perceptions concerning balancing work and family in higher education. The predominance of research on work and family issues in higher education has focused on exploring women’s experiences via qualitative research methods (Marshall, 2004; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004; Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006). This study approached the topic with quantitative, social scientific research methods.

In addition, research about academic life has focused primarily on faculty experiences at research universities, which has left a gap in the literature about the range of faculty experiences at other institution types (Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006). More than two-thirds of U.S. faculty
work at non-research academic institutions (*Digest of Education Statistics*, 2003). As Clark (1987) noted:

American academics are distributed in widely varied institutions as well as in different disciplines, in many kinds of universities, four and two-year colleges as well as in numerous subjects. The structures and cultures of those diverse settings cry out for our attention; they heavily shape academic life. (p. xxii)

Hollenshead, Sullivan, Smith, August, and Hamilton (2005) found that research institutions were more likely to have formalized and institutionalized work and family policies than do institutions of other Carnegie types. The results of their research found that a “chilly climate” often discouraged faculty from taking advantage of work and family policies and that “resistance to maternity and paternity leave was said to emerge from subcultures in the university that are male-dominated and senior in age and experiences” (Hollenshead et al., p. 62). Wolf-Wendel and Ward expanded the investigation of faculty experiences with balancing work and family at various types of Carnegie (2000) classified institutions. Their findings suggested that women faculty at comprehensive institutions have the most diverse range of experiences balancing work and family (in relation to research universities, liberal arts colleges, and community colleges).

Research has also suggested that workplace work/family issues extend beyond politics surrounding formalized policies (Gibson, 2006; Hochschild, 1997; Maslach, 2005; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004; Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006). Wolf-Wendel and Ward found that with regard to institution type, the intersection of motherhood and academic work is intensified by different demands in regard to time availability. At comprehensive institutions, time demands for faculty come from different directions simultaneously, including “heavy teaching loads, high service expectations and substantial research demands combined with few role models to
demonstrate the feasibility of achieving these expectations” (p. 514). The demands at comprehensive institutions are often perceived as more reasonable than expectations at research universities, which may be because these institutions are more likely to be unionized and/or because their tenure expectations are more clearly defined and modeled within the organization.

Organization of Study

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. The first chapter focuses on the need, purpose, and significance of the study. The second chapter explains the relationship of the dissertation topic to previous research. It reviews literature on work and family research and women’s issues in higher education. It also introduces the theories driving the research questions. The third chapter provides a description of the methods used for this study, including information on survey development, sampling procedures, data collection, and data analysis. Results of the study are outlined in chapter four, and chapter five elaborates on major findings of the study.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The research questions and hypotheses for this study were drawn from research on: (a) work/family research and the role of caretaker, (b) women’s issues in higher education, (c) job satisfaction, and (d) theories including cognitive dissonance, alienation, and social norms theories.

Work/Family Research and the Role of Caretaker

According to the National Organization for Women (2007), the average age of women when they give birth for the first time is at a record high: 25.2 years of age. Approximately 51% of women return to work within four months of giving birth to their first child. Forty-four million women and men, age 18 and older, provide unpaid care to an adult age 18 or older and 62% of employed caregivers say they have had to make some adjustments to their work life, from reporting late to work to giving up work entirely. The percentage of caregivers who are women is estimated to range from 69%-79%. Although men also provide care, female caregivers may spend as much as 50% more time providing care than male caregivers and are less likely to be employed full time. Forty percent of women caregivers report experiencing emotional stress due to their care giving role, versus only 26% reported among male caregivers (National Organization for Women).

According to the National Family Caregivers Association (2007), more than 50 million people provide care for a chronically ill, disabled or aged family member or friend during any given year. The typical family caregiver is a 46-year-old woman caring for her widowed mother who does not live with her. She is married and employed. Approximately 60% of family caregivers are women. The need for family caregivers will increase in the years ahead. People over 65 are expected to increase at a 2.3% rate, but the number of family members available to
care for them will only increase at a 0.8% rate. Elderly spousal caregivers with a history of chronic illness themselves who are experiencing caregiving related stress have a 63% higher mortality rate than their non-caregiving peers. Family caregivers who provide care 36 or more hours weekly are more likely than non-caregivers to experience symptoms of depression or anxiety. For spouses the rate is six times higher; for those caring for a parent the rate is twice as high (National Family Caregivers Association).

Efforts of feminists, civil rights activists, and advocates of the women’s movement from the past half-century are reflected in transformations in the law, which have contributed to changes in the ideologies of gender that influence work/family scholarship. Work and family research has been significantly influenced by progress in legal reform since the Equal Pay Act of 1963, which granted men and women equal pay for the same work. However, efforts to provide women with equal access to employment and pay were not initiated until the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was a driving force in the expansion of gender ideology in the mid- to late-1900s, arguing that gendered issues (e.g., pregnancy, maternity leave) were not addressed in the Civil Rights Act, thus women did not have truly equal access to employment and/or equal pay. Suggestions from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission from 1966-1977 resulted in establishment of the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978, which prohibited employers from terminating a woman’s employment for being pregnant and/or taking maternity leave. However, the Pregnancy Discrimination Act did not specify guaranteed terms or conditions for leave, nor did it account for family responsibilities outside of maternity.
The Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 is the most specific conceptualization of work/family law influencing work/family research today. The Family and Medical Leave Act was established for two primary reasons: (a) to promote the stability and economic security of families, and (b) to minimize gender discrimination pertaining to pregnancy/childbirth. The Family and Medical Leave Act provides virtually all workers (except those working for companies with less than 50 employees) with access to four entitlements related to balancing work and family: (a) 12 weeks of unpaid leave per 12-month period for the birth and/or placement of a child, (b) continued health benefits while on leave, (c) equal restoration upon return from leave, and (d) notification by employers of rights/entitlements guaranteed by the Family and Medical Leave Act. However, the Act is limiting in the way it defines family (i.e., parents, parents-in-law, children, and spouse) and extends leave protection to employees because it does not protect non-traditional families, thus perpetuating unequal support for all to balance work and family. However, women today are typically the primary caregivers for their own and their husbands’ relatives (Singleton, 2000). Indications are that fathers are contributing only approximately one-third of childcare responsibilities in the home (Coltrane, 1996).

Changes in gender ideologies over the past half-century have brought many scholars to a point at which they unconditionally acknowledge gender as being intricately and inextricably linked with facets of access and power. Similarly, progressive work/family scholarship has discussed gender as a hierarchical structure in which men and women experience balancing work and family roles differently. Hochschild’s (1989) research on women’s work and family identities revealed that women deal with role-strain via one of two coping strategies: (a) cutting back responsibilities/commitments in one role, and/or (b) prioritizing the role of family. Similarly, Marshall (2004) identified three role management strategies women need to focus on
to successfully balance their work and family roles: (a) learn to let some things go, (b) use time effectively and efficiently, and (c) rely on an elaborate support system of friends and/or family.

The predominance of research on work and family has focused on the negative outcomes when employees strive to balance work and family. Role conflict is one negative consequence of trying to fulfill the role of worker and the role of caretaker. Scholars of role conflict theory have posited that people have limited time and energy, and adding work and/or caretaking responsibilities creates tensions between competing demands (Marshall & Barnett, 1993). For example, “Many Americans may feel torn between work and family not just because their households increasingly juggle competing responsibilities, but also because job expectations and parenting standards have become more demanding” (Jacobs & Gerson, 2004, p. 80). Research on caretaking has focused on three general areas: (a) work and family conflict, (b) policies and practices designed to promote work/family balance, and (c) problems associated with work and family research.

The first area is work and family conflict. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) explained work and family conflict as a construct that reflects role strain, which they described as perceived conflict between the role of worker and the role of caretaker. There are three types of role stress that have been focused on in work/family literature: (a) role conflict, (b) role ambiguity, and (c) role overload (Mirowsky & Ross, 1986). Role conflict exists when two legitimate expectations are incompatible, whereas role ambiguity exists when it is not clear what is expected and role overload is when expectations create demands that overwhelm an individual.

Haas (1999) described role strain conflict as resulting from efforts to manage demands of multiple roles, which between one-fifth and two-thirds of all employees experience (Casey & Pitt-Catsourpes, 1994). Jacobs and Gerson (2004) claimed that “whether the arena is the job or
the home, the intensity of work is as important as the amount of time it takes” (p. 80). In *The Time Bind*, Hochschild (1997) explored ways in which first shift (paid work/employment) responsibilities take over the second shift (unpaid labor/caretaking) responsibilities at home. The majority of people report that work interferes with their family life more than their family life interferes with their work (Ferber & O’Farrell, 1991). However, Haas found that women more often report their caretaking responsibilities as interfering with their work responsibilities than do men. For example, women are expected to miss work due to childcare and eldercare responsibilities (Ferber & O’Farrell). Marshall and Barrett (1993) found that role strain is generally a more prominent problem for women than it is for men and their claim is supported by the predominance of empirical research on work and family conflict. More specifically, women have reported experiencing more employee stress and lower job satisfaction rates. Moreover, coworkers and supervisors perceive women as having lower levels of perceived organizational commitment (MacDermid, Williams, & Marks, 1994).

Policies and practices have been another focus in work and family research, with the majority of literature focusing on suggestions for transformation. A major contribution of work and family research to date is the general finding that employees often do not take advantage of work and family policies out of fear that their use may signal a lack of commitment to their job or employer (see review in Still & Strang, 2003). Bailyn (1993) argued that organizational work/family policies need to prioritize employees’ family needs over work allegiance, de-emphasize the importance of visible work (physical presence at work as necessary), and proactively support employees’ efforts to balance work and family roles.

Kirby, Golden, Medved, Jorgenson, and Buzzanell’s (2003) review of work and family research revealed four ‘problematics’ with the foci of work/family research: (a) voice, (b)
identity, (c) rationality, and (d) boundaries. They argued that work/family research has historically addressed work/family conflict as an individual/psychological issue as opposed to a structural issue, thus neglecting systematically oppressing forces that affect consequences surrounding efforts to balance work and family. They asserted that as a result employees receive mixed messages from supervisors and coworkers regarding work and family, which result in increased role strain. Issues concerning identity are another recurring problem in work and family research. Most work/family research has discussed the role as worker and the role as caretaker as discrete entities, thus neglecting to address the ways in which gender assumptions in one role affect expectations in the other. Rationality (characterized as a masculine trait) has been the major focus of most work/family research with emotionality (a feminine trait) taking a secondary focus in analysis, which has perpetuated the idea of striving to discuss work/family conflict as an ‘ungendered’ issue that simply affects women and men differently. In reality, women are actually socialized to be more feminine than men, and both genders are socialized to expect women to be more feminine than men. The final problematic is the issue of boundaries, which is the result of work/family research making a categorical distinction between work and family.

The work of Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) on role strain (described as perceived conflict between role as worker and role as caretaker) has influenced work/family research for over two decades. They have asserted that there are three types of role strain from which work/family conflict originates: (a) time-based, (b) strain-based, and (c) behavior-based. Time-based role strain is the result of a lack of time to perform responsibilities in either the worker role or family role. Strain-based role strain occurs when conflict/problems from one role create conflict in the
other. Behavior-based role strain occurs when behaviors that are socially acceptable in one role are not acceptable in the other.

Greenhaus and Beutell’s (1985) work on role strain aligns with Chow and Bertheide’s (1988) separate spheres model, in which work and caregiver roles, responsibilities, and expectations are constructed and discussed as discrete entities. Greenberger and O’Neil (1993) elaborated on the work of Chow and Bertheide in their development of the spill-over model, which illustrates that work and caregiver roles are not discrete entities because different expectations associated with men and women in their role as family member “spill-over” and create gendered expectations in the workplace. Hochschild (1989) coined the term “second-shift responsibilities” to refer to the family-rearing responsibilities which often default to women in society because men and women are socialized to expect females to be responsible for “domestic duties” (e.g., child-rearing, meal preparation, cleaning/laundry). In response, Crosby (1991) coined the term “juggler” to describe women who perform both a caregiver role and worker role and thus are expected to balance the gendered expectations of each role.

Hochschild (1997) discussed the concept of the “third shift,” which refers to caretaking performed during the early morning and late evening hours with/for children. Hochschild found that, rather than parents trying to arrange more flexible work schedules, they evade the time bind via three strategies: (a) developing ideas that minimize how much care a child, partner, or they themselves really need, (b) making do with less time, attention, and support, and (c) avoiding emotional reactions to time bind frustrations. Medved (2004) explored the micro-practices of navigating work and family life with children through an analysis of 35 women caregivers’ accounts of their daily work and family routines. Medved’s study revealed types of relational
work performed by women that are central to maintaining the “first” and “second” shifts including connecting, reciprocating, requesting, prepping, and evading.

Bem’s (1993) gender role theory has also had significant influence on, and been supported by, empirically-based work/family research (Hochschild, 1997; MacDermid et al., 1994; Marshall & Barrett, 1993). Gender role theory is grounded in two basic claims surrounding the ways in which women are socialized and the repercussions they face as a result: (a) women are socialized to identify with their role as caregiver more than men are and (b) women are more likely to experience work/family conflict. Research on multiple roles has shown that although roles can produces stress, they can also enhance life quality by providing access to resources that buffer the negative effects associated with increased demands (Barnett & Marshall, 1992; Marks & MacDermid, 1996). Milkie and Peltola (1999) investigated how particular roles and role qualities that affect the feeling of successfully balancing work and family are gendered. In examining feelings about work/family balance, Milkie and Peltola found that women and men report similar levels of success and kinds of work/family tradeoffs.

Issues Impacting Women Faculty in Higher Education

Despite progressive changes in ideologies of gender over the past half-century, women faculty in higher education have been negatively affected by a plethora of issues. Research on the environment in academia has found continued marginalization of women faculty (Glazer-Raymo, 1999). A major contributor to women feeling like outsiders is that there is often no one readily available to assist them in gaining access to the information required for success (Rios & Longnion, 2000). Glazer-Raymo suggested that “cultural, attitudinal, and structural constraints inhibit women’s progress” (p. 198).
Women continue to be underrepresented in the upper ranks of faculty and administration and are disproportionately overrepresented in part-time positions, earning less than men in comparable faculty situations (Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Perna 2000; Valian, 1998). As more women enter the academic profession, there is an increasing need to understand the personal and institutional barriers, challenges, and triumphs that women faculty who opt to have children face as they strive to balance work and family life (Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006). For example, findings from research on women faculty balancing work and family have asserted that women perceive work as never-ending (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Ward & Wolf-Wendel).

Nyquist, Hitchcock, and Teherani (2000) reported that women faculty report feeling less satisfied, more isolated, and less supported than their male counterparts. Riger, Stokes, Raja, and Sullivan (1997) argued that this is the case for women faculty in higher education as a result of five factors: (a) double standards exist for women, (b) women have less access to informal organizational socialization, (c) higher education is a sexist environment/system, (d) it is more difficult for women than men to balance work/family, and (e) women receive less mentoring and have fewer role models than their male counterparts. Gibson (2006) identified the political climate of higher education as an influential factor of the academic mentoring experiences of women faculty. In Gibson’s research on politics in academia, politics referred to “the characteristics of the departmental/institutional culture and structure (including roles and responsibilities) with which these women were associated” (p. 68). Gibson’s findings suggested three primary forms of human resources/organizational development initiatives needed to address current institutional climate issues in support of women’s career advancement: (a) the selection of department heads who are committed to the provision of mentoring, (b) the establishment of mentoring committees comprised of senior faculty and designed to mentor
Scholars have argued that responsibility for the situation of women in higher education rests primarily on institutions rather than individuals. For example, Grant, Kenelly, and Ward (2000) explained that:

The clockwork of the [academic] career is distinctly male. That is, it is built upon men’s normative paths and assumes freedom from competing responsibilities, such as family, that generally affect women more than men. In such a system, women with families are cumulatively disadvantaged. (p. 66)

Toth (1995) explained that for women faculty to be successful in attaining tenure status in higher education, they are encouraged to pick their battles, avoid public disputes, and make sacrifices. Tierney and Bensimon (1996) argued that double standards such as these exist for women more than men because in their role as caretakers they are expected to present themselves as amenable and nurturing, both of which are social expectations that spill-over into their role as faculty member. Tierney and Bensimon coined the phrases “smile work” and “mom work” to refer to colleague and student expectations of women in higher education. Smile work refers to colleagues expecting women faculty to be amenable in decision-making processes and mom work refers to student expectations of women faculty to be more nurturing than male faculty in their pedagogical philosophies and practices.

Ridgeway and Correll (2004) asserted that mothers get caught between the prescriptive image of the 24/7 ideal worker and the prescriptive image of the 24/7 ideal mother. Similarly, Williams (2005) described the patterns of stereotyping and gender bias that create the glass ceiling and maternal wall, which are documented demographically in relation to the scarcity of
mothers in tenure-track positions. There are a number of ways in which subtle gender 
stereotyping makes it more difficult for women in academia to demonstrate their competence. 
For example:

When an employer disadvantages women because of the assumption that they will 
conform to stereotypes (as opposed to the assumption that they should), what is often 
involved is cognitive bias, the term associated with the insight that much gender bias (and 
race and other types of bias) stems from the ways in which stereotypes shape perception, 
memory, and inferences. (Williams, p. 92)

Park (1996) argued that evaluation of the triad of the professoriate (i.e., research, 
teaching, and service) is itself problematic for women because evaluation and promotion in 
higher education prioritize the research prong of the triad, which has historically focused on 
objective (rational/masculine-based) standards over subjective (emotional/feminine-based) 
standards. Park claimed that because women in general are socialized to be more nurturing and 
inclusive, they are socialized to be more committed to professional endeavors that align with the 
teaching and/or service prong of the triad, which are often more time-consuming and less 
rewarded than research endeavors in tenure evaluation and promotion practices. Thus, Park 
advised women to avoid volunteering for and/or committing to teaching and service initiatives 
that are not directly related to their research endeavors. However, Tierney and Bensimon (1997) 
argued that turning down and/or not volunteering for teaching and/or service opportunities is a 
problematic issue for non-tenured women in higher education because they face different and 
more negative repercussions for doing so than their male counterparts as a result of the double-
standard expectations of smile work and mom work within the institution.
The combination of work and family can result in cumulative disadvantage for junior women faculty (Grant et al., 2000). In the literature, this disadvantage becomes apparent when women faculty members are compared to male colleagues when the variable of parenthood is considered and in regard to spillover resulting, in part, from the expectations of academic life (Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006). Clark and Corcoran (1986) analyzed the relationship between academic preparation and career success via interviews with 147 faculty from the biological sciences, physical sciences and mathematics, social sciences, and humanities. They explored the concept of cumulative disadvantage and concluded that although a critical mass of women may hold academic positions, their career success may be limited. This means that, “Women’s careers are hampered by practices and processes that continue to perpetuate inequities and the marginality of their careers relative to those of men” (Conley, 2005, p. 27). Even in situations where women are not focusing priorities on family/caretaking, the perceptions prevail that they are or will be, and barriers may exist that impose societal expectations on women relative to childbearing, child care, and coordinating with a husband’s career (Conley).

A consistent agenda item of the AAUP has been the concern that women faculty do not have equal access to earning tenure because pregnancy, childrearing, and tenure are often overlapping age-related endeavors, which men and women suffer different consequences for engaging in simultaneously (AAUP, 2001; Park, 1995; Tierney & Bensimon, 1997). As a result, the AAUP suggested administrators transform work/family policies and practices to include options for women faculty that include modified duties and/or stopping of the tenure clock. Although some academic institutions have implemented family leave or stop-the-clock policies for both male and female faculty member caregivers, there is evidence that these policies have not been fully accepted and/or used (Finkel, Olswang, & She, 1994). The recurring problem with
research findings associated with work/family research and issues impacting women faculty, as pointed out by Kirby et al. (2003), is that they address issues associated with work and family as individual/psychological issues specific to women, rather than addressing the institutional factors that create social inequities for women.

Although the academic literature is almost completely void of positive sentiments about the experiences of junior faculty, Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2004) found that women faculty consistently identified the flexibility and autonomy offered to tenure-track faculty as helpful in aiding them to achieve some sort of balance between work and family. However, they also found that women faculty perceive the ambiguity of expectations for tenure as one of the most significant prices paid for the freedom of flexibility of academic work. An expansionist view of work and family supports the notion that assuming multiple roles is beneficial (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). Respondents in Ward and Wolf-Wendel’s study claimed that having children made them more efficient and organized, which supports the findings of Bellas and Toutkoushian’s (1999) quantitative study, which reveals that having children does not contribute to a lack of research productivity.

Although work roles and caretaker roles can be consuming and therefore “spill over” into one another in potentially negative and stressful ways (Sorcinelli & Near, 1989), the roles of parent and academic can serve as a buffer to one another, providing relief and a sense of success for those who move between both spheres. Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2004) made a significant contribution to the literature on work/family balance by revealing buffering benefits experienced by junior women faculty associated with balancing work and family roles. Buffering is a process through which the “negative effects of stress or failure in one role can be buffered by success and satisfaction in another role” (Barnett & Hyde, 2001, p. 786). In general, buffering protects
women from feeling undue stress from different roles. Ward and Wolf-Wendel found that the academic accomplishments of women faculty can buffer them from the stresses of their home life, and visa versa. In this sense, women may “use their multiple roles to keep the rigors of the tenure track, the ambiguity of tenure expectations, and the consuming nature of academic work in perspective” (p. 254).

Job Satisfaction

Faculty work and its significance is not widely observed, understood, or appreciated outside of academia (Bowen & Schuster, 1986). However, faculty members’ professional satisfaction within higher education has been examined through various theoretical and substantive conceptualizations. For example, Johnsrud and Heck (1998) introduced a workload model that categorizes various aspects of worklife into three categories: (a) professional priorities and rewards, (b) administrative relations and support, and (c) quality of benefits and services. Smart (1990) also proposed a model that encompassed faculty members’ satisfaction consisting of three dimensions: (a) organizational satisfaction, (b) salary satisfaction, and (c) career satisfaction. Smart found that organizational and career satisfaction can have a positive and significant impact on tenured and untenured faculty members’ turnover intentions to leave their institutions. Hagedorn (1996) focused on the relationship between gender-based salary determination and job satisfaction with a concentration on three aspects of job satisfaction: (a) global satisfaction, (b) stress level, and (c) intent to remain in academia. Hagedorn’s research found that monetary compensation enhances faculty satisfaction and retention among female faculty and that satisfaction can be an aggregate response to satisfaction levels with students, colleagues, and administrators. However, overall research on faculty members suggests that salary, in and of itself, is not the most important aspect of their worklife and satisfaction (Boyer,
Benefit packages and securing tenure-track positions have also been shown to be important issues related to faculty job satisfaction (Matier, 1990).

A primary aspect of faculty job satisfaction is the work itself, including research, teaching and service endeavors (Olsen, Maple, & Stage, 1995). Often important in each of these areas is faculty members’ perceived control of their career development, perceived level of autonomy, and the challenges they take from their work (Manger, 1999; Olsen et al.). Another component of faculty job satisfaction concerns how well they believe they are valued and recognized by their colleagues and by their institutions. Job-related stress, which has been conceptualized as dissatisfaction (Barnes, Agago, & Combs, 1998), is often the result of faculty members’ receiving inadequate rewards and/or recognition (Gmelch, Lovrich, & Wilke, 1986).

Mentoring is an important aspect of career satisfaction. Women faculty report that, although they have been able to succeed without mentoring, they feel less able to work productively, less connected to their colleagues and their institution, and less able to develop professionally in multiple directions. Perceptions of equity and transparency in the tenure process are also important components of career satisfaction, wherein women report being more stressed about attaining tenure than men (Park, 1996). Specifically, women are significantly more likely than men to cite lack of clarity of tenure criteria and review process as barriers to their success (Johnsrud & Atwater, 1994). Caretaking duties also represent a unique challenge to women faculty members. They report that difficulties associated with time constraints in balancing their professional careers with their personal/family lives are more of a problem for them than for their male colleagues, putting them at a disadvantage within their departments (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988; Parson, Sands, & Duane, 1991; Riger et al., 1997). Thus, changes in family-related or personal circumstances often affect faculty job satisfaction, because conflict between
work and family concerns provide stress that ultimately can affect both psychological and
physical health (Adams, King, & King, 1996), particularly for women (Duxbury, Higgins, &
Lee, 1994). Faculty rank also affects faculty satisfaction. Baldwin (1990) explained that,
“Professors change as they progress through the faculty ranks and as their careers place different
demands on them” (p. 20). Braskamp and Ory (1984) found that assistant professors dwell on
advancing professionally, associate professors focus on establishing a balance within
professional life, and full professors focus on defining their professional life and fulfilling their
lifetime goals.

Theoretical Framework

The research questions of this study are grounded in three theories that are particularly
useful for the development of this dissertation research in an effort to expand on findings in the
current literature concerning women balancing work and family, particularly in higher education:
(a) cognitive dissonance theory, (b) alienation theory, and (c) social norms theory.

Cognitive Dissonance Theory

Cognitive dissonance theory is an attitude-based theory initially introduced by Festinger
(1957). It focuses on the unpleasant feeling resulting from lack of consistency between
cognitions people often experience in anticipation of and/or reflection on their actions. The basic
assumptions associated with cognitive dissonance theory are that people prefer cognitive
consistency, because they experience dissonance when they have inconsistent cognitions.
Because dissonance is an unpleasant feeling, they will try to reduce it. In his research, Festinger
has asserted that people experience cognitive dissonance under four circumstances. First, people
tend to experience cognitive dissonance before making a decision in which their anticipated
behavior does not align with their attitude and/or after making a decision in reflection of their
actions not aligning with their attitudes. Second, people experience the unpleasant feeling of dissonance when they comply with a request with which they disagree. Third, people are likely to experience dissonance associated with initiation rituals because the harder the entry phase is to an in-group, the more difficult it is to make the decision to end membership. Finally, people experience varying states of cognitive dissonance as a result of the social support they receive. The more social support or approval one receives for making a specific decision, the less cognitive dissonance she/he experiences. Conversely, the less social support one receives for a particular behavior, the more cognitive dissonance she/he will experience. In accordance with these four situations of experiencing dissonance, research grounded in cognitive dissonance theory has revealed five techniques people use to avoid dissonance and achieve cognitive consistency: (a) adding cognitively consistent elements or eliminating inconsistent elements to reduce dissonance, (b) changing attitudes to reflect behaviors, (c) changing behaviors to reflect attitudes, (d) avoiding alternatives that are unattractive when decision making because they do not align with attitudes, and/or (e) suppressing thoughts that create cognitive dissonance.

Festinger’s original conception of cognitive dissonance theory has served as the basis for many scholars who have sought to extend cognitive dissonance research to include psychological, perceptual, and personal aspects of cognitive dissonance. Bem (1970) argued that as an attitude-based theory, cognitive dissonance theory is a psychology-based theory that explains why people’s attitudes change. Bem asserted that people’s attitudes change in reaction to behavior change in order for their attitudes to support their behaviors because cognitive dissonance is actually a psychological state of being, not merely an attitude-related phenomenon. Tedeshi (1971) contributed to cognitive dissonance theory literature by discussing cognitive dissonance as an impression-management issue in which dissonance is mental unpleasantness.
that results from more than a binary relationship between attitudes and behaviors. Tedeshi argued that cognitive dissonance is a psychological state of discomfort, which is the result of people desiring to have their behaviors align with their attitudes in order to present a consistent persona that is free of hypocrisy. Scher and Cooper (1989) expanded the literature on the theory by arguing that cognitive dissonance is experienced as a result of causing unpleasant consequences for others. According to Scher and Cooper, cognitive dissonance is a psychological state of discomfort, which can result from feeling personally responsible for causing unpleasantness for others.

Cognitive dissonance theory has been used in a plethora of studies related to communicative, attitudinal, and perceptual phenomena, such as research on marital quality, dissonance enhancing intervention programs, pedagogy, and media criticism. Amato and Rogers (1999) argued that cognitive dissonance theory serves as a framework for predicting that people who experience decline in marital quality adopt more favorable attitudes toward divorce as they anticipate leaving the relationship, because people can reduce dissonance by adopting attitudes more favorable toward divorce. Amato and Rogers hypothesized that declines in marital quality lead people to adopt more favorable attitudes toward divorce. Consistent with this hypothesis, results of their national longitudinal study suggested that changes in marital happiness had a significant impact on pro-divorce attitudes.

Simmons, Webb, and Brandon (2004) tested whether an experiential learning intervention, based on cognitive dissonance theory, would increase college-student smokers’ intentions to quit smoking. Although actual quitting behavior was not measured in the study, intentions to quit were predicted to increase as a result of experimental manipulations. Results of the study indicated that when health-risk information was presented alone, risk perceptions were
significantly higher. That is, “When smokers in the current study were instructed to write a counterattitudinal essay, this active learning technique appeared to change smokers’ perceptions of risk” (Simmons et al., p. 1134). However, when information on the health risks of smoking was combined with information that it is easy to quit, risk perceptions were no longer affected. Simmons et al. explained that it is possible that the combination of information may have been too threatening, thus preventing smokers from acknowledging risk.

That is, from a cognitive dissonance perspective, it is plausible that when a smoker, who believes he/she is a reasonable person, is confronted with information that smoking is risky and it is easy to quit, he/she experiences heightened discomfort which is alleviated by maintaining low risk perceptions. (Simmons et al., p. 1134)

Burns (2006) argued that cognitive dissonance theory poses some interesting questions for those teaching religious studies in publicly funded colleges and universities. Burns explained that because religious beliefs can be challenged by historical-critical study of scriptures, and because cognitive dissonance is often generated when this occurs, it is important to make explicit the potential for manipulation of student beliefs. Combining cognitive dissonance theory with the notion of induced compliance inherent in higher education generates a complex and critical paradigm under which faculty operate. For example:

Under the influence of inducements, the greater the number and importance of thoughts that justify compliance the less dissonance will be aroused and therefore the less likelihood of impact on personal beliefs. Also, the less the student perceives herself to have a choice in compliance with discrepant behaviors, the less dissonance is aroused. These findings indicate that students who see high grades as extremely important and for whom non-compliance with the class ground rules is not an option will experience very
little dissonance even if they are committed to a literalist interpretation of scripture. The higher grades earned through “going along with the program” are probably sufficient to alleviate the dissonance. (p. 6)

Burns argued that although it is essential to generate cognitive dissonance in order to stimulate learning, research into the mechanisms by which dissonance affects learning should alert educators to the potential for questionable manipulation of beliefs for students.

Sun and Scharrer (2004) investigated students’ experiences with cognitive dissonance when examining two types of information: (a) their experience, past or present, with viewing Disney’s *The Little Mermaid*, and (b) their subsequent experience in the classroom, in which they were presented with arguments and research inquiry regarding problematic aspects of the film that were predominately negative. The overarching theme of students’ responses was that, despite the instructor’s facilitation of a critical discussion, they did not want to change their attitudes about the film, “which had given them intense pleasure and fond memories since they were children” (Sun & Scharrer, 2004). Rather, students used three strategies that enabled them to uphold their previously existing opinions: (a) they ignored or dismissed the criticism as “overdone,” (b) they said they liked the film too much to allow criticism to affect them, or (c) they said that although they acknowledged problems with the film, they could also suspend their criticism while watching it and, therefore, still enjoy it. However, when criticisms of the film from the instructor and/or fellow students fit within their already existing schema, they were accepted.

*Alienation Theory*

Seeman’s (1959) alienation theory, which derived primarily from the work of Marx, Weber, and Freud, is the second theory relevant to the research questions of this study. “On the
most general level, alienation is any form of social detachment or separation” (Mirowsky & Ross, 1986, p. 25). Alienation is ultimately a subjective phenomenon (Geyer, 1980), which aligns with Lewin’s (1936) assertion that people function on the basis of their perceptions of reality, and not reality per se. Thus perceptions of experiences with balancing work and family in higher education are important to study and strive to understand, even if they are misperceptions (Porter, 1976). Seeman (1959) noted that the social conditions that produce the variants of alienation are worthy sites of social scientific inquiry and called for future researchers to uncover them. According to Seeman, alienation is a feeling of estrangement, which is the result of feeling powerless. The major assumption of alienation theory is that alienation results when social conditions are either bad or neutral, meaning people feel alienated if social situations provide them with negative outputs (bad) or outputs that are neither negative or positive (neutral).

Geyer (1980) argued that the predominance of research grounded in alienation theory can be codified into one of three areas of study: (a) psychological, (b) sociological, and/or (c) ontological. This study focuses on the sociological prong because it focuses on perceived social repercussions associated with balancing work and family in higher education. The basic concepts associated with alienation theory are behaviors, expectations, social conditions, and behavioral consequences. Seeman argued that people experience different levels of estrangement in accordance with five different variants in relation to each of these four basic concepts.

The first variant is powerlessness, in which estrangement is the result of a perceived lack of control over the outcome of events in bad and neutral social environments. Powerlessness is the primary type of alienation, and is defined as “the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his [sic] own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcement, he [sic] seeks” (Seeman, 1959, p. 784). “Power is not an attribute of a person, but
of a relationship; it is often defined as the capability to control the number of someone else’s alternatives to act or react” (Geyer, 1980, p. 13).

The second variant is meaninglessness, in which people experience different levels of estrangement under bad and neutral social conditions as a result of not understanding the events they anticipate and/or experience. Meaninglessness as a type of alienation refers to an individual’s sense of understanding of the events/situations in which she/he is engaged. More specifically, it is the “low expectancy that satisfactory predictions about the future outcomes of behavior can be made” (Seeman, 1959, p. 786). Individuals in anomic situations of meaninglessness are unclear as to what they “ought to believe—when their minimal standards for clarity in decision-making are not met” (Seeman, p. 786); meaning they are not confident in their ability to predict the consequences of acting on their beliefs and assumptions.

The third variant is normlessness, in which people may feel alienated because of a perceived disruption in normative (implied) or descriptive (explicit) rules. Normlessness is a high expectancy that socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve given goals (Seeman, 1959).

The essence of normlessness, as broadly defined, is the rejection of the community as a source of standards. Good advice and exemplary behavior are seen as invalid guides. In rejecting standards that arise from the expressed needs, preferences, and rights of others, the individual falls back on intrinsic satisfactions and pragmatic efficiency as guides that do not require faith in others. (Mirowsky & Ross, 1986, p. 36)

Kohn (1976) found that normlessness is greatest among organizational members in low hierarchical positions.
Social estrangement is the fourth variant in which people may feel alienated because they believe they are inadequately rewarded (socially and/or monetarily) for their responsibilities and accomplishments. Self-estrangement is “the degree of dependence of the given behavior upon anticipated future rewards” (Seeman, 1959). Isolation refers to people’s feeling estranged because they are included/supported less than they had anticipated/expected (Seeman).

The meaninglessness variant of alienation is particularly relevant to this study. Findings from previous research on work and family suggest that, because faculty (particularly women) receive mixed messages and support surrounding work and family issues, they may not perceive themselves capable of accurately predicting consequences associated with their actions. Thus, cognitive dissonance is a likely product of meaninglessness.

Alienation theory has been used in various studies relevant to phenomena in the fields of communication studies and sociology, including research on pedagogy, marketing, and marital dyad dynamics. Keating’s (1987) micro-level analysis of alienation in the collegiate-level classroom focused on the sense of powerlessness, meaningless, and normlessness that faculty foster and/or perpetuate in students. Keating argued that faculty can reduce feelings of alienation amongst students. First, faculty can reduce the feelings of powerlessness among students by giving them more responsibility. Second, students experience meaninglessness when they are unable to see the relevance of a particular assignment or lecture to the total course or when they question why they are required to take certain courses at all. Faculty can reduce feelings of meaninglessness among students by clearly articulating a justification of the existence, content, and structure of the courses they teach. Finally, faculty can reduce feelings of normlessness among students by providing more complete syllabi and explicit written-guidelines for assignments and classes as a whole on the first day of class.
Alienation theory research has been linked to marketing. Fromm (1955) argued that alienated audience segments are often viewed as commodities to which monetary values may be readily targeted and sold. Fromm claimed that deceived customers who have made meaningless purchases feel a sense of dissatisfaction or alienation. Alienation in marketing has been explored in particular in the field of consumer behavior. Allison’s (1978) research on consumer alienation, defined as feelings of separation from the norms and values of market institutions, practices, or one’s self in the consumption role, revealed four major findings: (a) consumer alienation from the marketplace is positively related to social alienation, (b) consumer alienation is positively related to belief in government intervention in the marketplace, (c) controlling for income level, minority consumers are more alienated than whites, and (d) controlling for ethnic origin, consumer alienation is inversely related to income. Bearden and Mason (1983) found that alienated consumers: (a) are less confident in their ability to evaluate goods and services, (b) have less trust in others, (c) have less positive attitudes toward complaining, and (d) are less satisfied with their living standards. The mass communication system has been noted as adding to feelings of alienation. Johnson (1973) explained that the system creates and markets products and services that consist of physical goods that are inextricably linked to inherent lifestyles. Johnson claimed that alienation occurs when one fails to accept the doctrine of consumption or fails to find fulfillment in the offerings of the marketplace.

Neal and Groat (1977) conceptualized and measured multiple dimensions of meaningless, normlessness, social isolation, and powerlessness in relation to societal alienations and family alienations to investigate differential fertility behavior among married couples in their childbearing years. They also explored various fertility variables, including: (a) months between marriage and the birth of the first child, (b) unplanned last pregnancy, (c)
contraceptive efficacy, and (d) use of ineffective contraceptive methods. Neal and Groat did not find any differences in the relative efficacy of one kind of alienation over others. However, they did find that family alienation explained somewhat more variance in the planning status of the last pregnancy than did societal alienation. Overall, husbands’ alienation was as important as that of the wives. Combining alienations of wives and husbands substantially increased the amount of remaining variance explained. This means that the alienation of both wives and husbands is implicated in the family forming process.

Social Norms Theory

Social norms theory, initially developed by Berkowitz and Perkins, is the third theory relevant to this study. The basic assumptions of social norms theory are that misperceptions of negative peer behaviors perpetuate negative/bad behavior and accurate perceptions of positive peer behaviors promote positive/good behavior. Berkowitz (2004) explained that perceptions of peers’ normative behaviors vary from situation to situation and exist on different levels (e.g., individual, familial, societal). Social norms theory is grounded in three primary concepts: (a) pluralistic ignorance, (b) false consensus, and (c) false uniqueness. Pluralistic ignorance exists when people perceive themselves to be in the minority of performing a particular behavior, when they are in reality in the majority of performing that behavior. False consensus is when people think they are in the majority of performing a behavior when they are really in the minority. False uniqueness is the final basic concept of social norms theory, in which people perceive their behaviors to be more unique than they actually are. Pluralistic ignorance is the pivotal component of social norms theory. Hansen (1993) initially suggested that bridging the gap between perceived majority and minority reality is what can make people realize they are in the minority of performing a specific behavior (typically a negative/bad behavior) and thus conform
their behavior to align with the actual (real/self-reported) majority, assuming the actual majority are engaging in positive/good behavior.

The predominance of social norms research has historically focused on intervention-based social marketing campaigns designed for college campuses intended to minimize misperceptions, and thus negative behaviors, associated with at-risk drinking and tobacco use (e.g., DeJong, Schneider, Towvim, Murphy, Doerr, Simonsen, Mason, & Scribner, 2006; Lewis & Neighbors, 2006; Martnes, Ferrier, & Cimini, 2007). For example, Perkins and Craig (2006) implemented a social norms intervention program designed to reduce alcohol misuse among student-athletes by reducing harmful misperceptions of peer norms, and in turn, reducing personal risk. The intervention substantially reduced misperceptions of frequent and risky alcohol consumption as the norm among participants exposed to the intervention program. In addition, frequent personal consumption of alcohol, high estimated peak blood alcohol concentrations during social drinking, and negative consequences associated with alcohol consumption all declined by a minimum of 30% among participants after exposure to the program.

Social norms research has also been used in various studies relevant to phenomena in the field of communication studies, including research on social anxiety, drug use, gender identity, and sexual behavior. Neighbors, Fossos, Woods, Fabiano, Sledge, and Frost (2007) evaluated social anxiety as a moderator of the relationship between perceived norms and drinking among college men and women. They found that student participants who had higher social anxiety drank more, but did not differ significantly from students who had lower social anxiety on perceived norms. However, the relationship between perceived norms and drinking was stronger among students who had higher social anxiety relative to less socially anxious students. These
results corroborate findings from social norms research on drinking that suggest social factors are important determinants of drinking in this population and suggest that social anxiety is associated with susceptibility to peer influences on drinking.

Kilmer, Walker, Lee, Palmer, Mallet, Fabiano, and Larimer (2006) investigated the relationship between marijuana use, perceived norms of use by friends and students in general, and negative experiences and consequences associated with drug use. In accordance with social norms theory, they hypothesized that student participants would overestimate marijuana use of students in general and that perceptions about the prevalence of marijuana use would be related to drug-related consequences. Although two-thirds of participants reported no marijuana use, 98% of respondents incorrectly predicted that students in general use marijuana at least once per year.

Beatty, Syzdek, and Bakkum (2006) used social norms theory as a framework for investigating the relationship between college males’ self-reported gender role conflict and their perceptions of their peers’ gender role conflict. They used O’Neil, Helms, and Gable’s (1995) definition of gender role conflict as it refers to a “psychological state in which gender roles have negative consequences or impact on a person or others” (p. 336). They found that college men largely misperceive their male peers’ endorsement of gender role conflict. Beatty et al. argued that “This misperception may lead them to behave in more stereotypically masculine ways and construct their gender schema with more stereotypically masculine beliefs, resulting in negative health outcomes” (p. 331).

Personal health perceptions and decisions, particularly those related to sexual behavior, have been explored by social norms research. For example, Fisher (2007) investigated contextual variables in research data collection that may explain why men generally report having had more
sexual experience and sexual partners than women, as well as an earlier age at first intercourse. Specifically, Fisher investigated the differences that exist when college students (both men and women) report their sexual history to female versus male research assistants. With female research assistants (but not with male assistants), men reported more sexual partners when they were told that women are now more sexually permissive than men, however, this finding appeared to be largely a function of the men who scored higher on measures of hyper-masculinity and ambivalent sexism. Women’s reports were not significantly affected by introduction of messages about men’s sexual permissiveness or sex of the research assistant.

Bohner, Siebler and Schmelcher (2006) explored the relationship between perceived group norms about participants’ willingness to engage in sexually aggressive behavior and self-reported sexually aggressive behaviors by measuring and analyzing rape myth acceptance and rape proclivity. Their findings suggest that salient information about others’ rape myth acceptance may cause difference in men’s self-reported proclivity to exert sexual violence, suggesting rape myth acceptance may indeed function as a social norm. Scholly, Datz, Gascoigne, and Holck (2005) conducted social norms-based research targeting high-risk sexual behaviors among undergraduate students at four colleges. They found that students perceived their peers as engaging in more risky behaviors than they actually were. They also observed a consistent overestimation of perceived incidence of sexually transmitted infections and unintended pregnancies among peers on all campuses.

Berkowitz (2004) suggested that social norms theory would be useful for examining academic climate. Grounding the current study in social norms theory complements the use of cognitive dissonance theory because, as Prentice and Miller (1993) argued, when one’s self-reported attitudes do not align with the perceived normative (majority) attitudes of others,
feelings of discomfort (dissonance) are likely to occur. This suggests a need for more thoroughly understanding gaps between faculty perceptions and normative behaviors surrounding work and family issues in higher education.

Strengths and Limitations of Theoretical Framework

Littlejohn (2002) offered five different criteria that provide potential for evaluating communication theories: (1) parsimony, (2) openness, (3) theoretical scope, (4) heuristic value, and (5) appropriateness. Parsimony refers to the logical simplicity of a theory whereas openness refers to the extent to which a theory acknowledges its own completeness. The theoretical scope of a theory refers to the principle of generality within a theory and the heuristic value is its ability to generate ideas for future study. The appropriateness of a theory is based on three assumptions: (1) axiological assumptions, which are concerned with the values associated with the theory; (2) ontological assumptions, which are concerned with the nature of what is known via the theory; and (3) epistemological assumptions, which are concerned with how what is known is known via the theory.

Cognitive dissonance theory offers little logical simplicity (Griffin, 2001) because it focuses on an endless number of cognitions, which are subjectively determined by constantly fluctuating contexts and situations. Similarly, the variants of alienation theory are subjectively determined by individuals’ ever changing perceptions of estrangement in psychological, sociological, and ontological contexts (Geyer, 1982); thus the theory is not parsimonious. Social norms theory is the most logically simplistic of the three theories relevant to this dissertation research because it asserts that minimizing misperceptions of normative behaviors will result in individuals conforming to more positive behaviors in which the majority engage.
In terms of openness, cognitive dissonance theory does not account for individual differences in tolerating dissonance (Griffin, 2001). Alienation theory also lacks an element of completeness because it focuses on the variants of alienation, but fails to address how people will reduce feelings of estrangement and powerlessness. Social norms theory seems to be the most open of the three theories because it is built on the primary argument that people engage in the behaviors they do simply because they are striving to conform to the majority.

Social norms theory has a large theoretical scope, meaning it asserts a prominent principle of generality because it claims that people in general will strive to conform to what they perceive to be the majority (axiological assumption). However, the appropriateness of this claim has yet to be substantially supported empirically (epistemological assumption) because the abundance of social norms research that has been conducted is in accordance with alcohol/tobacco use and/or college campuses (Berkowitz, 2004). Thus there is significant potential for social norms theory to have heuristic value, but future studies need to continue to expand the contexts in which it is tested. In contrast, alienation theory has little to offer regarding theoretical scope because it is such a logically complex theory; however, it has great appropriateness because it is asserted in the literature as a controversial point from which to address issues of power and control (ontological assumption) and not as a method of analysis (epistemological assumption) for such (Geyer, 1993). Thus alienation theory has proven to have little heuristic value. Cognitive dissonance theory adheres to a strong theoretical scope, asserting that all people prefer cognitive consistency to the unpleasant psychological feeling of dissonance (axiological assumption) and the empirically tested history of this theory present in the literature (epistemological assumption) supported the principle of generality inherent within this theory. Cognitive dissonance theory has proven to have significant heuristic value because of the
overwhelming contexts in which it has been and expanded by scholars (e.g., Bem, 1970; Tedeschi, 1971; Scher & Cooper, 1989).

Justification of Study

The current study is needed to expand research on junior women faculty experiences with balancing the role of faculty member and caregiver at Carnegie-classified comprehensive institutions. This study is important because it investigates the extent to which junior women faculty at comprehensive institutions are comfortable with family talk at work (before and during interactions with colleagues who are also caregivers and who are not caregivers) and with taking family leave. Further the study explored the extent to which these comfort levels relate to four important elements of faculty satisfaction: (a) job position satisfaction, (b) job-security related stress, (c) satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family, and (d) satisfaction with availability and helpfulness of work/family policies/practices. Specifically, this research contributes to the current literature by exploring the inner conflict women experience when striving to balance their roles as faculty members and roles as caregivers within the organizational context and climate of higher education. In addition, this study expands the literature by examining the extent to which junior women faculty caretakers experience two forms of alienation surrounding balancing work and family: (a) having low expectations of their ability to accurately predict the consequences of their behaviors surrounding work/family issues (meaninglessness), and (b) having high expectations that socially/professionally unapproved behaviors are required to achieve personal and/or professional goals (normlessness).

The most unique contribution of this study is its focus on women’s personal experiences with and perceptions of balancing their roles as faculty member and caregiver in the workplace and their perceptions of other women’s experiences with and perceptions of balancing work and
family in higher education. This unique focus on both self-reported experience with and perceptions of balancing work and family and the perceived experiences and perceptions of other women expands the literature on work/family research and social norms. This expansion provides a unique framework for understanding the extent to which women believe their experiences with and perceptions of balancing work and family differ from and/or align with the experiences and perceptions of others. The knowledge that derives from this framework has great potential to be useful to university faculty and administrators in their efforts to bridge the gaps between perceived (self-reported) and actual norms surrounding balancing work and family at comprehensive institutions and to continue to promote an organizational climate in which women faculty feel support from the institution and faculty colleagues to balance their roles as faculty member and caregiver.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Work and family conflict scholars call for further quantitative research in the area. MacDermid and Harvey (2006) challenged future research to move beyond producing descriptive statistics to more solidly ground research questions and hypotheses/predictions in theory, and to more intricately examine the mediating factors that affect employees struggling to balance work and family. Haas (1999) called for work/family research to consider how the structural features of specific jobs influence work/family conflict as a construct. Work/family scholars have also been calling for continued and progressive research that strives to reveal why “family-friendly” policies within organizational contexts have continued to go unused by employees for decades (Hochschild, 1979; Marshall, 2004). In response to these pleas and in reflection of the review of literature on work/family research and the role of caretaker, women in higher education, job satisfaction, and cognitive dissonance, alienation, and social norms
theories, this study investigates 9 hypotheses related to the two overarching research questions of this project.

RQ1: To what extent do tenure-track women caretakers self-report experiencing cognitive dissonance and alienation surrounding issues of balancing work and family in higher education and to what extent do these experiences relate to elements of job satisfaction?

RQ2: To what extent do women’s self-reported experiences with cognitive dissonance and alienation surrounding issues of balancing work and family in higher education differ from the perceived experiences of other tenure-track women caretakers at their institutions?

Hypotheses 1-6 relate to RQ1 and hypotheses 7-9 relate to RQ2. Specifically, Hypothesis 1 is grounded in cognitive dissonance theory (see Table 1), Hypotheses 2-3 derive from alienation theory (see Table 2), Hypotheses 4-5 are related to elements of job satisfaction (see Table 3), Hypothesis 6 is guided by cognitive dissonance theory and social norms theory (see Table 4), and Hypotheses 7-9 are grounded in alienation theory and social norms theory (see Table 5).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis Number</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1</td>
<td><em>Comfort with family talk at work</em> is significantly associated with (a) <em>job security-related stress</em>, (b) <em>job position satisfaction</em>, (c) <em>satisfaction with availability and helpfulness of work/family policies</em>, and (d) <em>satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 2  
*Comfort with caregiver/non-caregiver communication at work is significantly associated with satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family.*

Table 2

*Alienation and Job Satisfaction Hypotheses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis Number</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3</td>
<td><em>Comfort with taking family leave is significantly associated with (a) job security-related stress, (b) job position satisfaction, and (c) satisfaction with availability and helpfulness of work/family policies and practices.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

*Job Satisfaction Hypotheses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis Number</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4</td>
<td><em>Satisfaction with institutional support to balance work/family practices is significantly associated with (a) job security-related stress, (b) job position satisfaction and (c) satisfaction with availability and helpfulness of work/family policies/practices.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5</td>
<td><em>There is a significant relationship between satisfaction with availability and helpfulness of work/family policies/practices and job security-related stress.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4

**Hypotheses Concerning the Relationship of Cognitive Dissonance to Perceived Social Norms for Cognitive Dissonance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis Number</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6</td>
<td>There is a significant difference between <em>comfort with family talk at work</em> and <em>perceived norms of comfort with family talk at work</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 7</td>
<td>There is a significant difference between <em>comfort with caregiver/non-caregiver communication at work</em> and <em>perceived norms of comfort with caregiver/non-caregiver communication at work</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 8</td>
<td>There is a significant difference between <em>comfort with caregiver/caregiver communication at work</em> and <em>perceived norms of caregiver/caregiver communication at work</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

**Hypotheses Concerning the Relationship of Alienation to Perceived Social Norms for Alienation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis Number</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 9</td>
<td>There is a significant difference between self-reported <em>comfort with taking family leave</em> and <em>perceived norms of comfort with taking family leave</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III: METHOD

The purpose of this study was to investigate women tenure-track faculty members’ experiences of and perceptions of issues surrounding work and family issues in higher education. This chapter outlines the sampling procedures, respondents, variables, and analyses employed in this study.

Sampling Procedures and Data Collection

Clark (1987) and Wolf-Wendel and Ward (2006) called for research on faculty experiences at Carnegie (2000) classified comprehensive institutions. For the purposes of this study, comprehensive institutions consisted of public master’s colleges and universities and public baccalaureate colleges as designated by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2005) classification system. Carnegie defined master’s colleges and universities as institutions that award a minimum of 50 Master’s degrees and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees per year. Baccalaureate colleges include institutions where baccalaureate degrees represent at least 10% of all undergraduate degrees and that award fewer than 50 Master’s degrees and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees per year. All public comprehensive institutions in the Midwest (i.e., Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin) were included within the sampling frame of this study. See Appendix A for a complete list of institutions.

For this study, I developed a plan for recruiting women tenure-track faculty who self-identified as current caregivers for a child, parent, and/or spouse. Participants were enrolled via e-mail. Initially, administrators at each institution’s equivalent of an Office of Institutional Research were contacted and asked to forward an e-mail with an invitation to participate in the study (see Appendix B), informed consent information (see Appendix C), and a link to the
electronic survey (see Appendix D) to all tenure-track women faculty on record at their respective institutions. However, response rates using this recruitment approach were low. Thus an e-mail list of women tenure-track women at each institution was compiled via information provided on each institution’s website including faculty directories, academic college homepages, and individual department websites. Everyone on this list received the email invitation to participate in the study. This produced a significantly better response rate. All women tenure-track (probationary) faculty employed at a public comprehensive institution in the Midwest should have received one or more invitations to participate in the study. The e-mail invitation described who was eligible to participate. The survey also asked respondents whether they were caretakers for a child, parent/parent-in-law, and/or partner/spouse. Only those who responded yes were included in the sample.

Respondents

Women tenure-track faculty members at 58 institutions in the Midwest were invited to complete the survey for this research. However, the exact number of institutions represented in the sample is unknown because respondents were not asked to identify their institutions in an effort to maximize confidentiality of participant identities. Of the 3,614 potential participants who received e-mail invitations to participate in the study, 203 women who met the criteria for the sample parameters completed the survey, resulting in an approximately 5.6% response rate. The response rate was likely low in part because many of those who were contacted were not eligible because they were not caretakers. Eighty-eight percent of respondents identified as White/Caucasian and 12% identified as American Indian, Asian, Black/African American, or Mexican American/Chicana/Latina. Seventy-five percent of respondents identified as a caregiver for at least one child, 18% of participants reported being a caregiver for a parent/parent-in-law,
15% were caregivers for a partner/spouse (these percentages total more than 100% because some participants are caregivers for more than one child, partner/spouse, and/or parent/parent-in-law), and 36% of these respondents reported having taken family leave.

Variable Specification

*Job Satisfaction*

Job satisfaction refers to tenure-track women faculty members’ sources of stress/satisfaction and perceptions of support in the workplace. More specifically, four types of job satisfaction were focused on in this study: (a) job position satisfaction, (b) job security-related stress, (c) satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family, and (d) satisfaction with availability and helpfulness of work and family policies and practices. The survey questions that represent the items that constitute these variables have been used in previous research related to faculty satisfaction. Items 49-58 derive from the *Quality of Work Life Survey* and were used with permission from George Mason University (2000) and questions 41-48 and 62-67 are from the *Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey* used with permission from Harvard University (Trower & Chait, 2003). Unfortunately, reliability and validity measures for these questionnaires were not available.

Job position satisfaction was measured with eight items. Respondents were asked to report on a scale of 1 (very satisfied) to 5 (very dissatisfied) the extent to which they were satisfied with the clarity of tenure expectations for each of the following roles: (a) scholar (e.g., research), (b) teacher, and (c) campus citizen (e.g., service). Respondents were also asked to report on a scale of 1 (very satisfied) to 5 (very dissatisfied) the extent to which they were satisfied with what is expected of them for each of the following roles: (a) scholar (e.g., research), (b) teacher, and (c) campus citizen (e.g., service). In addition, participants were asked
to report on a scale of 1 (very satisfied) to 5 (very dissatisfied) the extent to which they were satisfied with their work overall and with the quality of mentoring they received from senior faculty. Responses to these eight items were averaged. The Cronbach alpha for this measure was .75.

Job security-related stress was measured with two items. Respondents were asked to report on a scale from 1 (great source of stress) to 5 (not a source of stress) the extent to which they believed they experienced stress in two areas: (a) job security and (b) the review/promotion process. Responses to these two items were averaged. The Cronbach alpha for this measure was .75.

Satisfaction with availability and helpfulness of work/family policies/practices was measured with three items. Respondents were asked to report on a scale from 1 (very helpful) to 5 (very unhelpful) the extent to which they found three provisions at their respective institutions helpful: (a) university childcare, (b) stop-the-tenure clock for parental or other family reasons, and (c) personal leaves during the probationary period. Responses to these three items were averaged. The Cronbach alpha for this measure was .68.

Satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family was measured with two items. Respondents were asked to report on a scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree) the extent to which they agreed with the statements: “I think my institution’s work and family policies adequately support my efforts to balance my work and family roles,” and “I am satisfied with the balance between work time and personal/family time that is promoted by my institution.” Responses to these two items were averaged. The Cronbach alpha for this measure was .87.
Cognitive Dissonance

Cognitive dissonance refers to inner conflict individuals believe they experience during decision-making processes and/or in anticipation of making decisions. Three types of dissonance were focused on in this study: (a) comfort with family talk at work in general, (b) comfort with caregiver/caregiver communication at work, and (c) comfort with caregiver/non-caregiver communication at work. Comfort with family talk at work was measured with six items. Respondents were asked to report on a scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree) the extent to which they agreed with the statement: “I believe I have to make a personal judgment call when deciding whether or not to openly discuss family issues at work.” Participants were also asked to report on a scale from 1 (always) to 5 (never) how often they feel conflicted in four situations: (a) when deciding whether or not to discuss work/family issues with colleagues who are caregivers, (b) when deciding whether or not to discuss work/family issues with colleagues who are not caregivers, (c) during interactions about work/family issues with colleagues who are caregivers, and (d) during interactions about work/family issues with colleagues who are not caregivers. In addition, respondents were asked to report on a scale from 1 (always) to 5 (never) how often they avoid talking with colleagues about issues surrounding balancing work and family. Response to these six items were averaged. The Cronbach alpha for this measure was .88.

Comfort with caregiver/caregiver communication at work was measured with two items. Respondents were asked to report on a scale from 1 (always) to 5 (never) how often they feel conflicted in two situations: (a) when deciding whether or not to discuss work/family issues with colleagues who are caregivers and (b) during interactions about work/family issues with
colleagues who are caregivers. The two items were averaged. The Cronbach alpha for this measure was .86.

Comfort with caregiver/non-caregiver communication at work was measured with two items. Respondents were asked to report on a scale from 1 (always) to 5 (never) how often they feel conflicted in two situations: (a) when deciding whether or not to discuss work/family issues with colleagues who are not caregivers and (b) during interactions about work/family issues with colleagues who are not caregivers. The two items were averaged. The Cronbach alpha for this measure was .91.

Alienation

Meaninglessness refers to feelings of estrangement that are the result of not understanding the events anticipated and/or experienced by women tenure-track faculty caregivers in which they do not feel confident in their ability to predict the outcomes of their behaviors. Specifically, one issue/source of alienation/meaninglessness surrounding balancing work and family in higher education were explored in this study: comfort with taking family leave.

Comfort with taking family leave was measured with four items. Respondents were asked to report on a scale of 1 (very difficult) to 5 (easy) the extent to which it would be difficult for them to make the decision to take or not take family leave if eligible. Participants were also asked to report on a scale of 1 (very comfortable) to 5 (very uncomfortable) the extent to which they would feel comfortable taking family leave if eligible. In addition, respondents were asked to report on a scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree) the extent to which they agreed with the statements: “I think taking family leave would negatively influence my chances of earning tenure,” and “I believe I would avoid taking family leave if eligible because
colleagues would view my taking leave as abusing family leave policy/entitlements.” After reversing the scale for comfort, responses to these four items were averaged. The Cronbach alpha for this measure was .75.

Social Norms

There are two types of social norms under investigation in this study: actual norms and perceived social norms. Actual social norms refer to self-reported behaviors or beliefs and are specified as alienation theory or cognitive dissonance theory variables for the purposes of this study, whereas perceived social norms refer to assumed behaviors or beliefs of others and are categorized as social norms variables. Five perceived social norms were investigated in this study: (a) perceived norms of comfort with taking family leave, (b) perceived norms of comfort with family talk at work, (c) perceived norms of comfort with caregiver/caregiver communication at work, (d) perceived norms of comfort with caregiver/non-caregiver communication at work, and (e) perceived satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family.

Perceived norms of comfort with taking family leave were measured with four items. Respondents were asked to report on a scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree) the extent to which they agreed with the statements: (a) “I think other tenure-track women caregivers at my institutions think taking family leave would negatively influence their chances of earning tenure,” and (b) “I think other tenure-track women caregivers at my institution would avoid taking family leave if eligible because they believe their colleagues would view taking leave as abusing family leave policy/entitlements.” Participants were also asked to report on a scale from 1 (very comfortable) to 5 (very uncomfortable) the extent to which they thought other women tenure-track caregivers at their institutions would feel comfortable taking leave if eligible. In
addition, respondents were asked to report on a scale from 1 (very difficult) to 5 (easy) how
difficulty they think it is for other tenure-track women at their institutions to make the decision to
take or not take family leave. After reversing the scale, response to these four items were
averaged. The Cronbach alpha for this measure was .79.

Perceived norms of comfort with family talk at work were measured with six items.
Respondents were asked to report on a scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree) the
extent to which they agreed with two statements about women caretakers’ perceptions of the
institutional climate surrounding balancing work and family at their institutions: (a) “I believe
other tenure-track women caregivers believe they have to make personal judgments calls when
deciding whether or not to discuss family issues at work,” and (b) “I think other tenure-track
women caregivers at my institution think taking family leave would negatively influence their
chances of earning tenure.” Participants were also asked to report on a scale from 1 (always) to 5
(never) how often tenure-track women caregivers at their institutions felt conflicted in four
situations surrounding work/family issues: (a) when deciding whether or not to discuss
work/family issues with colleagues who are caregivers, (b) when deciding whether or not to
discuss work/family issues with colleagues who are not caregivers, (c) during interactions about
work/family issues with colleagues who are also caregivers, and (d) during interactions about
work/family issues with colleagues who are not caregivers. Responses to these six items were
averaged. The Cronbach alpha for this measure was .84.

Perceived norms of comfort with caregiver/caregiver communication at work were
measured with two items. Respondents were asked to report on a scale from 1 (always) to 5
(never) how often they thought other tenure-track women caregivers at their institutions felt
conflicted in two situations: (a) when deciding whether or not to discuss work/family issues with
colleagues who are caregivers, and (b) during interactions about work/family issues with colleagues who are also caregivers. Responses to these two items were averaged. The Cronbach alpha for this measure was .82.

Perceived norms of comfort with caregiver/non-caregiver communication at work were measured with two items. Respondents were asked to report on a scale from 1 (always) to 5 (never) how often they thought other tenure-track women caregivers at their institutions felt conflicted in two situations: (a) when deciding whether or not to discuss work/family issues with colleagues who are not caregivers, and (b) during interactions about work/family issues with colleagues who are not caregivers. Responses to these two items were averaged. The Cronbach alpha for this measure was .90.

Perceived norms of satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family were measured with two items. Respondents were asked to report on a scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree) the extent to which they agreed with the statements: (a) “I believe other tenure-track women caregivers at my institution think the university’s work and family polices adequately support their efforts to balance their work and family roles,” and (b) “I believe other tenure-track women caregivers at my institution are satisfied with the balance between work time and personal/family time that is promoted by the institution.” Responses to these two items were averaged. The Cronbach alpha for this measure was .86.

Quantitative Data Analysis

Pearson r correlation coefficient was used to measure the degree and direction of the linear relationship between variables in Hypotheses 1-5. Repeated measures analysis of variance was used to determine the extent to which there was a significant difference between self-
reported experiences with the variables measured and perceived norms of others’ experiences with the variables measured in Hypotheses 6-9.

Qualitative Data Analysis

Responses to open-ended questions were analyzed via a three-step inductive data analysis process commonly employed in qualitative research (Berg, 2004; Strauss, 1987). The first step is referred to as open-coding and consists of three components: (a) asking a consistent and relevant set of questions regarding what the data implies about the phenomena under study, (b) analyzing the data minutely with the goal being to forefront the respondents’ intended messages in the interpretation and reporting of data, and (e) engaging in a preliminary analysis of the data during the coding process (Strauss). The second step is referred to as axial coding and is a form of qualitative content analysis established through the use of coding frames. Coding frames are used to organize individual categories and are comprised of the open codes identified in step one (Strauss). The final step is to establish higher-order themes by grouping the axial code categories together into meaningful units that represent respondents’ answer to the research questions under investigation (Berg).
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to investigate women tenure-track faculty members’ experiences of and perceptions of issues surrounding work and family issues in higher education. The results of the hypothesis tests identify the extent to which women tenure-track faculty members at comprehensive universities who self-identify as caretakers have experienced issues identified in the literature as barriers to balancing work and family. Specifically, results of the analyses reveal the extent to which women faculty members believe they experience cognitive dissonance and/or feelings of alienation regarding their understandings of work and family norms at their comprehensive institutions of higher education. Further, the results illustrate how women’s experiences with balancing work and family in higher education relate to elements of job satisfaction. Finally, the findings identify the extent to which normative social perceptions of women’s experiences with balancing work and family in higher education differ from self-reported experiences.

Quantitative Data Analysis Results

Cognitive Dissonance and Job Satisfaction

Tests of hypotheses 1-5 serve (see Table 6 for results) to answer the first research question that guided this study, which stated: To what extent do tenure-track women caretakers self-report experiencing cognitive dissonance and alienation surrounding issues of balancing work and family in higher education and to what extent do these experiences relate to elements of job satisfaction?

Hypothesis 1 stated: Comfort with family talk at work is significantly associated with (a) job security-related stress, (b) job position satisfaction, (c) satisfaction with availability and helpfulness of work/family policies, and (d) satisfaction with institutional support to balance
work and family. Results of the correlation analyses revealed that comfort with family talk at work is positively correlated with job security satisfaction. Decreased discomfort with family talk at work was significantly related to decreased job security-related stress ($n = 202, r = .42, p = .01$). Analysis also supported that comfort with family talk at work was negatively correlated with job position satisfaction, such that decreased discomfort with family talk at work is significantly negatively related to increased job position satisfaction ($n = 203, r = -.39, p = .01$).

Comfort with family talk at work was not significantly correlated with satisfaction with availability and helpfulness of work/family policies and practices ($n = 203, r = -.05, p = .41$). However, discomfort with family talk at work was negatively correlated with satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family. More specifically, increased discomfort with family talk at work is significantly related to decreased satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family ($n = 203, r = -.47, p = .01$).

Hypothesis 2 stated: Comfort with caregiver/non-caregiver communication at work is significantly associated with satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family. Results of the correlation analyses revealed that comfort with caregiver/non-caregiver communication at work was negatively correlated with satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family, such that women who are less conflicted about caregiver/non-caregiver communication report increased satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family ($n = 200, r = -.30, p = .01$).

**Alienation and Job Satisfaction**

Hypothesis 3 stated: Comfort with taking family leave is significantly associated with (a) job security-related stress, (b) job position satisfaction, and (c) satisfaction with availability and helpfulness of work/family policies and practices. All three correlations were significant. Results
of the correlation analyses reveal that comfort with taking family leave was positively correlated with job security-related stress. More specifically, increased comfort with taking family leave was significantly related to decreased job security-related stress \((n = 202, r = .37, p = .01)\). The analysis also revealed that comfort with taking family leave is negatively correlated with job position satisfaction. This means increased discomfort with taking family leave was significantly related to decreased job position satisfaction \((n = 203, r = -.29, p = .01)\). Comfort with taking family leave was negatively correlated with satisfaction with availability and helpfulness of work/family policies and practices, such that decreased discomfort with taking family leave is significantly negatively related to increased satisfaction with availability and helpfulness of work/family policies and practices \((n = 203, r = -.32, p = .01)\).

**Job Satisfaction**

Hypothesis 4 stated: Satisfaction with institutional support to balance work/family practices is significantly associated with (a) job security-related stress, (b) job position satisfaction and (c) satisfaction with availability and helpfulness of work/family policies/practices. Results of the correlation analyses revealed that satisfaction with institutional work/family balance practices is significantly negatively correlated with job security satisfaction, such that increased satisfaction with institutional work/family balance practices was significantly related to decreased job security-related stress \((n = 202, r = -.43, p = .01)\). Satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family was positively correlated with job position satisfaction, such that increased satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family was significantly related to increased job position satisfaction \((n = 203, r = .49, p = .01)\). However, satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family was not significantly correlated with satisfaction with availability and helpfulness of work/family policies and
practices. This means increased satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family is not related to increased satisfaction with availability and helpfulness of work/family policies and practices ($n = 203, r = .11, p = .09$).

Hypothesis 5 stated: There is a significant relationship between satisfaction with availability and helpfulness of work/family policies/practices and job security-related stress. Results of the correlation analyses reveal that satisfaction with availability and helpfulness of work/family policies and practices was not significantly correlated with job security-related stress ($n = 202, r = -.03, p = .65$).

Table 6

*Intercorrelations for Hypotheses 1-5: Relationships between Self-Reported Experiences with Cognitive Dissonance and Alienation and Relationships to Elements of Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Care/Care</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Talk</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Leave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Security-Related Stress</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Position Satisfaction</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort with Caregiver/Caregiver Communication at Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Institutional Support To Balance Work Family</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort with Family Talk at Work</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Availability and Helpfullness of Work/Family Policies/Practices</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort with Taking Family Leave</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Norms

Hypotheses 6-9 relate to the second research question that guided this study: To what extent do women’s self-reported experiences with cognitive dissonance and alienation surrounding issues of balancing work and family in higher education differ from their perceptions of other tenure-track women caretakers experiences of other at their institutions?

Relationships of Cognitive Dissonance to Perceived Social Norms for Cognitive Dissonance

Hypothesis 6 stated: There is a significant difference between comfort with family talk at work and perceived norms of comfort with family talk at work. Results of the repeated measures analysis of variance reveal that self-reported comfort with family talk at work was significantly different than perceived norms of comfort with family talk at work ($F(1, 200) = 49.70, \ p = .01, \ \eta^2 = 0.03$). More specifically, women self-reported experiencing significantly more comfort with family talk at work ($M = 3.09, SD = .98$) than they perceive other women at their institution as experiencing comfort with family talk at work ($M = 2.76, SD = .87$).

Hypothesis 7 stated: There is a significant difference between comfort with caregiver/non-caregiver communication at work and perceived norms of comfort with caregiver/non-caregiver communication at work. Results of the repeated measures analysis of variance reveal that self-reported comfort with caregiver/non-caregiver communication at work was significantly different than perceived norms of comfort with caregiver/non-caregiver communication at work ($F(1, 191) = 9.36, \ p = .01, \ \eta^2 = 0.00$). More specifically, women believe they are significantly more comfortable with caregiver/non-caregiver communication at work ($M = 2.99, SD = 1.28$) than they perceive other women at their institution to be ($M = 2.79, SD = .96$).
Hypothesis 8 stated: There is a significant difference between comfort with caregiver/caregiver communication at work and perceived norms of caregiver/caregiver communication at work. Results of the repeated measures analysis of variance reveal that self-reported comfort with caregiver/caregiver communication at work was significantly different than perceived norms of caregiver/caregiver communication at work ($F(1, 192) = 98.82, p = .01, \eta^2 = 0.11$). Women self-reported that they were significantly more comfortable with caregiver/caregiver communication at work ($M= 3.88, SD = 1.02$) than they believe other women at their institution are ($M= 3.31, SD = .86$).

Relationships of Alienation to Perceived Social Norms for Alienation

Hypothesis 9 stated: There is a significant difference between self-reported comfort with taking family leave and perceived norms of comfort with taking family leave. Results of the repeated measures analysis of variance reveal that self-reported comfort with taking family leave was significantly different than perceived norms of perceived comfort with taking family leave ($F(1, 202) = 42.26, p = .01, \eta^2 = 0.02$). This means women self-reported that they would be significantly more comfortable taking family leave ($M= 3.12, SD = .97$) than they believe other women at their institution would be ($M= 2.77, SD = .82$).

Qualitative Data Analysis Results

Thematic analysis of women’s responses to the question, “Please elaborate on why you think it would be difficult to make the decision to take or not take family leave,” resulted in six themes: (a) financial constraints, (b) commitment to students, colleagues, teaching, and service, (c) lack of qualified colleagues to cover work, (d) self-imposed expectations and guilt, (e) work identity, and (f) pressure to continue tenure-track uninterrupted. A major theme amongst women’s responses to why they would find it difficult to take or not take family leave was in
regard to financial constraints in which they felt limited in their ability to take family leave because they could not afford to do so. For example, one respondent explained, “It would depend on whether or not I had enough sick leave accrued for the family leave to be paid. With my salary as the primary income for my family we cannot afford an unpaid family leave.” Similarly, another woman said, “Family leave does not include financial compensation, and I am the sole caretaker for my family.”

Another theme evident in women’s responses referred to their strong commitment to students, colleagues, teaching, and service. Examples of this theme were illustrated by women who said, “As a professor, it becomes difficult to leave behind the courses, students, and commitment to colleagues,” “I have such a commitment to my students and worry that if I was not there for them then their learning would suffer,” and “It depends on when the leave was and for how long. I would be reluctant to take leave mid-way through a semester, or to take leave that would put me back mid-semester. This doesn't seem fair to the students.”

Some women felt that there would be a lack of qualified colleagues to cover their work in the event they were to take family leave, saying, “I feel I have job responsibilities that only I, among my colleagues, can best carry out” and “there is no one to cover what I teach.” Women also reported feeling self-imposed expectations not to take family leave and a sense of guilt for burdening others with their work if they were to take leave. For example, one woman said, “It's not that I think I would lack support from colleagues and administrators, but I would feel a self-imposed sense of letting my institution down, not meeting my responsibilities, and creating difficulties for my department.” Other women explained, “I feel a responsibility to my students and colleagues. If I take leave, then my work gets dumped on someone else. It's my work” and “I
think the biggest stress is the stress that which I (and most academics, and high achiever types) put on myself to produce and perform well.”

Women’s responses illuminated the importance of their role as faculty member as a critical component of their identity and the role that part of their identity played in their contemplations about taking family leave. For example, one woman said, “I feel the support would be there at all levels, however MY discomfort at lack of progress towards tenure, MY unwillingness to admit that I can't ‘do it all,’ be all things to all people would present the biggest obstacle.” Other women explained, “So much of my identity is bound up in my job that I would be anxious if it weren't part of my life even for a short time,” “I would miss working. I planned my pregnancies so I wouldn't have to take leave,” and “The issue for me is more my need/desire to work, as well as not wanting others to ‘cover’ for me. I KNOW everyone would cover for me, but I personally wouldn't feel comfortable doing that if at all possible.”

Although some women explained that their institutions offered stop-the-clock options for faculty taking family leave and many women said they felt support from their institutions to balance work and family, their responses suggested that they are pressured to continue tenure-track uninterrupted. For example, one women explained, “Although the 'party line' is that family leave is OK, I have several friends who have encountered serious resistance to it in practice. I'm not sure what my administration's real reaction would be.” Others said, “Even though I feel like I have support from fellow faculty, pressure from my department chair and the administration to continue on the tenure track uninterrupted is high,” and “If I leave, it's ‘end of story.’”

Participants’ responses to the question, “please elaborate on why you think other tenure-track women at your institution find it difficult to make the decision to take or not take family leave,” elicited three themes: (a) commitment to others, (b) financial need, and (c) limited access to
taking advantage of family leave. The similarity among some of these themes and the themes that emerged from the question about personal contemplations about taking family leave illustrates that, while women believe they and their women tenure-track colleagues contemplate similar consequences associated with taking family leave, they inaccurately assumed that they experienced these consequences significantly differently than the majority of their counterparts. The theme that emerged from responses to this question about other women’s difficulty deciding to take or not take family leave that did not overlap with personal (self-reported) difficulty deciding to take or not take family leave related to women reporting a lack of access to taking advantage of family leave without negative consequence. For example, one woman explained that, “A lack of support does not seem like the right wording, I think of it [taking family leave] more as having a star next to your name that you may or may not have put in the time.” Other women said, “I think there is generally a perception that academia in general is not family-friendly, so even women I would think would have no worries about family leave affecting their tenure decision nevertheless worry about it” and “On a personal basis I believe that we all feel ‘supported’ by our colleagues and administrators but at an institutional level there is a loud and resounding thud when you stop and take family leave . . . no progress is no progress no matter the reasons.”
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

This study examined tenure-track women’s experiences with and perceptions of balancing work and family in higher education. More specifically, this research sought to answer two research questions:

RQ1: To what extent do tenure-track women caretakers self-report experiencing cognitive dissonance and alienation surrounding issues of balancing work and family in higher education and to what extent do these experiences relate to elements of job satisfaction?

RQ2: To what extent do women’s self-reported experiences with cognitive dissonance and alienation surrounding issues of balancing work and family in higher education differ from the perceived experiences of other tenure-track women caretakers at their institutions?

The results of this study indicate that, in general, women experience cognitive dissonance and alienation surrounding issues related to balancing work and family in higher education and these experiences significantly relate to elements of job satisfaction. Overall, women’s self-reported experiences with issues surrounding balancing work and family are significantly more favorable than their perceptions of other women caretaker’s experiences at their institutions. Findings from this study and implications are further discussed in this chapter, as are limitations of the study and suggestions for future research.

Cognitive Dissonance and Job Satisfaction

Whether or not women are comfortable with family talk at work about work and family issues significantly relate to their job position satisfaction and levels of job security-related stress. Women who believe it is acceptable to discuss family issues at work and that these
discussions will be well-received by their colleagues, are more satisfied in their role as faculty member and more secure in the longevity of their employment at the institution. This suggests that the roles of faculty member and caregiver cannot be discussed as discrete entities. The fact that job security-related stress is related to women anticipating experiencing inner conflict when discussing family issues with colleagues suggests that junior women faculty voices and concerns may not be wholeheartedly reflected in departmental and/or university discussions and/or policies because women refrain from full-disclosure and input out of fear for losing their job and/or opportunities for promotion. This finding empirically supports Toth’s (1995) claim that prior to attaining tenure status in higher education, women are encouraged to pick their battles, avoid public disputes, and make sacrifices in order to increase job promotion potential. Women experience inner conflict when contemplating engaging in dialogue with colleagues about their role as caretaker, which negatively relates to their job position satisfaction and increases job security-related stress. This suggests that if the organizational climate at comprehensive institutions more proactively supported openly discussing family issues at work, women would be more satisfied with their role as faculty member and more secure in the longevity of their employment and potential for promotion at the institution.

The less comfortable women faculty caretakers are with family talk at work, the less satisfied they are with their role as faculty member overall, the less satisfied they are institutional support to balance work and family, and the less satisfied they are with job security with and potential for promotion. Because consequences associated with work/family issues are more acute for women faculty than their male counterparts (AAUP, 2001), these findings offer some additional explanations to those in extant literature regarding why women may continue to be underrepresented in the upper ranks of faculty and administration than men in comparable
faculty situations (Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Perna 2000; Valian, 1998). In accordance with cognitive
dissonance theory, if the norms, expectations, and consequences associated with family talk at
work were more clearly-articulated by colleagues and administrators, women faculty would
experience inner conflict surrounding their interactions with colleagues within the context of
higher education. The findings of the current study suggest that in order to increase job position
satisfaction and satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family, and to
decrease job security-related stress, women faculty caregivers need to be more comfortable with
family talk at work. This means if women believed they could more accurately predict the
consequences associated with family talk at work and/or enact socially approved behaviors to
achieve personal and professional goals, they would feel more satisfied in the role of faculty
member, and less stressed about job security.

Women faculty caregivers are more comfortable discussing family issues with colleagues
who are also caregivers than with colleagues who are not caregivers. This suggests that
examining the extent to which comfort levels with discussing work/family issues with non-
caregiver colleagues relate to satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family is
exceptionally important. The more comfortable women are discussing work/family issues with
colleagues who are not caregivers, the more satisfied they are with institutional support to
balance work and family. This finding supports the notion that the education and promotion of
use of family-friendly policies and a family-friendly work environment should not be geared
only to faculty who are currently, or anticipate being, caretakers. Rather, university
administrators should strive to cultivate an organizational climate in which caregivers and non-
caregivers alike are empathetic and supportive of caregiver issues in order to increase women
faculty caregivers’ satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family.
Alienation and Job Satisfaction

Although federal family-leave legislation and university policies stipulate that faculty caregivers are entitled to family leave for the birth, placement, or adoption of a child and to care for a child, parent/parent-in-law, or spouse (and in some cases domestic partner), junior women faculty at comprehensive institutions do not feel comfortable requesting and/or taking leave. This discomfort is directly related to decreased job position satisfaction, increased job security-related stress, and decreased satisfaction with the availability and helpfulness of current university work/family policies and practices. These findings support Kirby and Krone’s assertion that work/family policies are discursively (re)structured and controlled by colleagues in a way that makes work/family leave entitlements inaccessible to employees. This means faculty colleagues, administrators, and university communities need to (re)evaluate the ways in which family-leave entitlements are made available and accessible to women faculty caretakers in order to decrease employee job security-related stress and increase faculty satisfaction with the availability and helpfulness of these policies. Moreover, university colleagues and administrators need to proactively and unconditionally advocate, promote, and support all valid use of entitled family-leave to improve overall job position satisfaction of junior women faculty caretakers.

Job Satisfaction

Nyquist et al. (2000) reported that women faculty feel less satisfied than their male counterparts. Although the current study did not compare women’s job satisfaction levels to men’s, the results do suggest that many women are less than satisfied with their job positions, institutional support to balance work and family, and the availability and usefulness of work and family policies. Thus the finding that increased satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family is significantly related to increased job position satisfaction supports Riger et
al.’s (1998) claimed that it is particularly difficult for women to balance work and family. Specifically, when women faculty caregivers are satisfied with institutional support to balance work and family, they are more satisfied with their role as faculty member overall and they experience less job security-related stress.

The measurement of job position satisfaction in the current study focused on the extent to which women faculty caregivers are satisfied with the work itself, including research, teaching and service endeavors. Findings suggest that if women were more satisfied with institutional support to balance work and family, they would be more satisfied with their work overall. Park (1996) claimed that evaluation of the triad (i.e., research, teaching, and service) of the professoriate is itself problematic for women because evaluation and promotion in higher education prioritize the research prong of the triad (which has historically focused on objective standards over subjective standards). Results of this study suggest that if universities truly supported a balance between the role of faculty member and caretaker, women’s perspectives and priorities would have greater potential to be more fully incorporated into their work. This means their research and teaching and service efforts could be more fully accepted and adequately rewarded by colleagues. However, if universities continue to fall short of supporting a balance between work and family for women faculty, the majority of women caretakers will likely continue to monitor their scholarly, teaching, and service contributions in an effort to align them with the masculine/objective expectations of academe. This means the optimal contributions of women faculty caretakers at comprehensive institutions will continue to be underrepresented, undervalued, and inadequately recognized in higher education.
Social Norms

The two basic assumptions of social norms theory are that: (a) misperceptions of negative peer behaviors perpetuate negative/undesirable behavior, and (b) accurate perceptions of positive/desirable peer behaviors promote positive/productive behavior (Berkowitz, 2004). Testing of each of the four hypotheses related to social norms theory in the current study revealed that women faculty believe their experiences with balancing work and family in higher education represent the minority of women faculty experiences, when in reality, their experiences are actually representative of the majority of self-reported women’s experiences with balancing work and family.

If women faculty who self-report discomfort with family talk at work and taking family leave realize that the majority of their colleagues experience less discomfort than they believe them to experience, this understanding would have the potential to transform another (mis)perceived norm. This means, the majority of women would align themselves with the actual (self-reported) and less discouraging norms in which women experience less discomfort than the current (mis)perceived norm perpetuates, which would result in women feeling more comfortable with family talk at work and contemplating family leave. Specifically, women would likely align with the actual social norm in which the majority of women are significantly more comfortable with caregiver/caregiver communication at work than they believe other women at their institution are. However, because women report that they are significantly more comfortable with caregiver/non-caregiver communication at work than they believe other women are at their institution, correcting the (mis)perception would not aid women in more accurately perceiving the social norm. Rather, the ways in which faculty, department heads, and university administrators institutionalize the accessibility of work and family policies should be explored to
determine the extent to which they promote and support women faculty in their efforts to balance work and family.

Hollenshead et al. (2005) found that research institutions were more likely to have formalized and institutionalized work and family policies than other Carnegie types. The results of their research found that a “chilly climate” often discouraged faculty from taking advantage of work and family policies and that “resistance to maternity and paternity leave was said to emerge from ‘subcultures in the university that are male-dominated and senior in age and experiences’” (Hollenshead, et al., p. 62). The results of the current study uniquely reveal the ways in which women believe a chilly climate exists for other tenure-track women caretakers at their institutions. However, the findings suggest that women at comprehensive institutions do not believe they personally experience the chilly climate that has been highlighted in the literature surrounding women’s experiences at other types of Carnegie-classified institutions.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Study

Limitations

Singleton and Straits (2005) offered two considerations relevant to potential response errors that are pertinent to electronic survey research. First is coverage error, which may be increased by response bias and/or user bias. Response bias occurs because participants who are more likely to respond to an invitation to participate in survey research are those who are strongly committed to (either in favor of or against) the topic addressed in the questionnaire. Response bias may have been a factor in the results of this study. For example, response bias may have occurred because respondents who self-identified as having to balance work and family opted to participate because of overwhelmingly positive or negative experiences with and/or a strong commitment to issues surrounding balancing work and family in higher
education. In addition, the results of this study may be limited because the sample was not stratified to explore the ways in which the issues investigated may differ based on the intersections of age, race/ethnicity, and/or socio-economic status (Lorber, 2005).

The AAUP (2001) suggested that administrators transform work and family policies and practices to include options for women faculty that offer modified duties and/or stopping of the tenure clock. Although some academic institutions have implemented family leave or stop-the-clock policies for both male and female faculty member caregivers, there is evidence that these policies have not been fully accepted and/or used (Finkel, et al., 1994). Regardless, the current study was conducted under the overarching assumption that, at minimum, the purposes and procedures of university work and family policies reflect those stated in federal Family and Medical Leave Act legislation. This means the institutions included in this study likely have different work and family policies, and although the research questions and survey questions for this study were designed with this in mind, they were not tailored to each institution’s work/family policies. Also, the correlations found in this study, although significant, were not strong. This is likely because so many other factors explain these relationships.

**Suggestions for Future Study**

As a study about tenure-track women’s experiences with and perceptions of balancing work and family, this study provided revealing data about ways in which women experience cognitive dissonance and alienation surrounding work and family issues and the extent to which these experiences relate to elements of job satisfaction. In addition, this research began to expose women’s perceptions of other women’s experiences with balancing work and family and the extent to which these perceptions differ from actual (self-reported) norms. As a result, there are numerous possibilities to build on this study in future research. Wolf-Wendel and Ward (2006)
investigated faculty experiences with balancing work and family at various types of Carnegie (2000) classified institutions. Their findings suggested that women faculty at comprehensive (master’s and baccalaureate) institutions have the most diverse range of experiences balancing work and family (in relation to research universities, liberal arts colleges, and community colleges). However, the current study focused only on pre-tenure tenure-track women’s experiences with balancing work and family. Future research should more thoroughly explore various levels of women and men faculty experiences, which may best be explored both quantitatively and qualitatively to attain a more thorough understanding of the ways in which women and men in different types of faculty positions experience issues related to balancing work and family. For example, future research should explore nontenure-track (e.g., fixed-term/renewable contract, visiting professor, and adjunct) faculty experiences with juggling work and family and differentiate among experiences at different types of comprehensive institutions (e.g., private, collective bargaining units, and non-unionized campuses). Further, future research should expand the definition of caretaker beyond the parameters set by the Family and Medical Leave Act and more specifically and comprehensively examine experiences of single (non-partnered) faculty and faculty in same-sex partnerships.

Some comprehensive university women faculty may not have fit the sample for this study because the tenure process has impacted their decision about committing to a partner and/or having children, meaning not seeking a tenure-track position may be some women’s way of balancing work and family. In addition, findings from the current study may also have been void of the voices of women who have chosen to stay ready to care for aging parents in lieu of caring for children of their own. Thus future research should more thoroughly explore long-term decisions related to balancing work and family/life in higher education, starting at the graduate
student-level where future-faculty begin socialization to the role of faculty member and learn of others’ experiences with and expectations of balancing and/or anticipating balancing work and family within the context of higher education.

Based on the survey used in the current study, there are a plethora of areas that should be explored in future research regarding women junior faculty experiences with and perceptions of balancing work and family at comprehensive institutions. Data was collected for this study that did not directly relate to the specific research questions under investigation in the study. Future research should use this data to further explore other variables and research questions related to balancing work and family in higher education. For example, future studies should explore the extent to having taken or not taken family when eligible is related to job position satisfaction, job security-related stress, satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family, and satisfaction with the availability and helpfulness of work/family policies/practices. Similarly, research should reveal the extent to these elements of job satisfaction differ for women who are caregivers for a child versus a partner/spouse versus a parent/parent-in-law. In addition, scholars should look at how the age of children who women faculty are caregiving for relates to elements of job satisfaction, specifically satisfaction with institutional support to balance work and family and satisfaction with the availability and helpfulness of work/family policies/practices. Future work should also examine the extent to which having taken paid versus unpaid family leave relates to elements of job satisfaction.

Future research should explore qualitative follow-up research questions to provide women with a voice and opportunity to share their narrative and to explain the extent to which they agree, and why they think the findings of the current study exist. Specifically, the decision-making process women engage in to decide to discuss (or not discuss) and take (or not take)
family leave should be examined. Similarly, women’s rationales regarding why they believe they experience inner conflict in anticipation of discussing family issues at work (particularly with non-caregiver colleagues) and/or taking family leave should be explored. Future research should continue to reveal the coping mechanisms, tactics, and strategies women faculty caretakers employ to successfully fulfill their roles as faculty member and caretaker. Scholars should also examine why and under what circumstances women avoid talking with colleagues about issues surrounding balancing work and family and how women believe institutional support for balancing work and family affects their research, teaching, and service endeavors.

The AAUP (2001) advocates that university administrators should promote the use of work/family policies and a progressive balance between work and family. However, future research should more intricately explore what women faculty believe individual colleagues (caregivers and non-caregivers), department heads/chairs, and upper-administrators can do to support their efforts to balance their roles as faculty member and caretaker. In addition, how and why women believe discussing family issues at work and/or taking family leave could potentially negatively affect their chances of successfully attaining tenure should be explored. Further, research should strive to more intricately identify work/family balance challenges associated with different types of caretaking responsibilities for childbirth, childrearing, elderly parents, and spouses.

Future research should strive to reveal why women believe they are more comfortable with family talk at work, taking family leave, and with caregiver/caregiver communication with colleagues than they believe other women faculty caretakers experience. To optimally benefit women faculty caretakers and increase perceived university support for balancing work and family, these findings should culminate in social norms intervention programs for faculty
orientation training, socialization, and mentoring practices in an effort to enhance and promote the availability and usefulness of work/family policies and practices.

At the end of the survey used in the current study, women were asked, “Are there any other issues related to women tenure-track faculty members’ experiences with and/or perceptions of balancing work and family in higher education I did not ask about and/or that you would like to expand on?” A thematic analysis of women’s responses elicited four themes of areas that should be considered for future research: (a) different work and family expectations and rewards for men and women, (b) partner status, income, and contributions to second and third shift responsibilities and children’s health, (c) formalized/institutionalized versus practiced/supported policies, and (d) departmental versus university support. The first theme illustrates that women believe different and unequal work and family expectations and rewards continue to exist for men and women in higher education. One woman said, “Women tend to do FAR more service than men and are rarely recognized or rewarded for their service contributions. Also, their service can be incredibly time-consuming and women continue to make less salary based on gender.” Other women spoke to the same sentiment and the idea of further exploring how intersectionality influences experiences with balancing work and family, explaining, “I feel that I need to work more than required to prove myself because I am judged against my recently tenured colleagues who are all males and American. I am not American. So I worked more than necessary to assure that my tenure process would go smoothly.” This point was further illustrated by another woman who said:

Glass-ceiling for women is a problem. Most females don't make it to higher administration. The male-dominated administration thinks it is non-sexist, but it is in fact, oblivious to male biases. Like most of the Baby-boomer females at my institution, I was
hired at a salary somewhat lower than what they were paying males. I never thought to negotiate because I was so grateful "they" gave me a job. There's plenty of "closet sexism" in Academia even though they are experts at hiding it. I am very conscious of how the "old boy" network perpetuates itself, because I see it everyday. I am a female faculty without children. If I had had children, I believe I would have felt even more marginalized.

Women’s responses also suggested that partner status, income, and contributions to second and third shift responsibilities and children’s health should be further explored in future research, explaining:

I think it is very important to note that my husband is a full-time stay-at-home-dad. The low cost of living in our city makes this possible despite modest faculty salaries. This SIGNIFICANTLY reduces the stress caused by balancing work and family life. Finally, my daughters are model children. I do not say this to brag, but to help explain why they are not a major source of stress for me. Easy-going children plus a first-rate primary caretaker make my life much easier and less stressful. This allows me to spend happy time with my children without any of the hassles of a rigid daycare schedule, concerns about the quality of their care while I am at work, etc.

Another woman explained:

It seems the expectation for those on the tenure track is that one should work 80 hours per week. At times this is not possible, due to family issues. I believe other faculty want to be supportive of families, but also believe you should put in your hours. My spouse is extremely supportive of my career, but many times that means a lot of extra work/stress for him at home. There seems to be little understanding of families with children who
have special needs, especially when those needs are related to mental health issues and it seems that some women still don't expect much from their husbands or partners-in other words, the woman expects more accommodations from the work environment than her male counterpart-for example, when the child is ill the woman always seems to stay home.

Women’s responses also call for formalized/institutionalized work and family policies to be more accessible in practice and for their use to be supported (as opposed to merely permitted) by administration. This theme is representative of women’s comments such as, “Administration acts supportive, because they can't legally not. BUT they don't seem supportive to me. So I don't talk about my family with them and pretend like work is the most important thing, when my family really comes first,” and “I think mothers often feel the need to ‘hide’ the fact that they have children so they don't appear less dedicated than childless counterparts.” One woman attributed the lack of accessibility to balancing work and family in higher education to a double-standard that exists for women and men, explaining, “I have children. It is funny that when I need to take time off for a sick child, I'm scowled at, but if the fathers in my department do that, they're just being great dads!! I actually try not to stay home with my children when they're sick sometimes just because I feel I have to be (seen) at work.”

The final theme that emerged from women’s responses addressed colleague support for balancing work and family. More specifically, women explained that the level of support they receive from their departmental colleagues is different than the level of support they receive from the larger university community and that their perceptions of departmental and university support are often shaped through interactions with specific individuals (e.g., department head, college dean, specific individual). For example, women said, “I am blessed to have had a boss who once
had been a single father of four children!!! Other bosses (sadly, some female) have not been so understanding of the needs of parents (male or female),” and “It greatly depends on the dean of your college. The dean of my college is very family friendly, but I'm not sure that's the case in other colleges.” One woman’s comment spoke directly to the dire need for continued research on balancing work and family in higher education, which stated, “University policies are helpful but women are still stuck with the informal policies and attitudes that impact their relationships with colleagues, supervisors, and the university.”
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APPENDIX A: INSTITUTIONS INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN STUDY

Illinois
Chicago State University
Eastern Illinois University
National-Louis University
Roosevelt University
Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville
Western Illinois University

Indiana
Indiana University-Purdue University-Fort Wayne
Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis
University of Indianapolis
University of Southern Indiana
Indiana State University
Indiana University-South Bend
Indiana University-Northwest
Indiana University-Southeast
Purdue University-Calumet Campus

Iowa
University of Northern Iowa

Kansas
Emporia State University
Fort Hays State University
Pittsburgh State University
Washburn University

Michigan
Eastern Michigan University
Ferris State University
Grand Valley State University
Northern Michigan University
Oakland University
Saginaw Valley State University
University of Michigan-Dearborn
University of Michigan-Flint
Minnesota
Bemidji State University
Minnesota State University-Mankato
Metropolitan State University
University of Minnesota-Duluth
Minnesota State University-Moorhead
Saint Cloud State University
Southwest Minnesota State University
Winona State University

Missouri
Central Missouri State University
Missouri Southern State University
Missouri Western State College
Truman State University
Northwest Missouri State University
Southeast Missouri State University
Missouri State University

Nebraska
University of Nebraska at Kearney
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Ohio
Shawnee State University
Youngstown State University

South Dakota
Black Hills State University

Wisconsin
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh
University of Wisconsin-Parkside
University of Wisconsin-Stout
University of Wisconsin-Platteville
University of Wisconsin-Riverfalls
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
APPENDIX B: RECRUITMENT E-MAIL

Good Day,
My name is Nicole Schultz and I am eagerly seeking participants to complete an electronic survey on balancing work and family in higher education for my dissertation. The survey is available at: http://survey.bgsu.edu/surveys/SCS/dissertationns/dissertationns.htm

I am interested in women tenure-track faculty members’ perceptions of issues related to balancing work and family in higher education and how these perceptions relate to faculty job satisfaction. If you are a woman faculty member in a tenure-track line who is a caretaker for a child, partner/spouse, parent/parent-in-law, and/or other family member, I hope you will please consider taking time to help me with my research by completing the survey. Details regarding informed consent are provided via the attached document.

Your participation is voluntary and participants have the right to have the confidentiality of their responses protected. You may have any questions you have about this study answered in-full by contacting the primary investigator and/or research supervisor for this study via the contact information provided below. You may choose not to answer any questions or withdraw your participation in the study at any time without penalty. Your decision to participate or not participate in the study will have no impact on your relationship with your or any other institution in any way.

Cordially,
Nicole J. Schultz

Principle Investigator: Nicole Schultz, Ph.D. Candidate
School of Communication Studies
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403
(419) 494-1991
nschult@bgsu.edu

Research Supervisor: Terry Rentner, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Journalism
School of Communication Studies
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403
(419) 372-2079
trentne@bgnet.bgsu.edu

Office of Research Compliance
201 South Hall
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403
(419) 372-7716
hsrb@bgnet.bgsu.edu
APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT

1. *What are my rights as a participant?* Your participation is voluntary. You have the right to have the confidentiality of your responses protected. You may have any questions you have about this study answered in-full by contacting the principal investigator and/or research supervisor for this study via the contact information provided below. You may choose not to answer any questions or withdraw your participation in the study at any time without penalty. Your decision to participate or not participate in the study will have no impact on your relationship with your institution in any way.

2. *What is the purpose of this study?* In this dissertation I seek to investigate women tenure-track faculty members’ attitudes and perceptions surrounding work and family issues in higher education at state institutions in the Midwest and how these perceptions relate to faculty job satisfaction.

3. *How was I chosen?* You are invited to participate in this study because the institution at which you are employed has you on record as a woman tenure-track faculty member. You meet the parameters of the sample set for this study if you are a woman tenure-track faculty member and are a caretaker for a child, parent, and/or partner.

4. *What will be involved in participating?* If you agree to participate, you will complete an electronic survey to be accessed via a link in the e-mail you received with this informed consent information sheet. It should take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete the survey. Completion of the survey represents informed consent. If you choose to participate, your identity will remain confidential and the data I collect will be password protected and destroyed upon completion of my research. Although I will be taking these precautions, it is important to note that electronic communication may not be 100% secure.

5. *Who will know what I say?* You will not be asked to share your name, the name of your institution, or your department should you choose to participate in this study. No identifiable demographic information will be associated with the individuals who participate in the study in the write-up of my findings in an effort to keep identities confidential. In addition, the data I collect will be filed electronically, password protected, and destroyed upon completion of my research.

6. *What risks and benefits are associated with participation?* Risks of participation in this study are minimal. The primary risks relate to breach of confidentiality and potential retribution for critical responses. As noted above, several steps will be taken to minimize these risks. First, you will not be asked to share your name, the name of your institution, or your department. Next, no identifiable demographic information will be associated with individuals who participated in the write-up of my findings in an effort to keep identities confidential. Finally, the data I collect will be filed electronically, password protected, and destroyed upon completion of my research.
I believe you may potentially benefit from participating in this study by having the opportunity to reflect on issues related to your experiences with and perceptions of balancing work and family. The research itself should result in a more complete understanding of how perceptions of issues associated with balancing work and family in academic culture may affect women faculty.

7. If I want more information, whom should I contact about the study? You may contact my research advisor or me at the contact information noted below. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, please feel free to contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Review Board at Bowling Green State University at hsr@bgnet.bgsu.edu or (419) 372-7716

Primary Investigator:
Nicole Schultz
Assistant Basic Course Director/Doctoral Candidate
School of Communication Studies
Bowling Green State University
(419) 494-1991
nschult@bgsu.edu

Research Supervisor: Terry Rentner, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Journalism
School of Communication Studies
Bowling Green State University
(419) 372-2079
trentne@bgnet.bgsu.edu
APPENDIX D: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Office of Nicole Schultz
Women Faculty, Work, and Family Questionnaire

The purpose of this research is to investigate women tenure-track faculty members’ perceptions of issues surrounding balancing work and family in higher education at state institutions in the Midwest and how these perceptions relate to faculty job satisfaction. Your participation is voluntary and participants have the right to have the confidentiality of their responses protected.

You may have any questions you have about this study answered in-full by contacting the primary investigator and/or research supervisor for this study via the contact information provided below. You may choose not to answer any questions or withdraw your participation in the study at any time without penalty. Your decision to participate or not participate in the study will have no impact on your relationship with your or any other institution in any way.

Primary Investigator:
Nicole Schultz
Assistant Basic Course Director/Doctoral Candidate
School of Communication Studies
Bowling Green State University
(419) 494-1991
nschult@bgsu.edu

Research Supervisor: Terry Rentner, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Journalism
School of Communication Studies
Bowling Green State University
(419) 372-2079
trentne@bgnet.bgsu.edu

Q1. Please accept or decline participation in this research about tenure-track women faculty caregivers’ perceptions of balancing work and family after reading the following information. Participation will consist of completing this electronic survey questionnaire, which should take approximately 20 minutes. Completion of the survey represents informed consent. If you choose to participate, your identity will remain confidential. Although I will be taking precautions, it is important to note that electronic communication may not be 100% secure. I would greatly appreciate it if you would be willing to help me with my research. Should you express interest in participating in the study and wish to withdraw your participation, you may do so at any time without consequence.

- Accept
- Decline
Q2. Are you a woman faculty member in a tenure-track/probationary faculty line who identifies as a caretaker for a child, partner/spouse, parent/parent-in-law, or other family member [question used as a contingent question to determine whether respondents should complete the remainder of the survey]?
  o Yes
  o No

Q3. In the event you became eligible for family leave, how difficult would it be to make the decision to take or not take family leave?
  o Very Difficult
  o Somewhat Difficult
  o Neutral
  o Somewhat Easy
  o Easy

Q4. In the event you became eligible for family leave, how difficult would it be to make the decision to take or not take family leave?
  o Lack of support from my spouse/partner.
  o Lack of support from my junior faculty colleagues.
  o Lack of support from my senior faculty colleagues.
  o Lack of support from my department chair.
  o Lack of support from my upper administration.
  o Other

Q5. Please elaborate on why you think it would be difficult to make the decision to take or not take family leave.

Q6. How difficult do you think it is for other tenure-track women at your institution to make the decision to take or not take family leave?
  o Very Difficult
  o Somewhat Difficult
  o Neutral
  o Somewhat Easy
  o Easy

Q7. Why do you think other tenure-track women at your institution find it difficult to make the decision to take or not take family leave (please mark all that apply)?
  o Lack of support from spouse/partner.
  o Lack of support from junior faculty colleagues.
  o Lack of support from senior faculty colleagues.
  o Lack of support from department chair.
  o Lack of support from upper administration.
  o Other

Q8. Please elaborate on why you think other tenure-track women at your institution find it difficult to make the decision to take or not take family leave.
Q9. Have you taken family leave?
   o Yes
   o No

Q10. Please elaborate on your experience with taking family leave.

Q11. Was your family leave paid?
   o Yes
   o No

Q12. Please elaborate on your experience with paid family leave.

Q13. How *comfortable* would you feel taking family leave if eligible?
   o Very Comfortable
   o Somewhat Comfortable
   o Neutral
   o Somewhat Uncomfortable
   o Very Uncomfortable

Q14. How comfortable do you think *other* women tenure-track caregivers at your institution would feel taking family leave if eligible?
   o Very Comfortable
   o Somewhat Comfortable
   o Neutral
   o Somewhat Uncomfortable
   o Very Uncomfortable

Please indicate how comfortable *YOU* are with discussing issues surrounding balancing work and family with each of the following people on campus.

Q15. Department Chair
   o Very Comfortable
   o Somewhat Comfortable
   o Neutral
   o Somewhat Uncomfortable
   o Very Uncomfortable

Q16. Senior Faculty
   o Very Comfortable
   o Somewhat Comfortable
   o Neutral
   o Somewhat Uncomfortable
   o Very Uncomfortable
Q17. Junior Faculty Colleagues
   o Very Comfortable
   o Somewhat Comfortable
   o Neutral
   o Somewhat Uncomfortable
   o Very Uncomfortable

Please indicate how comfortable you think OTHER tenure-track women caregivers at your institution are with discussing issues surrounding balancing work and family with each of the following people on campus.

Q18. Department Chair
   o Very Comfortable
   o Somewhat Comfortable
   o Neutral
   o Somewhat Uncomfortable
   o Very Uncomfortable

Q19. Senior Faculty
   o Very Comfortable
   o Somewhat Comfortable
   o Neutral
   o Somewhat Uncomfortable
   o Very Uncomfortable

Q20. Junior Faculty Colleagues
   o Very Comfortable
   o Somewhat Comfortable
   o Neutral
   o Somewhat Uncomfortable
   o Very Uncomfortable

Please indicate the extent to which YOU agree/disagree with each of the following statements regarding the climate surrounding work/family issues at your institution.

Q21. I believe I have to make a personal judgment call when deciding whether or not to openly discuss family issues at work.
   o Strongly Agree
   o Agree
   o Neutral
   o Disagree
   o Strongly Disagree
Q22. I think my institution's work and family policies adequately support my efforts to balance my work and family roles.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

Q23. I think taking family leave would negatively influence my chances of earning tenure.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

Q24. I believe I would avoid taking family leave if eligible because colleagues would view my taking leave as abusing family leave policy/entitlements.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

Q25. I am satisfied with the balance between work time and personal/family time that is promoted by my institution.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

Please indicate the extent to which you agree/disagree with the following statements about other tenure-track women caretakers' perceptions of the institutional climate surrounding balancing work and family at your institution.

Q26. I believe other tenure-track women caregivers believe they have to make personal judgment calls when deciding whether or not to discuss family issues at work.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
Q27. I believe other tenure-track women caregivers at my institution think the university's work and family policies adequately support their efforts to balance their work and family roles.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

Q28. I think other tenure-track women caregivers at my institution think taking family leave would negatively influence their chances of earning tenure.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

Q29. I think other tenure-track women caregivers at my institution would avoid taking family leave if eligible because they believe their colleagues would view taking leave as abusing family leave policy/entitlements.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

Q30. I believe other tenure-track women caregivers at my institution are satisfied with the balance between work time and personal/family time that is promoted by the institution.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

Please answer the following questions regarding YOUR feelings about discussions with colleagues surrounding work/family issues.

Q31. How often do you feel conflicted when deciding whether or not to discuss work/family issues with colleagues who are caregivers?
   - Always
   - Somewhat Often
   - Neutral
   - Occasionally
   - Never
Q32. How often do you feel conflicted *when deciding* whether or not to discuss work/family issues with *colleagues who are NOT caregivers*?
   - Always
   - Somewhat Often
   - Neutral
   - Occasionally
   - Never

Q33. How often do you feel conflicted *during* interactions about work/family issues with *colleagues who are caregivers*?
   - Always
   - Somewhat Often
   - Neutral
   - Occasionally
   - Never

Q34. How often do you feel conflicted *during* interactions about work/family issues with *colleagues who are NOT caregivers*?
   - Always
   - Somewhat Often
   - Neutral
   - Occasionally
   - Never

Q35. How often do you *avoid* talking with colleagues about issues surrounding balancing work and family?
   - Always
   - Somewhat Often
   - Neutral
   - Occasionally
   - Never

Please answer the following questions about your perceptions of *OTHER* tenure-track women caregivers' feelings about discussions with colleagues surrounding work/family issues.

Q36. How often do you think *other* tenure-track women caregivers at your institution feel conflicted *when deciding* whether or not to discuss work/family issues with *colleagues who are caregivers*?
   - Always
   - Somewhat Often
   - Neutral
   - Occasionally
   - Never
Q37. How often do you think other tenure-track women caregivers at your institution feel conflicted *when deciding* whether or not to discuss work/family issues with *colleagues who are NOT caregivers*?
   - Always
   - Somewhat Often
   - Neutral
   - Occasionally
   - Never

Q38. How often do you think *other* tenure-track women caregivers at your institution feel conflicted *during* interactions about work/family issues with *colleagues who are also caregivers*?
   - Always
   - Somewhat Often
   - Neutral
   - Occasionally
   - Never

Q39. How often do you think *other* tenure-track women caregivers at your institution feel conflicted *during* interactions about work/family issues with *colleagues who are NOT caregivers*?
   - Always
   - Somewhat Often
   - Neutral
   - Occasionally
   - Never

Q40. How often do you think other tenure-track women at your institution *avoid* talking with colleagues about issues surrounding balancing work and family?
   - Always
   - Somewhat Often
   - Neutral
   - Occasionally
   - Never

Please indicate the extent to which you are satisfied with the clarity of tenure expectations for each of the following roles:

Q41. Scholar (e.g., research)
   - Very Satisfied
   - Somewhat Satisfied
   - Neutral
   - Somewhat Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied
Q42. Teacher
   - Very Satisfied
   - Somewhat Satisfied
   - Neutral
   - Somewhat Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied

Q43. Campus Citizen (e.g., service)
   - Very Satisfied
   - Somewhat Satisfied
   - Neutral
   - Somewhat Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied

Please indicate the extent to which you are satisfied with what is expected of you in each of the following roles:

Q44. Scholar (e.g., research)
   - Very Satisfied
   - Somewhat Satisfied
   - Neutral
   - Somewhat Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied

Q45. Teaching
   - Very Satisfied
   - Somewhat Satisfied
   - Neutral
   - Somewhat Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied

Q46. Campus Citizen (e.g., service)
   - Very Satisfied
   - Somewhat Satisfied
   - Neutral
   - Somewhat Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied

Q47. How satisfied are you with your work overall?
   - Very Satisfied
   - Somewhat Satisfied
   - Neutral
   - Somewhat Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied
Q48. How satisfied are you with the quality of mentoring you receive from senior faculty?
   o Very Satisfied
   o Somewhat Satisfied
   o Neutral
   o Somewhat Dissatisfied
   o Very Dissatisfied

Please indicate the extent to which each of the following is a source of stress for you:

Q49. Availability of Childcare
   o Great Source of Stress
   o Some Source of Stress
   o Neutral
   o Minimal Source of Stress
   o Not a Source of Stress
   o N/A

Q50. Cost of Childcare
   o Great Source of Stress
   o Some Source of Stress
   o Neutral
   o Minimal Source of Stress
   o Not a Source of Stress
   o N/A

Q51. Children's Problems
   o Great Source of Stress
   o Some Source of Stress
   o Neutral
   o Minimal Source of Stress
   o Not a Source of Stress
   o N/A

Q52. Care of an Elderly Parent
   o Great Source of Stress
   o Some Source of Stress
   o Neutral
   o Minimal Source of Stress
   o Not a Source of Stress
   o N/A
Q53. Illness or Death of a Family Member
   - Great Source of Stress
   - Some Source of Stress
   - Neutral
   - Minimal Source of Stress
   - Not a Source of Stress
   - N/A

Q54. Personal Physical Health
   - Great Source of Stress
   - Some Source of Stress
   - Neutral
   - Minimal Source of Stress
   - Not a Source of Stress
   - N/A

Q55. Health of a Spouse/Partner
   - Great Source of Stress
   - Some Source of Stress
   - Neutral
   - Minimal Source of Stress
   - Not a Source of Stress
   - N/A

Q56. Workload
   - Great Source of Stress
   - Some Source of Stress
   - Neutral
   - Minimal Source of Stress
   - Not a Source of Stress
   - N/A

Q57. Job Security
   - Great Source of Stress
   - Some Source of Stress
   - Neutral
   - Minimal Source of Stress
   - Not a Source of Stress
   - N/A
**Q58.** Review/Promotion Process  
- Great Source of Stress  
- Some Source of Stress  
- Neutral  
- Minimal Source of Stress  
- Not a Source of Stress  
- N/A

Please indicate **whether or not you have used** the following provisions at your institution:

**Q59.** University Childcare  
- Have Used  
- Have Not Used  
- Not Available

**Q60.** Stop-the-Tenure Clock for Parental or Other Family Reasons  
- Have Used  
- Have Not Used  
- Not Available

**Q61.** Personal Leaves during the Probationary Period  
- Have Used  
- Have Not Used  
- Not Available

Please indicate the extent to which you **find each of the following provisions at your institution helpful:**

**Q62.** University Childcare  
- Very Helpful  
- Somewhat Helpful  
- Neutral  
- Unhelpful  
- Very Unhelpful

**Q63.** Stop-the-Tenure Clock for Parental or Other Family Reasons  
- Very Helpful  
- Somewhat Helpful  
- Neutral  
- Unhelpful  
- Very Unhelpful
Q64. Personal Leaves during the Probationary Period
   - Very Helpful
   - Somewhat Helpful
   - Neutral
   - Unhelpful
   - Very Unhelpful

Q65. How satisfied are you with your salary?
   - Very Satisfied
   - Somewhat Satisfied
   - Neutral
   - Somewhat Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied

Q66. How satisfied are you with your benefits?
   - Very Satisfied
   - Somewhat Satisfied
   - Neutral
   - Somewhat Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied

Q67. How satisfied are you with the family-friendly policies at your institution?
   - Very Satisfied
   - Somewhat Satisfied
   - Neutral
   - Somewhat Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied

Q68. Are there any other issues related to women tenure-track faculty members' experiences with and/or perceptions of balancing work and family in higher education that I did not ask about and/or that you would like to expand on? If so, please address them here:
Q69. Please indicate the age of each child you are a caregiver for under 18 years of age.
   o I am not a caregiver for a child.
   o 0-1
   o 1-2
   o 2-3
   o 3-4
   o 4-5
   o 5-6
   o 6-7
   o 7-8
   o 8-9
   o 9-10
   o 10-11
   o 11-12
   o 12-13
   o 13-14
   o 14-15
   o 16-17
   o 17-18
   o 18+

Q70. Are you currently a caregiver for a partner/spouse?
   o Yes
   o No

Q71. Are you currently a caregiver for a parent/parent-in-law?
   o Yes
   o No

Q72. What is your race/ethnicity?
   o American Indian
   o Asian
   o Black/African American
   o Mexican American/Chicana/Latina
   o Native Hawaiian
   o Puerto Rican
   o White/Caucasian
   o Not Listed

Q73. Please indicate the relationship/living condition that best represents your current situation:
   o Married, Living with a Partner
   o Married, Not Living with a Partner
   o Not Married, Living with a Partner
   o Single
   o Not Listed
Your participation is almost complete....

Please SELECT SUBMIT below to ensure your responses are successfully submitted and your participation will be complete.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey, your responses are invaluable to the successful completion of my research!