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ABSTRACT
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There is limited research available on the relationship between motherhood and career satisfaction. This dissertation examined women who worked as student affairs professionals to develop a greater understanding of the relationship between motherhood and career satisfaction.

The following research questions were addressed: Is there a difference between the levels of career satisfaction for women who work full-time in student affairs based on the independent variables? To what degree are the independent variables predictive of career satisfaction for women working in student affairs? What combination of the independent variables will produce the best predictive model of career satisfaction for women working in student affairs? Is there a statistically significant difference in levels of career satisfaction between mothers and non-mothers who work in student affairs? Is there a statistically significant difference in levels of career satisfaction of mothers who work in student affairs based on the independent variables?

Feminist standpoint theoretical framework was utilized and women who were members of ACPA – College Student Educators International were surveyed. Chi-square tests of independence was used to determine differences between groups and ordinal regression was utilized to model the relationship between levels of career satisfaction and independent variables. Findings showed that women were very satisfied or satisfied with four of the career satisfaction areas: career success, meeting overall career goals, professional development goals, and the development of new professional skills, but not for progress toward meeting goals for income.
There were statistically significant relationships between the five areas of career satisfaction and degree attainment and motherhood status. Suggestions for future research and implications for practice are discussed.
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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

This document is my doctoral dissertation about the relationship between motherhood and perceived career satisfaction for women who work in the field of student affairs. As a woman who has worked in the field for over seven years and has a child myself, this particular topic is one in which I am interested on both a personal and professional level. The existing research on mothers working in student affairs is limited; this research will expand the knowledge base regarding the relationship of motherhood and career satisfaction for women in student affairs.

Background and Context

**Historical perspective of women’s participation in higher education.** It is important to understand where women have been so we can understand where they are and where they are going. To fully appreciate the experience and status of women in higher education, it is essential to provide a historical perspective on women’s participation in higher education. According to Bell (1997), “Historical context is vital for understanding how stereotypes develop in one context with particular meanings, and continue as unquestioned fact down through the ages” (p. 6). We can learn strategies from history to tackle current issues, as well as learn from mistakes we have made in the past (Bell, 1997).

As early as the 1400s, women were concerned with their access to education and ability to learn (de Pizan, 1997). Labè (1997) talked about women’s place in society in 1555 and the fact that men would be ashamed if women surpassed them educationally, and that women needed to take ownership over their knowledge. Women’s access to education and its relationship to equality has been a topic of significance and concern for hundreds of years.
Although Harvard College, which was founded in 1636, was the first institution of higher education in the United States, women were not able to fully participate in higher education until nearly 200 years later (Thelin, 2004), and then only with the goal of helping women to become better wives and mothers (Eisenmann, 1998). Later, the need for more teachers in formal primary and secondary school settings grew (Howe, 1977; Newcomber, 1959), which provided additional opportunities for women to gain an education. There was also a general increase of women working outside the home. However, women’s intellectual abilities were believed to be nonexistent or inferior at best (Goodsell, 1931), and the commonly referenced Dr. Clarke believed that women’s health would be adversely affected by education (Zschoche, 1989). In 1862 the Morrill Land Grant Act was passed, providing greater access to higher education (Thelin, 2004). According to Thelin (2004), although the Morrill Land Grant Acts of 1862 and 1890 did not explicitly refer to women’s participation in higher education, they did lead to additional universities and colleges being created and expanded, thus providing greater opportunities to women. The rise of women’s colleges, the women’s movement, and the World Wars all led to the increase of women’s participation in higher education and the workforce. Shifts in societal roles and expectations of women eventually led to the continual increase in women’s participation in higher education (Rury, 2005). Women earned 57% of all bachelor’s degrees in 2008-2009 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010).

Education has been, and continues to be, used as a mechanism to transmit culture and to teach individuals what behavior is acceptable and important, and this is true for women as well as men. Formal education is a way to perpetuate culture as well as a means to equalize power among various groups (Pai, Adler, & Shadiow, 2005). However, according to Pai et al. (2005), one of the critiques of formal education is that it transmits the dominant culture. Through this
process of formal education, the dominant culture’s values, behaviors, and language are taught as the appropriate way to live and are seen as a major source of meanings and values (Pai et al., 2005). When women were first admitted into higher education, they were taught the values, beliefs, and language of the dominant culture, characterized by several interlocking systems of oppression, including patriarchy.

This idea of cultural transmission has implications for women in education. When women were permitted to enroll in higher education, they were taught the values, language, and beliefs of patriarchy. Even today, students are learning the dominant culture in higher education, which impacts the environment for women as students as well as for administrators and faculty members.

**Women’s entrance into student affairs.** As more women were granted entrance into higher education as students, there was a need for someone to watch over them. In the late 1800s, the position of dean of women started to appear on college campuses and their presence and activities began what is now the profession of student affairs (Nidiffer, 2000; Schwartz, 1996, 1997). These early pioneers, who were typically faculty members, worked on college campuses to watch over the moral and intellectual well-being of female students. However, there were very few women who worked in these positions, therefore they had to work hard to professionalize their positions and role in higher education.

According to Schwartz (1996), deans of women have been absent from the history of higher education and their contributions to higher education and the field of student affairs are often overlooked. Although more recently deans of women have been the subject of a considerable amount of literature, historically they often have not been credited with beginning the ideology of the student affairs profession. The number of deans of women grew as college
attendance by women students increased. The first dean of women was at the University of Chicago, with the appointment of Alice Freeman Parker (Schwartz, 1996). Also according to Schwartz (1996), this increase in deans of women led to the development of organizations to support deans of women, including the National Association of Deans of Women, which was established in 1917. Further, a graduate program was established at the Teachers College of Columbia University “specifically to train deans of women” (Schwartz, 1996, p. 6), and the women at Columbia University conducted a great deal of research and published many books and articles. Although these women made many successful contributions to higher education, at the time the position of dean of women was created, women were unwelcome on campuses, and in most cases were simply tolerated (Schwartz, 1996).

In 1919, the first dean of men was appointed, changing the landscape of higher education, particularly for deans of women (Schwartz, 1996). The personnel movement began to gain momentum in the 1930s, when deans of women became a permanent fixture in higher education for a period of time. Unfortunately, eventually the personnel movement led to the disappearance of the deans of women and led to the increase of administrative hierarchy in higher education under the leadership of men. As personnel directors took over on college campuses, deans of women were often demoted, dismissed, or were permitted to retire (Schwartz, 1996). According to Schwartz (1996), “men assumed the role of leading higher education and student affairs issues, research, and policy, but in fact, they were simply advancing the ideology of the women who had begun the process as early as the 1890s” (pp. 19-20).

Clearly, women made an impact early in the history of higher education, both through their participation as students and in their roles as deans of women; however, their presence was not welcome and their contributions were not valued. “The male voice which has dominated
higher education, including the written and oral histories of American colleges and universities, has rarely given much credit to women and especially not to the deans of women” (Schwartz, 1996, p. 4). Unfortunately, the climate and structure of higher education continues to be challenging for women in academe due to gender inequities (Armenti, 2004).

Today, there are many women who work in student affairs, although it is difficult to pinpoint the exact number. Universities do not all classify student affairs professionals in the same way. For example, at one university, career services may be within student affairs, but at another may be under enrollment management or academic affairs. For this reason, providing the number of women who work in student affairs is not possible. However, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2009d), 63% of education administrators were women. In addition, it is also impossible to know how many women in student affairs have children; however, the labor force participation rate – the percent of the population working or looking for work – for all mothers with children under 18 years is 70.8% (BLS, 2011).

**Insights Regarding the Status of Women in Higher Education**

Women who serve as faculty and staff members in higher education have made some progress when one considers their experiences from a historical perspective, including representation in faculty positions (NCES, 2008) and in terms of greater representation in leadership positions than the past (Lewis, 2005). However, there are still many barriers that women employees in higher education face, barriers that one would hope would not still be present in the 21st century, including lower salaries (Acker, 2006), less representation as tenured faculty (NCES, 2008) and in leadership positions in administration as compared to men (Dale, 2007), and as college presidents (Chronicle, 2008), for example.
Although some of the literature provides reasons why barriers for women continue to exist in higher education, it is essential that we stop looking to what women are doing to cause this, and look at the underlying structures of higher education and more broadly in the corporate setting and in our culture. Scholars frequently ask where all the women are in higher level positions in the workforce and wonder why there is a gender gap (Chliwniak, 1997; Dale, 2007; Tischler, 2004), which is a topic that should be addressed. However, we also need to consider how we are helping the women who are currently working in higher education to succeed, particularly women who have children.

A career in higher education and student affairs may present working conditions that may particularly challenge women with children. There are frequently long hours (Renn & Hughes, 2004; Turrentine, 2005), on-call duty, and in some cases, women may live where they work if employed in residence life. These working conditions are not necessarily unique to higher education and student affairs and are shared by other highly demanding careers such as law, medicine, and business, but they do present a challenge to women who have children.

There have been a number of studies conducted that identified various connections between career and family for women in higher education with children (Blackhurst, 2000; Marshall, 2002, 2009; Nobbe & Manning, 1997; Ting & Watt, 1999; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). Some women considered or altered their career plans and goals after having children (Marshall, 2009; Nobbe & Manning, 1997; Ting & Watt, 1999, Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004), others put their family’s needs above jobs or promotions that they believed were not beneficial to their family (Marshall, 2009; Ting & Watt, 1999), delayed or chose not to pursue an advanced degree (Marshall, 2009), and considered leaving higher education altogether (Marshall, 2009). In addition, the dual role of mother and administrator presented some challenges (Marshall,
2009; Nobbe & Manning, 1997). For example, women are still responsible for the majority of house work (Bond, Galinsky, & Swanberg, 1997; Greenglass & Burke, 1988; Wade, 2009). The challenges women face in their roles as both mothers and higher education professionals are important to address if we want women to succeed in higher education. If the culture of higher education supports women with children, they may feel more able to accept promotions, pursue advanced degrees, and stay in the field. However, for researchers and scholars to understand and address some of these issues is an important step toward assisting this group of individuals.

**Women in the Workforce**

According to the BLS (2007), women’s labor force participation increased during the 1970s and 1980s and reached a peak of about 60% in 1999. The rate declined a bit to 59.9% in 2000 and it has been declining since then, with the rate being 59.3% in 2005. In 2020, the participation rate of women is expected to be at 59.4% (BLS, 2007). Despite the fact that there are more women in the workforce today than prior to the 1970s, women’s position in the workforce compared to men has not improved. Although Dyer (2003) wrote this eight years ago, I believe it is still appropriate today:

> The findings regarding women’s status in the economy today indicate that women overall are fairing relatively well in many respects. They have more education and work opportunities than ever before... At the same time, women remain at a disadvantage in the work force when compared to men. (Dyer, 2003, p. 42)

According to Dyer (2003), women participate in the paid labor force less than men, and when comparing men and women with a college education, men had higher rates of flextime options. In addition, occupational segregation is still present and women are concentrated in similar
common occupation as they were 20 years ago, thus making them slower to respond to changes in the economy (Dyer, 2003).

**Women in Higher Education**

Women are continuing to outpace their male counterparts in higher education attainment as well. Women earned 62% of associate’s degrees, 57% of bachelor’s degrees, and 61% of master’s degrees in 2006-07 (NCES, 2009). In fact, the number of women in graduate school has been greater than the number of men since 1984 (NCES, 2008). There was a 63% increase for women graduate students and only a 32% increase for men from 1997 to 2007. Although historically women have earned fewer doctoral and first-professional degrees than men, they were on par with men in 2006-07, earning about the same number of those degrees (NCES, 2009). In general, women of each ethnic/racial group earned more degrees than their male equivalents in 2006-07 (NCES, 2009).

Women are also well-represented in the faculty ranks of higher education. Although they do not have equal numbers with men overall, women do make up 41.8% of total faculty and 46% of tenure-track faculty members at institutions that participate in Title IV federal student financial aid programs (NCES, 2008). However, there are other disparities between men and women at such institutions. Of those with tenure, only 33.9% of full-time faculty members were women, while 66.1% of those with tenure were men. In addition, there was a gap in average salaries for faculty as well, particularly at public four-year and two-year Title IV institutions, where women’s salaries were lower in all ranks of faculty, including professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, and lecturer. At four-year private Title IV institutions salaries were lower for women in all categories except instructor; however women had higher salaries at two-year private institutions in all categories except professor.
As previously discussed, student affairs as a profession was started in the late 1800s by the activities of faculty serving as deans of women on college campuses (Nidiffer, 2000; Schwartz, 1996, 1997). Although it is difficult to find an exact number detailing how many women work in student affairs today, Turrentine and Conley (2001) found that women made up 67-68% of the labor pool for positions that were considered entry-level. However, in senior-level positions in college administration, other research has shown women comprised less than half of the population (Dale, 2007). In fact, as of 2006, women made up only 23% of college presidents (Chronicle, 2008). Furthermore, according to Sagaria (1988), even though women and men applied for new administrative positions at the same rate, women were hired at lower rates.

**Statement of the Problem**

Working long hours is a common characteristic of the culture of student affairs (Renn & Hughes, 2004; Turrentine, 2005). According to Turrentine (2005), “student affairs work simply requires more than most people can give and remain healthy. The hours are long and the work is frequently stressful” (p. 212). The Bureau of Labor Statistics ([BLS], 2007) reported that administrators have additional responsibilities than in the past, which has also led to increased stress. In fact, one in three administrators works over 40 hours a week (BLS, 2007). Thus, the culture of student affairs can be difficult to navigate, particularly for women who wish to have children. Attempting to find a balance between work and family is frequently difficult in general, but for women who work in student affairs and who wish to have children, it can be especially troubling (Nobbe & Manning, 1997; Marshall, 2002; Ting & Watt, 1999).

In addition, there is a lack of literature on the topic of women with children in student affairs. Although more is being written about women employees in higher education in general,
there is very little about women as mothers. Addressing this gap can help administrators gain an enhanced awareness of what women with children are facing, how to better support them, and hopefully how to retain them. By conducting this study, I plan to better understand the relationship between perceived career satisfaction and parenting for women who work in student affairs. I hope to gain information specifically about career satisfaction for women who work as professionals in student affairs and who have children by comparing women who do not have children and those who do. Specifically through quantitative methods, I can address the correlation and whether we can predict information based on various variables. In addition, I am confident that this topic is appropriate to study through a critical paradigm. According to Stage (2007), using quantitative methods from a critical paradigm is an effective way to focus on research questions, as the method is secondary to the research questions. I believe that providing this information will assist members of the profession and hopefully improve the culture of student affairs.

**Terms and Definitions**

To operationalize the constructs in my study, I am providing definitions for a number of terms. There are a number of ways to go about conducting a study to understand the relationship between parenting and career success for women in student affairs; however, by providing these definitions, I am making clear who will be included and who will not.

**Women with Children** – anyone identifying as a female parent of children by any means, including children who are biological, adopted, foster, or those who are guardians of children.

**Relationship or Partnership Status** – women who identified themselves as a partner in a committed, loving relationship living in the same household.
Working in Student Affairs – individuals who work in higher education in one of the following functional areas: academic advising, admissions, admissions/enrollment management, adult learner services, assessment/research, career planning/placement, commuter services, counseling, disability student services, financial aid, food services, gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgender awareness, greek affairs, health/drug and alcohol, international students, intramural/recreation sports, judicial affairs, leadership development, multicultural affairs, orientation, religious programs, residence life, service learning, student activities, student affairs administration, student union, or women’s resources as informed by ACPA – College Student Educators International (2009).

Children – Children who are pre-school age, primary school-age, secondary school-age, or adult (18+ years old).

Work/Career/Job – These words are used interchangeably for the purposes of this research with reference to the paid work one does.

Purpose of Study

It is difficult to estimate the exact number of women who work in student affairs and have children. However, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for all mothers with children under the age of 18, the labor force participation rate (the percent of the population looking for work or working) was 70.8% in 2010 (BLS, 2011). The same report stated that there are differences in labor force participation for women depending on the age of their youngest child. For instance, mothers of children under six years old had labor force participation rates of 64%, versus 77.3% for women whose youngest child was between the ages of 6 and 17. Finally, mothers who had infants under one year of age had a labor force participation rate of 56.4%. 
Although this is aggregate information about women in the United States, there is no reason to assume it is largely different for women in student affairs.

How does having a child impact women’s careers? How does having a career impact women’s roles as mothers? There is a need to better understand the relationship between being a mother and perceived career satisfaction in student affairs for women. Quantitative methods will be used to better understand this from a general perspective of women in student affairs. This is a complex topic, and I hope to gain a better understanding of the interaction between motherhood and career satisfaction perceptions for women in student affairs.

Significance of the Study

More women are in the workforce than in the past, and that trend is expected to continue (Dyer, 2003). In addition, although women are employed in the field of student affairs, they are leaving the profession at higher rates than their male counterparts (Bender, 1980; Holmes, Verrier, & Chisholm, 1983). In addition, Blackhurst (2000) found that 14% of women who work in student affairs would consider leaving the field to spend more time with their family. As discussed earlier, motherhood influences career plans for women in student affairs, including considerations of leaving the field (Marshall, 2009; Nobbe & Manning, 1997; Ting & Watt, 1999; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004).

There is also a significant gap in the literature about the link between motherhood and women who work in student affairs. Although there have been a few qualitative studies conducted specifically on this topic (e.g., Marshall, 2002; Marshall, 2009; Nobbe & Manning, 1997), there is much to be learned to understand the relationship between motherhood on career satisfaction. In particular, these studies have been qualitative in nature, allowing us to better understand the experiences of women with children who work in higher education.
However, gaining an understanding about the relationship between career and parenting and perceptions of career satisfaction can be best understood through quantitative research methods. Further, the design and sample I will be using is beneficial because it can provide the kind of generalizable results that leaders in higher education can utilize to make significant and necessary changes to the culture of the academy that will better serve women with children.
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The experiences of women in higher education have been discussed in literature, addressing their experiences as workers, educators, and individuals. However, to fully understand women’s experiences within higher education as mothers, one must be familiar with women’s experiences as employees, and more specifically as employees in higher education. In this chapter, I discuss the theoretical framework that structured my approach to this study and provide a review of the literature on women as employees in higher education grounded in a feminist theoretical framework, concluding with the need for further research.

Theoretical Framework

Theoretical frameworks are essential for guiding one’s research, and should be carefully thought out. According to Bell (1997), theories help researchers think about their purpose in conducting research. Theories can give us a framework for deciding what to do and to decide which approach in research will work best. In addition, “at its best, theory also provides a framework for questioning and challenging our practices and creating new approaches as we encounter inevitable problems of cooptation, resistance, insufficient knowledge, and changing social conditions” (Bell, 1997, p. 4). In conducting a study on the experiences of women with children who are employees in student affairs, choosing a theoretical framework is helpful in thinking about these experiences in an unbiased manner.

I have chosen to use a critical theoretical framework, specifically feminist standpoint theory, to situate my research on the career satisfaction of women with children who are student affairs employees. To explain my rationale, I will begin with an overview of the types of feminism to create a foundation of understanding, followed by a description of feminist standpoint theory and its relevance to my study.
Types of Feminism

To understand the experiences of women in higher education, it is important to be familiar with the concept of feminism. Feminist thought has contributed greatly to higher education through challenging the culture and hierarchical structure, thus impacting the experiences of women in higher education. Although there is no commonly accepted definition for feminism (Winter, 2000), there are many types of feminism, each with its own purpose for addressing the variety of issues that women face today. I will provide information about important concepts to understand the impacts of feminism on higher education as well as a brief overview of different types of feminism.

Providing a definition of feminism is a difficult task because there is fundamental disagreement about its meaning; however, some believe that the term feminist must be defined before someone else defines it for women, and creates an incorrect definition (Winter, 2000). Although there is power in naming something, like the terms feminist or feminism, there is a desire by some not to create a label (Atkinson, 1969). Coming up with a common understanding of feminism is certainly a powerful issue, and has been for decades. There is some resistance about defining the term feminism for a variety of reasons, including a fundamental disagreement of its meaning and unacceptable closure once it is defined (Winter, 2000). Despite resistance to define the term and the variety of interpretations that exist, “basically feminism concerns the questioning of unequal gender relations and attempting to change them” (Fester, 1998, p. 229).

Foss, Foss, and Griffin (1999) defined feminism as

The political analysis that looks at how structures in society mirror the relationships of domination between women and men. Whole systems of power relations are connected
to the domination of men over women... Feminism is about challenging this model of power on which our culture is based. (p. 170)

This definition sheds light on how women have experienced higher education, particularly related to the culture and structures of the institution. Some scholars believe that “feminist thought has generated nonhierarchical and non-patriarchal paradigms that can be applied to academic communities” (Crumpacker, McMillen, & Navakas, 1998, para. 16), therefore significantly impacting higher education (Safarik, 2002). Feminism has challenged the traditional values, norms, and assumptions on campuses, leading to changes in curriculum, the addition of women’s studies programs and departments, and inclusion of women in higher education in greater numbers. Different types of feminism call for different actions to combat the oppression of women in higher education, and I will discuss three of the commonly cited types of feminism: liberal, radical, and Marxist/left feminism.

**Liberal feminism.** Proponents of liberal feminism have suggested that each individual should have the right to equality (Sallee, 2008) and have focused on individual characteristics (Simpson, Sturges, Woods, & Altman, 2004). These scholars also focus on how to boost the influence and power of women while working within social structures and policies that currently exist, eventually resulting in improved equity at the top of the hierarchy. Liberal feminists want to take away structural obstacles that prevent women from participating fully in work and society (Sallee, 2008), with the ultimate goal of equal treatment within the workplace (Hart, 2006). According to Hart (2006), “liberal feminism is the prevailing feminist perspective among faculty” (p. 55).

**Radical feminism.** Radical feminism is, in many ways, the opposite of liberal feminism. According to Calas and Smircich (1996), radical feminists want more than equity, they desire a
complete transformation of the current culture. Radical feminism involves dismantling the systems that are currently in place (Crow, 2000). More explicitly, Simpson, Sturges, Woods, and Altman (2004) explain that “radical feminists focus on patriarchal forms of power that are embedded in the bureaucratic organization, in gender based power dynamics, and in norms and values that prescribe women’s subordination” (p. 462). Radical feminists believed that women’s oppression is the first and primary form of oppression (Crow, 2000).

**Marxist/left feminism.** Marxist feminism, also called left feminism, is based on the ideas of capitalism (Rubin, 1997). In particular, Marxist feminists posited that the way to liberate women was through dismantling capitalism. This is particularly important because of the capital that women produce – their work within the private sphere is primarily unpaid work. In the past and even today, many women stay home and take care of their children and their home, and are not compensated for their work. Therefore, they help to keep the capital “machine” running. In addition, according to Shelton and Agger (1993) “Left feminists describe dual sources of oppression. Not only does patriarchy oppress women but the capitalist labor economy also oppresses them” (as cited in Hart, 2006, p. 47).

Although this is not an exhaustive list of types of feminism, it provides different lenses through which to understand feminism. Regardless of the type of feminism to which one ascribes, the impact of feminist ideals in higher education cannot go unnoticed. Women have aspired to create a more welcoming environment in higher education, as well as include greater numbers of women participating and working in the academy. Leave policies have been developed, childcare centers have been created, and women have reached higher levels of leadership in higher education, to name but a few changes. Feminism has challenged the culture of higher education and continues to do so.
Feminist Standpoint Theory

Feminist standpoint theory emerged in the 1980s and 1990s by social scientists and “endeavors to develop a feminist epistemology that delineates a method for constructing effective knowledge from the insights of women’s experiences” (McCann & Kim, 2003, p. 278). It emerged from feminist theory, specifically Marxist/socialist feminist theories (McCann & Kim, 2003), and is a type of critical theory (Anderson, 2011). One of the tenets of feminist standpoint theory is that women have a unique voice because they are oppressed. Utilizing this theory as a foundation for a study about the relationship between motherhood and career is especially relevant because of the unique perspective women offer on society and the world of work.

Hartsock (2003) argued that because women give birth, this fact provides a rationale for a feminist standpoint. Further, she believed that there is a gendered division of labor between men and women and that this division of labor impacts the perspectives of women and men, and these perspectives are shaped by the relations of power between gendered social groups. In addition, the sexual division of labor also contributes to men’s dominance of women (Hartsock, 2003). Finally, she also believed that this division of labor “constructs a singular unique perspective on society from which feminists can effectively challenge male domination” (McCann & Kim, 2003, p. 280).

Collins (2003) wrote primarily about Black feminist thought and feminist standpoint theory, and her insights are essential to understanding feminist standpoint theory. She has written about the need to address women’s multiple identities and the matrix of oppression related to those identities and how this relates to a woman’s life and opportunities. Depending on where a person is situated within domination historically, her personal experiences with
oppression will vary (Collins, 2003). It is important to recognize that women have different experiences based on their identities and experiences. Further, Collins (2003) suggested that, due to women’s subordinated position, they have a unique perspective on power relations.

**Why useful/appropriate for my topic.** I agree and adopt the rationale asserted by a colleague that the perspectives achieved through the collective process of struggle – the standpoint – are a lens through which to understand and investigate the experiences of a group (E. A. Russell, personal communication, December 10, 2009). As applied to this study, this collective perspective belongs to women who have children and work in student affairs. The assumption of feminist standpoint theory, that there are common experiences of women that bind them together, is of particular relevance for my study on the relationship between motherhood and career. Utilizing feminist standpoint theory to examine the experiences of these women is also useful because the ultimate goal of the theory is to deconstruct social norms and structures to begin to create systems that are based on social justice. My desire to conduct this research is not only to contribute to the literature, but also to begin to make a case for improving the experiences for women in the workplace, specifically within student affairs. In addition, such a theoretical foundation provides further rationale for conducting a quantitative, critical feminist paradigm on this topic because it posits that there are common experiences by this group of women. Finally, the inclusion of standpoint is important because it can provide insight about how these women view the world based on their membership in this particular group and the relationship of that group to common structures of power and privilege – mothers who work in student affairs.
Women in the Workplace

Women’s continued and increasing presence in the workforce raises some interesting issues, particularly for women who have children. One commonly discussed aspect of women in the workforce is salary disparity (Acker, 2006; Blackhurst, 2000; Dey & Hill, 2007; Simpson et al., 2004; West & Curtis, 2006). Although the exact reasons for the disparity are not entirely clear, there is no denying that there is inequality in salary that is related to gender. It is important to understand that salary discrepancies do exist, and have an impact on women in the workforce (Aguirre, 2000; Blackhurst, 2000).

According to Acker (2006), “Wage setting is often a bureaucratic organizational process, integrated into the processes of creating hierarchy” (p. 450). Employees in occupations perceived as feminine are more likely to be paid poorly than employees in occupations that are not perceived that way (Drudy, 2008). These *pink-collar jobs* are dominated by women and are underpaid, and include careers like education, nursing, and librarianship, to name a few (Ferraro, 1984, p. 1167). Research has found that the proportion of females in a particular occupation has a negative impact on wages (Magnusson, 2008). For college graduates specifically, women who work full-time one year out of college earn 80% as much as men, and at the ten year mark, women earn 69% as much as their male colleagues (Dey & Hill, 2007). In their study on women master’s of business administration graduates, Simpson et al. (2004) found that women are disadvantaged in their salaries compared to men who hold master’s of business administration degrees.

Motherhood and Career Outside of Higher Education

As previously mentioned, women’s participation in the workforce continues to increase. With this growth, it is also helpful to know how many women who are working also have
children. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the labor force participation rate for women with children under the age of 18 is 71.4% (Employment Characteristics, 2009). Labor force participation rate, which is defined as those looking for work or working. The lowest rates of labor force participation are for mothers with infants under the age of one and the highest are for those who have children between ages six and 17, with these percentages at 56.4 and 77.3, respectively (Employment Characteristics, 2009).

As women’s participation in the workforce continues to grow, there is another aspect to women’s lives that needs to be considered. According to Perry-Jenkins, Repetti, and Crouter (2000), the domain of ‘work and family’ emerged as a distinct area of research in the 1960s and 1970s. By the 1980s, what had begun as a narrow research area, focused on dual-career families and ‘working mothers,’ had evolved into a sprawling domain of study involving researchers from several disciplines and theoretical perspectives. (p. 981)

As the number of women participating in the workforce has increased, research on women’s dual role as worker and mother has increased. For many adults who work, the two key parts of their lives are home and work (Lambert, Pasupuleti, Cluse-Tolar, Jennings, & Baker, 2006). Unfortunately, the combination of these two areas often results in conflict of the competing demands. In their study of women in dual-career families, Gilbert, Holahan, and Manning (1981) found that women experienced substantial stress due to conflicts between their roles as professional and mother. In addition, they found that the women in their sample had a high commitment to their professional and their maternal roles, experiencing demands from both of those roles continuously and simultaneously. Finally, it is important to point out that a piece of the struggle for women who work and who are mothers comes from unrealistic self-
expectations (Gilbert et al., 1981). “Women choosing a dual-career life style may not be prepared for the conflicts arising from their deep-rooted value systems regarding the maternal role. High stress due to role conflict may occur” (Gilbert et al., 1981, p. 425). The balance of family and work also is mentioned in the literature about women who work in student affairs (Marshall, 2002; Nobbe & Manning, 1997 Ting & Watt, 1999).

Although men also have to balance both work and family, it is particularly difficult for women because women continue to do a majority of the work in the home (Bond, Galinsky, & Swanberg, 1997; Greenglass & Burke, 1988). According to Barr (2004), “To be sure, men are assuming more and more responsibility for childcare and other parental responsibilities, but it is usually the woman who must adjust more of her professional life to this important role” (p. xiv).

Much like the literature about motherhood and career in student affairs, a key topic in the research about combining work and family is support. Breaugh and Fyre (2008) looked at whether reporting to a supervisor who was family-supportive. They found a positive relationship between reporting to a family-supportive supervisor and the use of family leave and flexible work hours, and concluded that a supervisor’s informal actions to accommodate family responsibilities might have a greater influence on work-family conflict than using formal practices. The support of supervisors was also related to reducing work stressors and emotional exhaustion for female police officers in Thompson, Kirk, and Brown’s (2005) study. These stressors spilled over into family environment, impacting reduced family conflict and perceptions of reduced family cohesion (Breaugh & Frye, 2008). The support of supervisors was associated with perceptions of family environment due to its impact on emotional exhaustion and role stressors (Thompson et al., 2005).
In their study examining the relationship among gender, life stages, and perceived workplace flexibility using a multi-company database, Hill, Jacob, Shannon, Brennan, Blanchard, and Martinengo (2008) found that being a woman was modestly associated with greater stress, burnout, and family-to-work conflict. Perceived flexibility predicted less stress, burnout, and family-to-work burnout. Women who worked in part-time positions that were high-status and career-oriented experienced reduced conflict between work and family, according to Hill, Märtinson, and Ferris (2004). The women in this group reported greater satisfaction with childcare, family success, and higher work-family success. Goodman and Crouter (2009) also found that greater work pressure and less flexible work environments predicted higher levels of depressive symptoms. Similarly, Jackson and Scharman (2002) found that women who worked in jobs requiring less than 40 hours a week found solutions that were satisfying when combining family and career and did not feel like they had to choose between the two.

Many of the studies reviewed above found that mothers who worked less than full-time experienced less stress in the dual role they play as mother and worker. “Although females can and do juggle these many demands, the greatest satisfaction with the balance between work and family roles exists when females reduce the time and commitments at work when children are at home” (White, 1999, p. 173). Unfortunately this is not possible or desirable for all women, and the findings above are important when considering the needs of women in the workplace and the benefit of flexibility for workers, particularly women.

**Women in Higher Education**

To understand the status and condition of women who work in higher education, it is important to discuss the culture of higher education. The hierarchal and patriarchal structures of
the academy create challenges for women. In addition to a discussion about the culture, I will also review the literature about women’s experiences as employees in higher education.

**Status and Condition for Women in Higher Education**

Important to understanding the experiences of women who work in higher education is the culture of the academy. Although the number of women who work in higher education has increased, both as faculty members and administrators, there are still structures in place that negatively impact women’s experiences in higher education. According to Chliwniak (1997), “the academy has comfortably reproduced itself for several centuries and a male-dominated, patriarchal culture has been solidly established” (p. 6). This culture has had, and continues to have, negative effects on women who work in higher education, and these effects can be particularly troubling for women with children. According to Armenti (2004), “Educational institutions contribute to gender inequities, play a role in reinforcing sexism, and do not interrupt patriarchy” (p. 225). This is because the academic workplace is organized in a manner that is meant to address the needs of White men, whereas women run into obstacles to their socialization when working in higher education (Aguirre, 2000).

The patriarchal and hierarchical structures of higher education have been discussed by many (Armenti, 2004; Chliwniak, 1997; Crumpacker, McMillin, & Navakas, 1998; Hart, 2008; Kolodny, 2000; Lewis, 2005). There are some obvious structures that contribute to the inequality in the system, like the hierarchy that makes up departments, colleges, programs, and majors (Bradley, 2000). These structures can disadvantage women in a variety of ways, including issues of power, underrepresentation in leadership positions, and lower pay but these structures alone cannot address all of the gender disparity in higher education. It is important to address these hierarchies because they are problematic and “are usually gendered and racialized,
especially at the top” (Acker, 2006, p. 445). Hierarchical organizational power leads to control, which is used to preserve the power of those in charge, who in turn make sure that employees advance the goals of the institution and accept a system that is not equal. Further, if women are indeed underrepresented at the highest levels of leadership in the academy, one has to wonder whether women’s needs are being considered when decision-making is taking place. One might also argue that reaching the higher levels of leadership is more difficult for women because those in power are often working to preserve their own power.

Patriarchy is one such structure that is oppressive to women. According to Foss, Foss, and Griffin (1999),

Patriarchy is a hierarchical system maintained by ‘the belief that some people are more valuable than others’. In a hierarchical system such as patriarchy, those on the top command, and those below obey. More recent systems of hierarchy are found in the less obvious and seemingly benevolent structures of the classroom. Each of these systems perpetuates the dominance of some individuals over others. (p. 166)

Women in higher education have been operating within such a system, and it has had detrimental effects on their participation in leadership positions (Acker, 2006), their wages (Blackhurst, 2000), and their representation in the curriculum (Schuster & Van Dyne, 1985). This glass ceiling in higher education is the result of a male-dominated organizational structure, and the product of women being perceived as different than their predecessors, typically White men (Chliwniak, 1997). One way the structure of higher education has been challenged is through the ideals of feminism, principles which will continue to be utilized to challenge the inequities in higher education.
Women in leadership. Although there are more women in positions of power and decision-making in higher education than in the past (Lewis, 2005), women are still considerably underrepresented, relative to their participation as students in higher education as members of society generally, and in the upper levels of administration in higher education where decisions are made (Aguirre, 2000; Blackhurst, Brandt, & Kalinowski, 1998a; Dicker & Piepmeir, 2003). In fact, according to the *Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac* (2008), women still only made up 23% of college presidents as of 2006. Women as presidents of colleges and universities are still somewhat of an anomaly and although women have made progress toward achieving top leadership positions, progress has not come quickly (Wolverton, Bower, & Hyde, 2009).

In her literature review examining women in leadership positions in higher education, Chliwniak (1997) found that there were legitimate problems with trying to study women in leadership in higher education because they are so underrepresented. In addition, “leadership traditionally has been studied using male norms in hierarchical structures as the standard for behaviors and characteristics against which women were assessed” (Chliwniak, 1997, p. 3). To fit into the male-dominated hierarchical organizational structures, women have had to take on masculine characteristics used as measures of success, yet those who do so are often ridiculed.

Although the gap of women in positions of power exists outside of higher education as well (Simpson et al., 2004), it is particularly troubling in higher education because those in leadership positions impact the culture and structure of institutions of learning. The culture of institutions of higher education is then passed down to students. Those who are in power have the ability to make decisions about what is taught, how money is spent, and who is hired. Through all of these means, those in power have the ability to perpetuate a patriarchal norm as the status quo (Chliwniak, 1997). Further, those who are in positions of power have the ability to
make decisions about who gets admitted to academic programs, how resources are allocated, what acceptable scholarship is, and who gets hired (Lewis, 2005).

Those who have decision-making ability in higher education have the ability to make significant changes in the academy. They can make changes to the curriculum to address the contributions and experiences of women as well as better serve the current population (Howe, 1977; Schuster & Van Dyne, 1985). They can hire more women to work in higher education in leadership positions; to create appropriate policies that do not discriminate against women; help create a more receptive environment for women, particularly women with children; and include more women in the decision-making processes (Aguirre, 2000). Institutional policymakers can work to break down institutional barriers that impede women’s advancement and satisfaction in higher education (Blackhurst, Brandt, & Kalinowski, 1998b). Those who are in power in higher education have the ability to challenge the current structures and discipline boundaries by using a feminist approach to create a less hierarchical culture and define leadership using a more collaborative model (Crumpacker, McMillen, & Navakas, 1998; Kolodny, 2000). The culture and structures of higher education need to be challenged to bring about a more inclusive environment that values the contributions of women and addresses the unique needs they have as employees.

**Tenured faculty.** Faculty members in higher education have an interesting work environment made up of an arrangement that is relatively unique to their profession. According to the American Association of University Professors (n.d.), tenure “is an arrangement whereby faculty members, after successful completion of a period of probationary service, can be dismissed only for adequate cause or other possible circumstances and only after a hearing before a faculty committee” (para. 1). Tenure is a process that was created with the male
experience in mind, as discussed by Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2004). In their qualitative study about how women combine and handle their dual roles as tenure-track faculty members at research universities with being mothers of young children, they found that the career path of women is impacted significantly by tenure due to the timing of the process, which often conflicts with the ideal time to have children. The tenure system is an added element of structure that impacts women’s experiences as tenure-track faculty members. In addition, information about leadership, mentoring, and salary are all included in the literature about female faculty members.

According to Rosen (1999)

> For a long time, it was perfectly reasonable to organize colleges and universities around the male experience. Now that there is a critical mass of women, we need to reconsider the lack of child care, the tenure cycle, the publishing expectations, and the other ‘normal’ patterns that often seem to be cast in concrete. (p. 3)

Challenging and adjusting such structures is especially important for women because the existence of these hierarchical structures can have particularly negative impacts for women in higher education.

In considering the tenure and promotion process in higher education, it is essential to first look at any hidden obstacles for women and minority faculty in their advancement (Kolodny, 2000). For example, women faculty members have a more difficult time moving from part-time positions to full-time positions (Perna, 2001). In fact, in a study conducted by Perna (2001) about the relationship between employment status and family responsibilities of married women, the odds were higher for married women to hold a non-tenure track, part-time position than for non-married women after controlling for other factors. In addition, among full-time faculty, women held more non-tenure track positions than men. This is significant because, in the
hierarchy of higher education, non-tenure track positions are positions of lower status, less pay, and less job security (Perna, 2001).

For women who are tenure-track faculty members and choose to have children, the tenure process can be even more troublesome. In Varner’s and Varner and Drago’s studies (as cited in Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004), due to the timing of tenure in the lifespan career arc, which often coincides with the ideal time, biologically, to have children, many women believe they have to postpone having children (Drago et al., 2003), time their pregnancies for delivery over the summer (Armenti, 2004), or even choose between career and children (Wilson, 1995a). Some faculty members even believe that having children while serving as a faculty member equates to not being serious about one’s career (Rosen, 1999). Stopping the tenure clock is an option for women at some institutions. This is a process where one can take time off from publishing, research, and teaching without being penalized. For example, if they have five years to obtain tenure and take one semester off to have a child, the semester will not count toward their five-year probationary period. Although some institutions do allow women to stop the tenure clock when they have children, it can still have a negative impact on their evaluations due to the perceptions other faculty have about such a decision. This can ultimately lead to a disadvantage in the tenure review process (Wilson, 1999), particularly because a gap in a tenure track faculty member’s academic record is of great concern for women in higher education (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004).

Gaps in employment occur when time is taken off of work. One such example that is significant for women in particular is when women take time off of work for family-related reasons, such as having or raising a child. In a longitudinal study conducted with three cohorts of Harvard graduates, Jaschik (2008) found that for comparable groups of women, those who
took 18 months off from their full-time positions had lower incomes than those who did not. In addition, when determining eligibility for tenure, a gap in employment often is a detriment (Wilson, 1999).

**Mentoring.** Mentoring for women in higher is important because of its success with improving women’s career satisfaction and advancement in higher education (Blackhurst, 2000; Hughes, 2004; Marshall, 2002; Marshall, 2009; Nobbe & Manning, 1997; Paterson & hart-Wasekeesh, 1994). Due to the structural and cultural barriers that women in higher education face, mentoring relationships can be particularly useful for both women students and professionals. Mentors help women reach leadership roles in higher education, as well as navigate the patriarchal systems that have already been established in higher education.

Unfortunately, there are not enough role models for women in higher education, particularly for junior faculty, which can have detrimental effects (Chliwniak, 1997). When women do not have other women to turn to as mentors, they must seek out men as role models. Turning to male mentors to identify professional success can be troubling because, according to Chliwniak (1997), men and women define success differently. The unwritten rules for success in higher education, including evaluation of research and teaching, are often passed down and informally communicated from one group of individuals to the next (Hall & Sandler, 1983). These networks of scholars decide which matters, including research, are important, but they also control access to information. They act as gatekeepers, and therefore “for newcomers to succeed, merit alone is rarely enough, they must also be socialized into the profession” (Hall & Sandler, 1983, p. 3). As previously discussed, men hold the majority of the higher level positions in higher education, and due to the informal networks that are present in academe, they also control the information, and therefore the power.
Salary. It is important to consider how worth is measured in higher education when considering the status and condition of women faculty members. If it is measured by typical patriarchal standards, women will automatically be at a disadvantage. However, “gender is difficult to see when only the masculine is present. Since men in organizations take their behavior and perspectives to represent the human, organizational structures and processes are theorized as gender neutral” (Acker, 1990, p. 142).

Gender impacts salary differences for faculty members, which can impact job satisfaction and job performance (Aguirre, 2000). Of particular concern is that White women and women of color are at the lowest levels of the salary hierarchy in most service organizations, like higher education (Acker, 2006). Across all institutions and all ranks, women faculty’s average salary was 81% of men’s, a comparison that “has remained virtually unchanged since the AAUP began collecting separate salary data for women and men faculty in the late 1970s” (West & Curtis, 2006, p. 11). According to the 2011 Almanac of Higher Education (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2011), average faculty salaries for women are still less than those of men.

Such disparity is concerning. This wage gap between women and men “maintains a pecking order that implies hierarchical institutional value and respect for members, regardless of equal contribution” (Chliwniak, 1997, p. 34). As previously discussed, this gap is not specific to female faculty members, but is a general trend in employment (Dey & Hill, 2007). Although this is an additional challenge that women face, it is of particular concern because of the impact on job satisfaction and job performance (Aguirre, 2000).

Student Affairs Administrators. Although there are other administrators who work in higher education, not all of them are student affairs administrators. In this section I will be discussing those who work specifically as student affairs administrators. Student affairs
administrators serve in a variety of capacities on university and college campuses. Their experiences as professionals in higher education are essential to gaining an understanding of the relationship between motherhood and career in student affairs. There are a number of issues that the literature has covered about women who work in this field, some of which are specific to women in student affairs.

**Mentoring.** As previously discussed, mentoring can have a positive impact on women who work in higher education (Blackhurst, 2000; Hughes, 2004; Marshall, 2002; Marshall, 2009; Nobbe & Manning, 1997; Paterson & Hart-Wasekeesikaw, 1994). Women in higher education can benefit other professionals by serving as mentors to them. In fact, serving as a mentor is a way to not only benefit someone else, but it can improve the career development of the mentor (Hughes, 2004). In their qualitative study of 10 women student affairs professionals’ experiences combining motherhood and career, Nobbe and Manning (1997) found that women in student affairs considered themselves particularly well-suited to mentor new professionals, thus providing benefits to those being mentored and receiving benefits themselves. Some of the benefits of mentoring to both the mentor and the woman being mentored included a decrease in role conflict and an increase in commitment to one’s institution (Hughes, 2004), achieving advanced degrees, involvement in professional associations, writing for publication, and retention in higher education (Blackhurst, 2000; Hersi, 1993; Tinsley, 1985; Twale & Jelink, 1995).

**Salary.** The salary discrepancies found for women in the workforce generally and for women faculty in colleges and universities also manifest for women in student affairs. Blackhurst (2000) surveyed 307 women student affairs professionals who were members of NASPA to learn more about career satisfaction and perceptions of sex discrimination. She
discovered that women in student affairs perceived sex discrimination at moderate to high levels. Although overt discrimination was found to be relatively rare, “systemic discrimination in the form of salary inequity was reported by the majority of women in the sample (60%)” (p. 409). Although research has demonstrated that women who work in student affairs need to negotiate better for higher salaries (Compton & Palmer, 2009), it is also important to remember that salary inequities between men and women cannot be explained simply by inadequate negotiation techniques. One way worth is measured in higher education is through salary, and the patriarchal standards that are being used are a barrier to women’s success.

**Common Issues among Faculty and Student Affairs Administrators**

There is also literature about issues common to both faculty and student affairs administrators. Leave policies can be utilized for a variety of situations, but are particularly relevant when discussing policies after children are born or adopted. In addition, understanding identity is important for women in higher education. Their experiences as employees in higher education are impacted not just by their gender, but by their other identities as well.

*Leave policies.* Although many institutions of higher education have parental leave policies, they are not always as accommodating as one would hope, and they vary considerably (Sallee, 2008). According to MacKinnon, the practices and policies that are believed to be gender-neutral usually reinforce the culture that is male-defined (as cited in Armenti, 2004). For example, a faculty member’s tenure-track years and the optimal years for having children frequently happen at the same time for women. Both responsibilities carry heavy demands on time and resources that are typically unevenly borne by women. This issue has not led to widespread reform of tenure policies in higher education. The fact that the tenure system has not changed and is perceived to be gender neutral because of its focus on merit; however, it in fact
favors men’s patterns of spending more time on work and career goals than in the home (Armenti, 2004).

Developing a climate where balance between work and family is valued can help break down some of the hierarchical structures and barriers faced by those in higher education. Women who have children are significantly impacted because they have to balance both work and family and, according to Wilson (1995b), the hierarchical structures in higher education can cause difficulties for individuals who have children. One specific way to help women successfully combine their responsibilities to their families and their responsibilities at work is to change the structures and leave policies that are currently in place in higher education (Kolodny, 2000; Nobbe & Manning, 1997; Perna, 2001; Ranson, 1998; Robin, 1999; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004).

The type of leave policy accorded to new mothers can express a great deal about an institution’s commitment to equity between men and women (Sallee, 2008). The lack of such policies can negatively impact recruiting and retaining full-time faculty members and staff into institutions of higher education (Kolodny, 2000). In addition, if the culture of an institution does not support people taking advantage of such policies, they will not be used frequently.

**Identity.** Although much of this literature review has focused on gender, it is important to address the fact that women have other identities that impact their experiences in higher education. As Acker (2006) stated, “focusing on one category almost inevitably obscures and oversimplifies other interpenetrating realities” (p. 442). Although women frequently are seen as a homogeneous group (Twombly, 1993), it is essential to consider other contexts that comprise their identities because they “influence who we are and how we view the world” (Pope, Reynolds, & Mueller, 2004, p. xiv).
Women’s lives are shaped by more than just their gender. It includes other identities, like race, ethnicity, social class, educational background, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status (Howard-Hamilton, 2003; Kemp, Madlala, Moodley, & Salo, 1995; Tetreault, 1985). Given the fact that women have many identities, they have to negotiate these different identities. Different identities may be salient at different times and under different circumstances. However, it is unfortunate that one way that women in higher education do so is to demonstrate that they are equal to White men (Aguirre, 2000).

“Our identities as women are shaped by race, class, and gender, and these identities have molded our particular experiences of gender oppression” (Kemp et al., 1995, p. 133). There are other identities, including physical ability, nationality, sexual orientation, and others, that are important as well. Due to the structures and policies previously discussed, women often must deal with policies and procedures that were created with men, specifically, in mind (Aguirre, 2000). Negotiating this culture can be challenging for women, and until changes are made, many women may feel it is necessary to demonstrate that they are equal to ‘the norm’ – White men.

At the same time, women in higher education also must face the dilemma of tokenism (Aguirre, 2000). For example, a woman may be asked to serve on a committee of all men, thus giving the committee the appearance of being inclusive. Further, women may be “asked to use their intuitive sense of compassion to deal with students, especially women students” (Aguirre, 2000, p. 73). Such requests further demonstrate that women are often viewed as a homogenous group (Twombly, 1993), as well as advances stereotypes.

Although throughout this dissertation I refer to women as a group, it is essential to point out that women are not a homogenous group. Due to the intersection of multiple identities, women may face multiple oppressions. Privileging gender over other identities does not
necessarily represent the range of women’s experiences (Gottfried, 1996). The intersections of such identities can have considerable impacts on the experiences of women in higher education because women have different needs and different experiences depending on their various identities and how they intersect to uniquely shape their experiences.

Women have different experiences based on characteristics such as social class, nationality, race, and sexual orientation; however, these categories cannot be treated separately because of the intersection of identities (McCann & Kim, 2003).

As we have already seen with the category ‘women,’ where there is not a common identity, there are dangers in treating race, nationality, class, and sexuality as if each category captures some perfectly shared common experience or identity. The discussion of differences can also be oversimplified by treating the experiences captured within these categories as if they are each analytically discrete and separate from the others. Furthermore, in treating one factor as the principle focus of analysis, important interactions with simultaneously present other factors can easily be obscured or misconstrued. Thus, with a narrow focus on gender, one cannot see the specificity of nationality within racial groups. (McCann & Kim, 2003, pp. 148-149)

Identity is not one dimensional; it is complex and fluid (McCann & Kim, 2003). Furthermore, as far as the feminist movement has been concerned, there have been conflicting views from women about their place in the movement (Combahee River Collective, 2003; Martinez, 2003). Specifically, some women felt the movement was dominated by middle-class White women and therefore did not address the importance of racism (Martinez, 2003). Some Black women asserted that their struggles were unique because they were fighting “to address a whole range of oppressions” (Combahee River Collective, 2003, p. 168).
As mentioned previously, I am utilizing feminist standpoint theory as my theoretical foundation, which posits that women have common experiences through which they are linked, like motherhood. However, it is still important to be aware of the fact that, although there are commonalities, women are not a monolithic group. Women interpret their experiences differently depending on intersections among various identities, and I expect that some of this will come out in my study.

**Mothers in Higher Education**

A prominent theme in the literature about women in higher education is their role as mothers (Blackhurst, 2000; Marshall, 2002; Marshall, 2009; Nobbe & Manning, 1997; Ting & Watt, 1999; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). Although there have been a limited number of studies conducted on the topic of motherhood, particularly related to women in student affairs, much of what has been done highlights the connection between motherhood and career. Beginning to gain a better understanding of the experiences of women professionals with children can be accomplished through a review of literature on the topic.

**Faculty.** Understanding the experiences of faculty members in higher education who are also mothers is of importance because of the unique work culture for faculty members discussed earlier. To better understand this phenomenon, Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2004) interviewed women faculty members’ juggling motherhood and their career at research universities. The women in this study identified both barriers and positive aspects about their dual role as a mother and a faculty member.

Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2004) found that “the structure of academic life, especially for those in their pretenure track years at research universities, has many characteristics that both encourage and inhibit women with small children” (p. 243). Although women in the study did
state that the flexibility of work as a faculty member was helpful, the “autonomy comes with a significant price” (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004, p. 243). These unique characteristics, autonomy and tenure, impact women’s experiences as mothers. Several of the interviewees considered leaving higher education because of the challenges they faced (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). The pressure and timeline of achieving tenure were seen as challenging because the timing of tenure and childbearing often are overlapping. However, despite the negative aspects of serving in a dual role as a faulty member and a mother, those participating in the study reported positive aspects of serving in this dual role. The women had realistic ideas about what they could achieve in a given day, for example. In addition, the necessity to move between their role as a faculty member and their role as a mother gave them temporary breaks from the stress of either role.

In addition, support was significant for the women in their study (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). Although these participants appreciated their husbands’ help with household work and childcare, they felt that they still did more work in both of these areas. Hochschild and Machung (2003) discussed this phenomenon of a “second shift” for women, working a full-time job outside of the home, and then coming home to their families and working a second shift, doing housework and caring for children. It is important to consider institutional support like effective leave policies and the ability to potentially stop the tenure clock for childbearing, but support within the home is also essential.

**Student Affairs Administrators.** According to several researchers, women in higher education have either contemplated or actually changed their career goals and plans upon having children (Marshall, 2009; Nobbe & Manning, 1997; Ting & Watt, 1999; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). Women turned down jobs or promotions that conflicted with their family’s needs (Collins, 2009; Marshall, 2009; Ting & Watt, 1999), postponed or decided not to pursue
advanced degrees, and limited their participation in professional associations (Marshall, 2009). Some women found that trying to balance children and work in student affairs so challenging that they planned to leave the profession (Ting & Watt, 1999). It is clear from this literature that having children impacts women’s career plans.

In their qualitative study of 10 women with children in student affairs, Nobbe and Manning (1997) found that, although the women found it challenging to serve in these dual roles, they saw both benefits and tradeoffs. Marshall (2002) conducted a qualitative study of 17 women who worked in student affairs and had children and learned “more about how female administrators manage the dual roles of administration and motherhood” (p. 42). Although the women in the study believed they made compromises in their roles as both mothers and professionals, they all agreed that the benefits prevailed over the tradeoffs. For example, it may have taken them longer to receive tenure because they took time off during the birth of their children, but they still believed that it was worth it. With the exception of one woman, they enjoyed being full-time working professionals and preferred the intellectual stimulation to staying home with their children full-time.

Another significant theme in the literature about women student affairs professionals who have children is that of support (Marshall, 2002; Nobbe & Manning, 1997). This included the support of everyone from partners to babysitters or childcare, family, mentors, friends, and work colleagues in order for women to successfully manage their dual roles. Some women reported feeling like they received less support from their subordinates than from their supervisors (Nobbe & Manning, 1997). Finally, women in Marshall’s (2002) study felt that, although their husbands helped, they were the ones who were primarily responsible for household and childcare duties.
Due to the demands of higher education careers, some women delay having children, or decide not to have any. Blackhurst (2000) found that 14% of women in her study cited a desire to spend more time with their family as one factor that would influence their decision to leave the field of student affairs. Among the studies focused on faculty, the findings are similar. In their study on care giving of faculty members and bias avoidance strategies, Drago et al. (2003) found that women who were interested in faculty careers at research institutions were inclined to either delay having children or reduce their commitments to their children. Finkel and Olswang found, in a study of tenure-track assistant professors at a public Carnegie I research university, that nearly half of the women delayed having children because of a perception that it was an impediment to their careers (as cited in Aguirre, 2000).

Summary

As long as women continue to have children and work outside the home, they will have to balance work and family life. It is clear from the literature that women have to make choices between their profession and their children, which leads me to conclude that institutions of higher education need to address barriers that create work environments that are not supportive of women with children. The retention of student affairs professionals in particular could be impacted positively if the culture of higher education was more supportive of combining motherhood and work. In addition, we are passing down a culture to our students that having children and a career is not ideal. Addressing some of the policies that exist is one place to begin addressing the needs of mothers in higher education.

Conclusions

We have learned about women who work in student affairs and their experiences in their dual roles of mother and professional through qualitative studies. However, there is still much to
be learned about this topic regarding the generalizability of these findings. These types of findings can only be gleaned through quantitative studies. In addition to addressing what we already know about this topic, this conclusion will include a critique of the literature.

I believe that phase theory is useful in organizing the literature on women’s experiences in higher education as employees as well as mothers. Specifically, it accounts for where women have been, where they are, and where they might be going (Tetreault, 1985). Although this framework was originally used to look at women’s integration into the mainstream curriculum in higher education, it has successfully been used as a conceptual framework to look at the literature about women (Marshall, 2002).

The phase theory framework allows an exploration of the historical contexts of women’s roles in higher education compared to their current situation, while still considering the potential for the future. According to Twombly (1993), “the strength of feminist phase theory is that it permits identification of changes in feminist thinking over time” (p. 196). In addition, feminist phase theory “calls for rethinking what we know about women” rather than using the “add women and stir” model (Marshall, 2002, p. 12). This theoretical framework is beneficial in understanding how women have been integrated into research about higher education employees. The phases address a number of aspects, including: the exclusion of women (phase one); looking at women in comparison to exceptional men (phase two); the experiences of women as problems and the obstacles that they face (phase three); and viewing women’s experiences “on their own terms” (phase four); and looking at the experiences of both men and women in relation to each other (phase five) (Marshall, 2002, p. 13).

In considering the literature that is available about women in higher education, it is encouraging that women’s experiences are valued enough to be written about, researched, and
published. There was a time when women were not present in the literature and obviously we have made progress since that time. However, when considering the literature utilizing feminist phase theory (Andersen, 1988) as a means to frame the analysis of the literature, one can identify some trends in the literature about women in higher education.

**Phase one.** As evident from the review I conducted, women are included in the literature generally. However, certainly there was a time when this was not the case. I would like to see additional articles about women and higher education from an international perspective where these issues are combined.

It would be interesting, for example, to learn more about the experiences of international students or visiting faculty or staff from non-Western countries when they come to study or teach in the United States. Learning more about how their understanding of feminism and their home culture impact their experiences in higher education in the United States would be fascinating. In addition, it is only relatively recently that research has been conducted about women student affairs professionals who have children. There has been research about the experiences of faculty, which is pertinent to understanding the lives of women as mothers in higher education; however, working as a faculty member is quite different from working in student affairs.

**Phase two.** The second phase in feminist phase theory is understanding women’s experiences compared to exceptional men. Although women are included in the literature even if they are not exceptional by masculine terms, I do think it is important to point out that there are still some subtle aspects of phase two that are present in the literature. One example is how women in leadership positions in higher education are compared to men. Chliwniak (1997) said that leadership typically is studied using male norms for the standard for characteristics and behaviors against which women are assessed. As I have argued throughout this paper, women’s
experiences in higher education are significantly impacted by the hierarchical and patriarchal structures present in the academe. Therefore, one can conclude that the standards of excellence to which women are being held were established by men (Marshall, 2002).

Phase three. Understanding women’s experiences related to the problems they face is evident in the literature I reviewed. Women are seen as victims in this phase and the literature depicts a negative image of women (Marshall, 2002). I believe there are many examples in this literature review that fall within phase three, specifically the literature about salary for women and their lack of negotiation abilities. Further, much of the literature about women who are mothers and work in higher education highlights the barriers they face in attempting to combine work and family.

Phase four. The fourth phase of feminist phase theory highlights the positive experiences of women, allowing them to share their experiences in their own words. Much of the literature that is from a constructivist paradigm and is qualitative in nature does just that. One such example is the literature about women who work in student affairs and are mothers. The participants in the qualitative studies conducted by Marshall (2002) and Nobbe and Manning (1997), for example, provided a perspective previously unrecognized. The women discussed positive experiences. This is one of the benefits of conducting such research, and as qualitative research is increasingly viewed as valuable, women will continue to be able to tell their stories, a key feature of feminism as well.

Phase five. Phase five “is harder to conceive because it is so unrealized” (Andersen, 1988, p. 236). Specifically, this phase would include literature that is based on the diversity of all human experience, rather than on generalization. The literature about the intersection of identity for women (McCann & Kim, 2003) and the danger of using particular aspects of identity
to explain a perfectly shared common identity is a good example of this phase. Literature about intersectionality of identity discusses the need to address multiple identities of women and how those identities relate to a woman’s life (Collins, 2003). Further, the key tenets of research in the positivist paradigm are that it is generalizable and there is a single, objective reality (Kuh, Whitt, & Shedd, 1987); however, if research from a positivist paradigm continues to be seen as more valuable than constructivist, as I believe is the case, we will continue to base our conclusions on generalized information, which will lead to research being published that does not reach phase five.

**Need for Further Research**

Women who work in student affairs and who are also mothers have particular experiences and needs due to their dual roles. There is a good deal of literature about women who work in higher education in general that has given us an idea of what support systems women use, what barriers they face, and their status and condition in higher education. However, there is a gap in the literature about these women’s experiences as mothers working in student affairs.

What we know about women who are mothers and work in student affairs in particular comes from qualitative research that has been conducted over the past 12 years. We know that these women face barriers and decisions that other individuals do not necessarily have to address in the same way. We also know from these qualitative studies that there is a connection between career and motherhood. However, quantitative methods can add to our understanding by understand whether there or a correlation between these two issues. Addressing the prediction and correlation between variables is something that qualitative research cannot accomplish and
can help us to better understand the relationship between motherhood and career for women in student affairs.

Understanding the unique experiences of women with children in student affairs is essential to providing additional information to administrators who can enact change to improve the workplace for these women as well as retain them. In addition, if we better understand this group’s experiences and needs, we can better assist them in their career advancement and retention by helping them to find balance in their dual role of mother and student affairs professional.

My research addresses this gap in quantitative research on this topic. Specifically, through my research, I explore perceptions of career satisfaction in mothers and non-mothers who work as professionals in student affairs. This type of research has not yet been conducted on women who work in student affairs, and reflects a sizeable gap in the literature, given how many women this particular topic impacts.

Gaining information from a more diverse population of women is also something that has been lacking in the literature. Though the use of the ACPA – College Student Educators International membership, I will be able to reach out to a great number of women in student affairs. This includes populations that have been underrepresented in previous research, such as women of color and bisexual and lesbian women, as well as entry- and mid-level administrators. Previous research has focused a great deal on senior-level administrators, which leaves many women in student affairs out of the literature on this topic.

My research proposes to address this gap by surveying a large portion of the population of women who work in student affairs. The information I gather through my questionnaire can be used to generalize to other women in the profession, and to gain a broader knowledge about
the relationship between motherhood and career. This quantitative study also has the ability to address both correlation and whether we can predict information based on variables.

The information I hope to gather from my study will be useful in a number of ways. Not only will the data gathered be helpful to administrators and leaders in higher education, but it will also be useful to women who currently work in student affairs and either have children, or plan to have children. My study will provide additional information that can be used to enact positive change on campuses for women with children.

In addition, my sample will represent a large population of women from a variety of backgrounds, uncovering additional information that we did not have prior to this study due to limitations in sample size and a lack of diversity within previous research. The leadership on campuses will have concrete data about women related to career satisfaction. Having this information will allow them to make important and effective changes on campus for the betterment of employees, and base these changes on research. I also believe the information I gather will be helpful to women who currently work in student affairs and have children or plan to have children. Not only will they see that there are commonalities among women, but the information will hopefully empower them to make change on their individual campuses.

Although earlier studies on this topic have been incredibly useful and provided information that was previously not in the literature, there is not only room for, but a need for additional research to be conducted on this topic. More women are entering the workforce, and women will always be mothers as well. Understanding the relationship between these two realities is essential to the future of women who work in student affairs.
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

Introduction

As I have demonstrated in my literature review, there has been very little research conducted specifically on women in student affairs and the connection between motherhood and career satisfaction for these professionals. This is an increasingly important topic as more women have entered the workforce and there is a need to better understand the impact of motherhood on career if student affairs is to help women succeed professionally. Further, the retention of women in the field of student affairs is an issue we must address (Blackhurst, 2000; Hersi, 1993; Tinsley, 1985; Twale & Jelink, 1995), and is one that may be linked to the relationship between motherhood and career satisfaction. The few research studies on this particular topic have been qualitative in nature, which has provided insights into the nature of the potential conflicts and success strategies for negotiating motherhood and career. However, quantitative analysis would contribute new information from a broader sample of women in student affairs that could empirically test the relationships among motherhood, career satisfaction in student affairs, and other factors that may moderate that association. The sample in this study included women who were members of ACPA – College Student Educators International who work in student affairs and it included both mothers and non-mothers. Such a study captured a broader range of women’s experiences in student affairs as mothers and non-mothers and provided comparative data between the two subgroups that has not been available before.

Research Questions

Based on the literature that was reviewed in the previous chapter, my study addresses five research questions. A table with my independent variables, dependent variables, research questions, and type of statistical test I utilized can be found in Appendix E.
1. Is there a difference between the levels of career satisfaction for women who work full-time in student affairs based on the following variables:

- partnership status
- degree attainment
- functional area of student affairs
  - academic advising, admissions, admissions/enrollment management, adult learner services, assessment/research, career planning/placement, commuter services, counseling, disability student services, financial aid, food services, gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgender awareness, greek affairs, health/drug and alcohol, international students, intramural/recreation sports, judicial affairs, leadership development, multicultural affairs, orientation, religious programs, residence life, service learning, student activities, student affairs administration, student union, or women’s resources (categories used by ACPA – College Student Educators International)
- race/ethnicity
- institutional size
- motherhood status

2. To what degree are the following variables predictive of career satisfaction for women working in student affairs?

- partnership status
- degree attainment
- functional area of student affairs
  - academic advising, admissions, admissions/enrollment management, adult learner services, assessment/research, career planning/placement, commuter services, counseling, disability student services, financial aid, food services, gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgender awareness, greek affairs, health/drug and alcohol, international students, intramural/recreation sports, judicial affairs, leadership development, multicultural affairs, orientation, religious programs, residence life, service learning, student activities, student affairs administration, student union, or women’s
resources (categories used by ACPA – College Student Educators International)

- race/ethnicity
- institutional size
- motherhood status

3. What combination of the variables below produces the best predictive model of career satisfaction for women working in student affairs?

- motherhood status
- number of children
- age when first became a mother
- age of child(ren)
- length of tenure in the field when you first became a mother
- partnership status
- degree attainment
- functional area of student affairs
- age of women
- race/ethnicity
- institutional size

4. Is there a statistically significant difference in levels of career satisfaction between mothers and non-mothers who work in student affairs?

5. Is there a statistically significant difference in levels of career satisfaction of mothers who work in student affairs based on the variables below?

- number of children
• age when first became a mother
• age of child(ren)
• length of tenure in the field when you first became a mother
• partnership status
• degree attainment
• functional area of student affairs
• age of women
• race/ethnicity
• institutional size

**Methodological Framework**

I conducted a quantitative study on the relationship between motherhood and career satisfaction. To conduct this study effectively, it was important to address the assumptions about the issues addressed in this topic. To shape my research and guide the action I took as a researcher, I first addressed the paradigm from which I was operating (Creswell, 2006). For my study, I operated from a critical methodological framework.

Although I used quantitative methods for my study, I did do so through a critical framework, which is consistent with Stage’s (2007) assertion that one can conduct quantitative research from a critical paradigm. There are a number of benefits to utilizing such an approach, which I will discuss in greater detail below, and I believe it was the most suitable paradigm from which to operate for my dissertation research. In addition to providing information about what a critical paradigm is, I will also discuss why this paradigm is appropriate for my research.
Critical Paradigm Characteristics

To better understand the critical research paradigm, I will use the work of Tierney and Rhoads (1993) to demonstrate the key characteristics of critical theorists. They described theorists like myself as people who attempt to understand individuals’ and groups’ experiences while considering the role of society and constraints of culture (Tierney & Rhoads). The culture and hierarchy in higher education impact higher education professionals’ experiences as mothers, as I discussed previously. The impact of institutional policy, the structure of tenure, and the lack of women in leadership positions in higher education all impact women’s experiences. As a critical theorist, I understand that power is fundamental to structuring human subjectivity (Tierney & Rhoads). In other words, power and the power that comes with being privileged helps shape and impact who we believe we are as individuals and how we position ourselves in the world. Privilege plays a role in how one views the world.

I also recognize the important role of cultural difference (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993). People have different experiences depending on who they are. Their identities shape their experiences, and although identities cannot be looked at separately (McCann & Kim, 2003), those identities are important when studying individuals’ experiences. Critical theorists are individuals who study how knowledge is defined (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993). There is power in defining knowledge, and people who have certain knowledge can transmit power as well. Finally, critical theorists attempt to bridge the gap between research and action (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993).

Conducting research on the relationship between motherhood and career satisfaction, for example, is not enough. Critical theorists take what is learned through research and put it into practice. Critical research is about making the world a better place and creating positive change
– in other words, serving as an advocate (Baez, 2007). It is taking the information and
knowledge you have to make positive changes for others. Critical researchers empower people
to give them a voice and try to use their “work as a form of social or cultural criticism”
(Kincheloe & McLaren, as cited in Stage, 2007, p. 7), and hope to use their work to transform
society (Baez, 2007). Those who conduct research from a critical paradigm choose research
topics that will result in information that could positively impact society and people. They take
the information they have gathered through their research and put it into action. Finally, critical
theorists desire to bridge the gap between research and action, a gap that they believe was
promoted by traditional research from a positivist paradigm (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993).

Specifically, I utilized feminist standpoint theory, which is a type of critical theory
(Anderson, 2011). Critical theories, such as feminist standpoint theory, intend to improve the
situation of those who are oppressed. Because I wanted to conduct my research as an advocate
for women, it was logical to use feminist standpoint theory, as I discussed previously.

**Why a Critical Paradigm is Appropriate for My Research**

The topic I studied is certainly a complex societal issue. I believe that studying
motherhood and career satisfaction using quantitative methods was appropriate to identify equity
issues and gain insight into career satisfaction for mothers; however, I also believe that this
subject is multifaceted and a critical perspective helped me gain a better understanding of the
phenomena in which I was interested. According to Reinharz (1992), most feminist researchers
often research a topic that troubles them personally. As I stated previously, my interest is in
studying women administrators in student affairs and how having children impacts their
perception of career satisfaction. This is certainly a topic that concerns me personally. Given
that fact, critical theory was appropriate for my topic and interest in it because it did not require
neutrality as a necessary pre-condition to studying a topic (Kinzie, 2007). Further, studying the social issues of a group whose voice has been silenced in the past is also a piece of critical theory. Putting women at the center of my study was a part of embracing feminism as well (Krane, 1994).

According to Lather (1991), using a critical framework considers how gender impacts our organizations and lives, as well as the distribution of privilege and power. This provides another reason why using gender as the primary category in this study was appropriate. An additional benefit to conducting quantitative research from a critical paradigm is that we can focus on concerns about equity through the analysis of large data sets (Stage, 2007). I was able to focus on a topic specific to women – motherhood. The goal of my research was not to reproduce the status quo and confirm a priori knowledge, to further explore and investigate the topic of career satisfaction and motherhood. This is in line with a critical perspective.

Stage (2007) also suggested that utilizing a critical stance and quantitative methods was an effective way to focus on research questions and to select those questions carefully. The researcher who utilizes a critical paradigm does more than just attempt to gain consensus. She is proactive in selecting research questions that challenge previously assumed knowledge, finding where there is conflict, and using quantitative methods to take theory and knowledge to a more prominent place (Stage, 2007). As Krane (1994) discussed, using traditional methods, such as quantitative methods, can be done successfully while still having a critical awareness of the role and impact of gender. It is this awareness that encourages researchers to ask different questions that might not otherwise have been asked.

Finally, due to my personal background, gender, and interest in the topic of career satisfaction and motherhood, I believe I brought a particular perspective as the researcher. This
subjectivity is appropriate and in line with using a critical perspective. Tierney and Rhoads (1993) said that,

From a critical perspective, researchers are seen as active participants in the creation of knowledge and therefore must rely on subjectivity. Hence, the objectivity of positivist science is not a goal when conducting research from the perspective of critical theory; indeed, critical theorists argue that objectivity is not possible. We are all positioned subjects with inherent biases. In the end, interpretation is not possible without adopting a subjective stance. (p. 322)

Krane (1994) stated that gender plays a role in the entire research process, and acknowledging this role is important. This acknowledgement can prevent viewing phenomena through the dominant perspective.

The assumptions of a critical framework informed my beliefs about my research topic as well. The literature speaks to the relationship between career satisfaction and motherhood, and I believe that there is definitely an identifiable relationship between these two constructs for women who work in student affairs. Further, I think that there are common strategies that can be employed by women who have children and are student affairs professionals. My belief that there is a relationship between career satisfaction and motherhood and that this relationship is generalizable further provides support for utilizing quantitative methods.

**Instrument**

To collect data relevant to answering my research questions, I created my own survey instrument (Appendix C). I collected demographic information, as well as asked five specific questions about perceptions of career satisfaction to answer my research questions. I adopted the five questions about perceptions of career satisfaction from a study conducted by Greenhaus,
Parasuraman, and Wormley (1990). In their study, Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Wormley (1990) looked at relationships among organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, race, and career outcomes for both Black and White managers. The study looked at job performance evaluations and career outcomes to determine the differences between managers based on race. Measuring career outcomes was done with five career satisfaction questions in addition to other questions. The researchers averaged the response for a total career satisfaction score (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990). In my study, I chose to use the five career satisfaction questions separately, and was not attempting to utilize a scale score. By keeping these five questions separate, I was able to find specific differences within each question for the women who participated in the study. I did not want to average the results of the five questions, because I would not be able to determine the specific differences and similarities among women in each of these five areas.

The five items that reflected the career satisfaction that were from the scale created by Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Wormley (1990) to operationalize women’s perception of career satisfaction were as follows:

1. I am satisfied with the success I have achieved in my career.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree to Some Extent
   c. Uncertain
   d. Agree to Some Extent
   e. Strongly Agree

2. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my overall career goals.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree to Some Extent
   c. Uncertain
   d. Agree to Some Extent
   e. Strongly Agree

3. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for income.
   a. Strongly Disagree
b. Disagree to Some Extent  
c. Uncertain  
d. Agree to Some Extent  
e. Strongly Agree

4. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for professional advancement.  
a. Strongly Disagree  
b. Disagree to Some Extent  
c. Uncertain  
d. Agree to Some Extent  
e. Strongly Agree

5. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for the development of new professional skills.  
a. Strongly Disagree  
b. Disagree to Some Extent  
c. Uncertain  
d. Agree to Some Extent  
e. Strongly Agree

**Pilot Testing**

Because I designed the instrument, it was important for me to conduct a pilot test. This involved asking nine women who currently work in student affairs to complete the survey. These women included those with children and those without. The information I gathered from the pilot test enabled me to clarify a number of items on my survey. I clarified the last two career satisfaction questions by adding the word “professional” when referring to skills and advancement. I also clarified the options for age of children and partnership status to prevent any confusion. By doing this, I better ensured that the questions I asked would provide me with the kind of information about which I was interested and ensured reliable responses.

**Method**

I utilized a survey method to gather data about women’s experiences in student affairs related to their career satisfaction and motherhood. There were a number of demographic questions, which will be discussed in greater detail below, as well as questions about perception
of career satisfaction. This particular method was useful because these issues have not been addressed through a survey in the past; rather, qualitative methods have been utilized. In addition, approaching the topic of motherhood and career satisfaction using quantitative methods has not been done through a critical paradigm previously.

**Data Collection Procedure**

Developing and implementing a research study takes time, and there were many steps that had to be taken. Creating research questions, reviewing the literature, selecting participants, collecting and analyzing data, and discussing the implications of the findings for the field, as well as areas for further research are were involved in this process. I will discuss how I conducted my dissertation research below.

I also asked demographic questions in this survey. Specifically, I wanted to find out the following information: number of child(ren), current age of women, age of mother when she first became a mother, partnership status, degree attainment, race/ethnicity, current functional area of student affairs, age of child(ren) (for those who are mothers), institutional size of employment, length of tenure in the field when they had their first child (for those who are mothers), and motherhood status to compare responses from various groups.

According to Creswell (2008), it was also important to make sure my instrument was brief, taking less than 15 minutes to complete. I pilot tested my survey with nine women who worked in student affairs in a variety of functional areas, at various professional levels, some of whom were mothers and some who were not. They reported that it took less than 10 minutes to complete the survey and that they saw the study as valuable and of personal interest, which likely helped my final response rate as well.

**Participant Selection**
To select the appropriate participants for my study, I specified the population from which I wanted to select my sample (Creswell, 2008). Characteristics of the population included women working in professional positions within student affairs who were members of ACPA – College Student Educators International. I recruited both mothers and non-mothers for my study.

My sample included women who were members of one of the professional associations in the field of student affairs: ACPA – College Student Educators International. This provided me with a sample of individuals who were accessible and represent diversity within the field of student affairs. I sent an application to ACPA – College Student Educators International to request permission to conduct research on their membership and was approved to do so. I was provided with an Excel spreadsheet of the email addresses of all members who checked the box “female” upon registering with the association and had an email address, which included women in all functional areas and at all professional levels. There were 3,728 individuals who identified as female and had an email address out of the total membership of 7,169 (A. Mayo, personal communication, May 17, 2011). Just over 50% of the membership of ACPA – College Student Educators International, therefore, identified as female. Once I sent out the emails, however, I had 155 email addresses come back as undeliverable, leaving a total of 3,573 of usable email addresses. I did not survey all women who work in the field of student affairs; however, ACPA – College Student Educators International claims that it “is the leading comprehensive student affairs association” (ACPA, 2009a, ¶1) and is widely known as one of the major professional associations in the field, founded in 1924. Therefore, my target survey population of the 3,573 females who are members of ACPA – College Student Educators International reached a large group of women in student affairs. It is important to note that the individuals who received my
recruitment email may have chosen to forward it to other women who were not members of ACPA – College Student Educators International. This was beyond my control as a researcher; however, those women worked in student affairs and therefore still fit my criteria.

**Data Analysis**

I conducted two tests to answer my research questions. To determine if there were significant differences between groups, I used chi-square tests of independence. To understand the relationship between career satisfaction and my variables, I used ordinal regression.

**Chi-Square Tests of Independence**

For research questions one, three, four, since I was trying to determine if there were significant differences between groups, chi-square tests of independence were one of the appropriate tests for doing so. Additionally, since my variables are generally categorical and ordinal level variables, I needed to use non-parametric tests of significance. Cramer’s V and the chi-square tests of independence were used against my dependent variable of career satisfaction to determine if there was indeed a significant difference between my variables. When I reported the results of my tests, I provided the residuals between the observed frequency and the expected frequency because the residual is a more reliable indicator (Wigglesworth, 2006). The standard residual is the difference between the observed and expected frequencies and is a z-score. In addition, when I interpreted the standardized residuals, it is noted whether it was a positive value or a negative value. In the case of a positive value, that particular cell was overrepresented in the actual sample compared to the expected frequency. In the case of a negative value, there were fewer subjects who were in that category, or cell, than expected.
Ordinal Regression

I used ordinal regression to answer my research questions about the relationship among demographic variables and career satisfaction. Ordinal regression allowed me to model the relationship between levels of career satisfaction and various demographic variables. There were two decisions that needed to be made in the model building process for ordinal regression. First, I had to decide which explanatory variables to include in the model. The explanatory variables were motherhood status, number of children, current age of women, age when first became a mother, partnership status, degree attainment, race/ethnicity, residency of children, functional area of student affairs, age of child(ren), institutional size, length of tenure in the field when you became a mother, and current age of mother. The outcome variable for career satisfaction was measured through a give-point Likert scale. Next, I had to choose the link function (e.g., logit link or complementary log-log link). The two most commonly used link functions are logit link and complementary log-log (cloglog) link (Chen & Hughes, 2004). After I created both candidate models, I had to examine them one at a time through the test of parallel lines. According to Chen and Hughes (2004), using the test of parallel lines is a fundamental step to determine the validity of the model assumption. I also had to assess the model fitting statistics, the validity of the model assumption, and accuracy of the classification results to select the best model. These decisions helped me determine the appropriate model.

There were three options to use as a goodness-of-fit measure, Nagelkerke, McFadden, and the Cox and Snell. These three pseudo R-square values are used to interpret “the proportion of the total variability of the outcome that is accounted for by the model” (UCLA, n.d.). They are used to predict variability. I chose to use Nagelkerke in my report of the data because it is
adjusted to parallel the standard $R^2$ value and the range of outcomes is from 0-1, unlike the other two options.

**Ethical Considerations**

Finally, when conducting research, it was necessary to consider ethics and obtaining permission prior to collecting data (Creswell, 2008). I received permission from BGSU’s Office of Research Compliance, as I conducted my research as a student at BGSU. I also received permission from ACPA – College Student Educators International to survey their members. As noted in my Human Subjects Review application, my survey involved minimal risk. I did not survey participants in any of the categories of concern, and I did not ask for any health information. I also developed an informed consent for individuals who participated in the study, guaranteeing them certain rights and having them acknowledge those rights prior to taking the survey (Appendix D).

**Summary**

I utilized a critical paradigm to study the relationship between motherhood and career satisfaction for women in student affairs. To gather these data and answer my research questions, I used two different statistical tests: Chi-square tests of independence and ordinal regression. These two statistical tests allowed me to determine if there were significant differences between groups and ordinal regression allowed me to model the relationship between various demographic variables and levels of career satisfaction.
CHAPTER IV. RESULTS

The sample used in this study included individuals who self-identified as women, were members of ACPA – College Student Educators International, and who worked in the field of student affairs. The purpose of this study was to look at various aspects of career satisfaction, including career success, career goals, income goals, goals for professional advancement, and development of new professional skills. Specifically, I was interested in learning about the differences in career satisfaction between mothers and non-mothers who work in student affairs. Table 16 reports frequencies and percentages for the variables included in the study. This chapter is organized by first providing descriptive information about my participants and data, followed by inferential analysis of the data. The data are presented in two different sections. The first section explains the results about the relationship between career satisfaction and the demographic variables, and is organized by each of the five career satisfaction items. The second section details the predictive models of career satisfaction for women in student affairs, and is also organized by each of the five career satisfaction areas. My research questions will be addressed explicitly in chapter five.

Respondents

Out of the 3,573 surveys emailed to potential participants, I received 1,130 responses, for a response rate of 31.63%. After cleaning my data, I had 1,080 usable responses. I used research conducted by Bartlett, Kotrlik and Higgins (2001) to guide my decision that for my population size of 3537 I needed a sample size of 351 for categorical data (margin of error = +/- 2.5, \( p = .50, t = 1.96 \)). According to The Research Advisors (2006), and given my population and resulting sample size, I can report my findings within a +/- 2.5% margin of error. As
previously stated, my sample included 1080 women after cleaning my data. I will discuss how I established my significance criteria in my data analysis section.

**Data Cleaning**

The data cleaning process was somewhat difficult, because I wanted to maintain the integrity of my data when deciding how to deal with inadequate cell sizes, collapsing variables, and other data cleaning issues. In addition to dealing with missing data, I also had to collapse categories to create cells with adequate numbers through performing some data transformations. According to Mertler and Vannatta (2010), there are several options for how to deal with missing data, the first of which is to delete the variables or cases that have a missing value. Another option is dropping an entire variable from the data set. I chose to do both of these for various cases because the missing values were relegated to just a few variables.

There was one participant who did not answer any of the questions, six did not answer whether or not they had children, and two individuals who did not answer any of the five career satisfaction questions. This information was crucial to answering my research questions, so I did not include these six individuals in my data analysis and chose to delete these cases. There were 41 who selected the “graduate preparation coordinator” as their functional area. This particular category was not appropriate to include in the sample because it did not fit my demographic qualifications. I was interested in learning about women who worked in student affairs administration and this category included those who were faculty members in preparation programs. I did not provide an option to choose “teaching faculty” and had a few women who were teaching faculty email me to ask if they should complete the survey. I asked them not to complete the survey, in addition to making sure the first page of the survey included a sentence
that stated that faculty should not complete the survey. Deleting these cases left me with the final sample of 1080 usable cases.

I had to perform data transformations for the race/ethnicity item, combining categories where appropriate to create categories with sufficient numbers to do valid statistical tests. I provided the following options to respondents: Black/African American, Asian American/Pacific Islander, Native American/American Indian, White/Caucasian, Biracial/Multiracial, Latina/Hispanic, Arab/Middle Eastern, Bi-ethnic/Multiethnic, and Not Listed. Unfortunately there were a number of categories that did not have sufficient numbers in order to be included in my analysis for race/ethnicity as separate categories. There were three people who declined to answer, one who wrote-in Asian, two who identified as Arab/Middle Eastern, none as Native American/American Indian, and 20 who identified as Asian American/Pacific Islander. In addition, because participants had the option of selecting multiple options for this question, I had individuals who, for example, chose biracial/multiracial, Black/African American, and White/Caucasian. In order to account for those who only chose biracial/multiracial, I created a new variable: Biracial/Multiracial/Bi-ethnic/Multiethnic and this category consisted of 56 individuals. I then added everyone who chose either of those categories, or who chose more than one of the other categories. This left me with the following four categories when I finished cleaning data. There were 83 women who identified as Black/African American, 872 who identified as White/Caucasian, 56 in the Biracial/Multiracial/Bi-ethnic/Multiethnic category, and 45 who identified as Latina/Hispanic.

I also had to perform data transformations for the number of years women worked prior to becoming a mother due to inadequate cell sizes. There were only 18 people in the category of 16-20 years, 12 people in 21-25 years, and only 6 individuals in the 26 years or more category.
Therefore, I combined those three variables into one variable, named “worked 16+ years prior to becoming a mother”.

For the question asking the age of children, I also created two additional variables. Women had the option of choosing multiple categories if they had children at different ages, and there were 74 women who had children across multiple ages. Their options included: pre-school, elementary school, middle/junior high school, high school, and adult (18+ years). When I looked at the data, I found that there were 62 individuals who selected both pre-school and elementary school, so I created a variable for those who selected both of these options. I created a second variable for those who selected multiple categories and called it children across multiple age categories. This was the most logical way to account for these individuals to make the data analysis more meaningful. However, creating the variable for children across multiple age categories resulted in inadequate cell sizes for middle / junior high school and for high school age children. The new variable of children across multiple age categories included middle / junior high school and high school age children, which took these items out of individual categories.

I asked how many children were living in the home, and found that I had inadequate cell sizes for seven of the possible answers, but did not have enough in those seven to combine them into their own, new variable. There were a total of 13 women who responded that they had four or more children. Therefore, for analyses that included numbers of children living at home, I did not include responses that included four or more children. I decided not to combine the categories of four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, and ten or more children living in the home with the category of three children living in the home, which is the only way I could have an adequate
cell size. I did not want to have a category with such a large range of ages of children because I believed it would result in losing some valuable information.

Another response with inadequate cell sizes was the age of the women answering the survey. There were 18 women who were 61-65, three who were 66-70, and two who were 71 or older. For this question, I decided not to combine these responses with those who reported being aged 55-60, which was the only way I could create an adequate cell size. Like the number of children in the home, I believed this was too wide of a range to combine.

Finally, there were a number of responses about functional areas that had inadequate cell sizes. The following functional areas had fewer than 30 responses: Admissions (n = 4), Admissions/Enrollment Management (n = 18), Adult Learner Services (n = 12), Assessment/Research (n = 20), Commuter Services (n = 7), Counseling (n = 18), Disability Student Services (n = 4), Financial Aid (n = 5), Food Services (n = 1), Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual/Transgender Awareness (n = 2), Greek Affairs (n = 17), Health/Drug and Alcohol (n = 8), International Students (n = 7), Intramural/Recreation Sports (n = 9), Judicial Affairs (n = 18), Multicultural Affairs (n = 26), Student Union (n = 5), and Women’s Resources (n = 6). There did not seem to be a logical way to combine these categories that would still maintain each functional area’s unique role. Combining all 18 did not make sense, as I believed it would not be meaningful to do so. Therefore, I did not include these 187 in my data analyses when functional area was used as an independent variable.

I first tried to apply linear regression to my data, but the responses were not normally distributed, a condition of linear regression. This required me to conduct ordinal regression to investigate questions regarding the existence of the ability to predict information based on the variables. To use ordinal regression, I had to first dummy code two of my variables because they
were nominal level variables. I dummy coded partnership status and functional area. For example, for those who selected divorced as their partnership status, I coded them as a 1 and everyone else who selected a different partnership status as a 0. I did this for each partnership status and for each functional area. Because I utilized ordinal regression, I had to have categorical variables, where the different variables have no actual numerical relationship with one another. This was solved by using dummy variables where I only had two values, a 0 and a 1.

As I mentioned previously, I established my significance criteria at the alpha level of .05. Typically, a sample needs to be different from 95-99% of the population to be considered statistically significant (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). I chose to set my alpha level at .05. Specifically, because I set the alpha level at .05, I required a large change of the population mean and the probability of such a change to be low (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010) thus decreasing the chance of a Type I error.

To fully understand the data from a broad perspective, I began by running descriptive statistics. This allowed me to find out more about the general tendencies, the spread of scores, and how certain scores might relate to the others (Creswell, 2008). All of these items allowed me to see trends in the data and have a general understanding of the information gathered.

**Characteristics of Participants**

**Motherhood status.** Respondents had the option of answering yes or no to whether they were a parent. Over half of the respondents, 59.7% ($n = 645$), did not have children. There were 40.3% ($n = 435$) who reported that they were a biological, step-, foster, or adoptive parent.

**Partnership status.** The majority of all respondents, 61%, ($n = 659$) reported being in a long-term committed partnership, which included marriage, civil union, and domestic
partnership. Another 16.5% \((n = 178)\) reported that they were single and not dating, 9% \((n = 97)\) were single but dating, and 5.6% \((n = 60)\) were exclusively dating and not co-habitating. There were 4.8% \((n = 52)\) who were co-habitating and exclusively dating, and 3% \((n = 32)\) of respondents reported their relationship status as divorced.

Among those who identified as mothers, 3.5% were single and 1.4% were single and dating. The majority of mothers, 87.5%, reported being in a long-term committed partnership. There was a small percentage, 1.6%, of mothers who were co-habitating and exclusively dating, 0.5% were exclusively dating but not co-habitating, and 5.5% were divorced.

**Degree attainment.** The majority of all of the respondents (73.1%) attained a master’s degree \((n = 790)\) and nearly 20% \((n = 211)\) held a doctorate. There were 7.3% \((n = 79)\) who had a bachelor’s degree. Among those who identified as mothers, 3.2% of them held a bachelor’s degree, 67.4% held a master’s degree, and 29.4% of mothers held a doctorate.

**Race/ethnicity.** The vast majority of the respondents to the survey identified as White/Caucasian – 80.7% \((n = 872)\) of respondents selected this option. There were 7.7% \((n = 83)\) who identified as Black/African American, and 5.2% \((n = 56)\) who identified as Biracial/Multiracial/Bi-ethnic/Multiethnic. The smallest group included 4.2% \((n = 45)\) who identified as Latina/Hispanic. Among those who were mothers, 8.8% of identified as Black/African American. There were 81.9% who identified as White/Caucasian and the other 9.3% were in other categories.

**Functional area.** There were 27 options for functional area from which respondents could choose one. There were 18.9% \((n = 204)\) of respondents who chose residence life as the functional area in which they worked. This functional area included the greatest number of respondents. There were 13.1% \((n = 141)\) who chose student affairs administration, and 12.8%
(n = 138) who selected student activities as their primary functional area. Academic advising represented 8.8% (n = 95), religious programs 7.4% (n = 80), and career planning/placement included 7.0% (n = 76) of the sample. All other options represented less than 5% of respondents.

Among those who identified as mothers, the plurality, 19.4%, worked in student affairs administration. There were 16.6% who worked in residence life and 15.4% worked in student activities. These three functional areas made up the majority of respondents’ answers. The rest of the mothers were in other functional areas, including 7.6% who worked in academic advising, 8.3% in career planning/placement, and 3.2% in orientation. There were 1.1% of mothers who worked in admissions/enrollment management, 1.1% in adult learner services, 2.3% in assessment/research, 2.5% in counseling, 1.4% in Greek affairs, 3.7% in leadership development, 2.3% in multicultural affairs, 3.0% in religious programs, 1.4% in judicial affairs, and 1.8% in service learning. The remaining eight areas, commuter services, disability student services, financial aid, food services, health/drug/alcohol counseling, international student services, student union, and women’s resources had less than one percent of mothers.

**Residency of children.** Of those who identified as a mother, 83.6% had their children living with them the majority of the time. There were 16.4% who did not have their children living with them the majority of the time.

**Age of children.** There were five options for mothers to choose from to identify the age of their child/children: pre-school, elementary school, middle/junior high school, high school, and adult (18+ years of age). There were two additional variables created after data collection: children across multiple ages and pre-school and elementary school age (for those who selected both). There were 29.9% of mothers who had pre-school age children and 18.6% had adult children. There were 17.2% of mothers who had children across multiple ages and 13.9% who
had elementary school age children. The combined category of pre-school and elementary school included 14.4% of mothers. There were 3.2% of mothers who had middle/junior high school age children and 3.9% who had high school age children.

**Number of children living in the home.** The options for number of children ranged from zero to 10 or more. They had the option to select zero, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, or 10 or more. There were 13.1% of mothers who had zero children living in the home with them and 38.1% had one child living in the home. There were 39.7% of mothers who had two children living in the home and 6.1% had three children living in the home. For 2.1% of mothers, there were four children living in the home. There were 0.5% of mothers who had five children living in the home, 0.2% who had six children living in the home, and 0.2% had 10 or more children living in the home with them.

**How long before becoming a mother.** Women were asked how long they worked prior to becoming a mother and were given six options from which to choose. The vast majority worked between zero and 10 years before becoming a mother. There were 47.1% who reported having worked between zero and five years prior to becoming a mother and 30.6% who worked for six to 10 years. There were 13.9% of women who worked for 11-15 years prior to becoming a mother. There were 4.2% of women worked for 16-20 years before becoming a mother, 2.8% who waited 21-25 years, and 1.4% who waited 26 or more years prior to becoming a mother.

**Age of women.** Of all of the women who took the survey, there were 12.7% who were between 20-25 years of age, 25.2% who reported being 26-30 years old, 19.2% were 31-35 years old, 13.6% were 36-40, 10.6% were 41-45, 6.7% were 46-50, 5.9% were 51-55, 4.1% identified as 56-60 years old, 1.7% identified as 61-65, 0.3% as 66-70 years of age, and 71 and above included 0.2% of the women who responded to the survey.
Among mothers, 0.5% were 20-25 years old, 8.7% were 26-30 years old, and 19.5% were 31-35 years old. There were 22.1% who were 36-40 years old and 17.0% who were 41-45 years old. There were fewer women in the age categories of 45 years of age and older. There were 11.7% who were 46-50 years old, 10.1% who were 51-55 years old, 6.9% who were 56-60 years old, and 2.8% who were 61-65 years old. There was only 0.7% who were 66-70 years old.

**Institution size.** Respondents were given eight options to choose from for the size of institution at which they worked. There were 19.3% \( (n = 208) \) of respondents who worked at an institution that had between 1,000-2,499 FTE (full-time enrollment) and 15% \( (n = 162) \) who worked at institutions with 20,000-29,999 students. There were 12.3% \( (n = 133) \) of respondents who worked at institutions with 2,500-4,999 students, 14.3% \( (n = 154) \) were employed at institutions with 5,000-9,999 students, and 10.2% \( (n = 110) \) who worked at institutions with 10,000-14,999 students. Finally, 9.7% of respondents worked at institutions with 15,000-19,999 FTE, 8.1% \( (n = 88) \) worked at institutions with 30,000-39,000 FTE, and 10% of respondents worked at institutions with 40,000 + students.

Among mothers, nearly half worked at institutions that had less than 10,000 FTE. There were 18.5% of mothers who worked at institutions that were 1,000-2,499 FTE, 12.9% who worked at institutions that were 2,500-4,999 FTE, and 16.0% of mothers who worked at institutions that were 5,000-9,999 FTE. There were 10.6% of mothers who worked at institutions that were 10,000-14,999 FTE, 10.6% who worked at institutions that were 15,000-19,999 FTE, and 13.1% of mothers who worked at institutions that were 20,000-29,999 FTE. Finally, 8.9% of mothers worked at institutions that were 30,000-39,999 FTE and 9.4% of mothers worked at institutions that were 40,000 FTE and above.
Tests of Association

Relationship Between Career Satisfaction and Demographics

As I discussed in chapter three, I wanted to find out if there was a relationship between motherhood and career satisfaction. To do that, I utilized the chi-square tests of independence, which tests the association between two categorical variables. These tests compare the expected proportions of responses in each category if there were no relationship between the variables with the observed proportions of respondents in each category in the dependent variable. The expected proportions are in comparison to the distribution of people in the sample in general. For example, if 50% of the sample are mothers and 50% are not, then we would expect these same proportions in each response category. When there are greater or fewer than expected respondents from a given category, there is a significant association present. Below I detail the results of that statistical test to show when there was a relationship between each career satisfaction area and the demographic questions in my survey.

Career success. The first question asked women to report on their satisfaction with the success they had achieved in their career. There were 1079 responses to this question and the following reports the variables with which a significant relationship was observed. In addition, I provided a summary of my results, which include the alpha level for the data analyses at .05, a commonly accepted margin of error for categorical data (Bartlett, Kotrlik, & Higgins, 2001). I reported statistical significance when $p < .05$ and provided a summary of chi-square results that have meaningful standardized residuals ($z$). The results for mothers can be seen in Table 2 and the results for all women can be seen in Table 1 below.
Table 1.
*Relationships with “Satisfaction with Success Achieved in Career” (n=1079)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$V$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership status</td>
<td>39.10</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree attainment</td>
<td>84.70</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional area</td>
<td>174.06</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherhood status</td>
<td>27.38</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency of children</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school age children</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult age children</td>
<td>18.96</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of women</td>
<td>135.74</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Smaller $n$ due to missing response for success achieved in career.

Table 2.
*Relationships with “Satisfaction with Success Achieved in Career” Among Mothers (n=428)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$V$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children Living in the Home</td>
<td>46.76</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Attainment</td>
<td>28.90</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Age</td>
<td>70.70</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School Age Children</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Age Children</td>
<td>18.96</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Administration</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Missing values result in some variables not all adding up to the total sample of 435.

*Number of children living in the home.* There was a significant relationship between career success satisfaction and number of children living in the home for mothers ($x^2 = 46.756, df = 28, p = .015$). The effect size was .165. Among mothers who reported that they had zero children living in the home, fewer than expected reported agreeing to some extent that they were satisfied with their career success ($z = -2.0$). There were more mothers than expected in this same group who strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their career success ($z = 2.6$). For mothers who had one child living in the home, more women than expected reported that they were uncertain about their satisfaction with their career success ($z = 2.1$).
**Partnership status.** There was a significant relationship between career success satisfaction and partnership status ($\chi^2 = 39.140, df = 20, p = .006$). The effect size was .095. Specifically, there were more respondents than expected who were single and uncertain about their satisfaction with the success they had achieved in their career ($z = 2.5$) and more respondents than expected who were in a long-term committed partnership who strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the success they had achieved in their career ($z = 2.0$).

**Degree attainment.** There was a significant relationship between career success satisfaction and degree attainment ($\chi^2 = 84.666, df = 8, p = .000$). The effect size was .198. Within degree attainment, fewer women with bachelor’s degrees than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their career success ($z = -2.3$) and among that same group there were more than expected who were uncertain about their career success satisfaction ($z = 3.5$). For women who had master’s degrees, fewer than expected reported that they strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their career success ($z = -2.4$). Finally, for women who had doctorates, fewer than expected reported that they were either uncertain ($z = -2.7$) or agreed to some extent ($z = -3.4$) that they were satisfied with their career success and more than expected strongly agreed ($z = 6.0$) that they were satisfied with their career success.

For mothers, there was a significant relationship between career success satisfaction and degree attainment ($\chi^2 = 28.897, df = 8, p = .000$). The effect size was .198. Among mothers with a doctorate, fewer than expected were uncertain ($z = -2.0$) and more than expected strongly agreed ($z = 3.1$) that they were satisfied with their career success.

**Age of children.** For mothers, there was a significant relationship between career success satisfaction and pre-school age children ($\chi^2 = 18.070, df = 4, p = .001$). The effect size was .205. For mothers with pre-school age children, there were more women than expected who were
uncertain \((z = 2.1)\) and fewer than expected who strongly agreed \((z = -2.4)\) who were satisfied with their career success. For mothers, there was a significant relationship between career success satisfaction and adult \((18+\) years of age) children \((\chi^2 = 18.955, df = 4, p = .001)\). The effect size was .210. For mothers with adult age children, there were fewer women than expected who agreed to some extent \((z = -2.3)\) and more women than expected who strongly agreed \((z = 2.9)\) that they were satisfied with their career success.

**Functional area.** There was a significant relationship between career success satisfaction and functional area \((\chi^2 = 174.056, df =104, p = .000)\). The effect size was .205. This significant association is attributed to variance in six functional areas: academic advising, religious programming, residence life, student activities, orientation, and student affairs administration. There were fewer respondents than expected who worked in academic advising \((z = -2.1)\), religious programming \((z = -2.4)\), and residence life \((z = -2.9)\) who reported that they strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their career success, while there were more than expected among those who worked in student activities \((z = 2.7)\) and student affairs administration who responded in this way. There were more respondents than expected who worked in orientation who strongly disagreed that they were satisfied with their career success \((z = 3.1)\). There were more respondents than expected who worked in residence life \((z = 2.4)\) and less than expected who worked in student affairs administration \((z = -2.4)\) who agreed to some extent that they were satisfied with their career success.

For mothers, there was a significant relationship between career success satisfaction and working in academic advising \((\chi^2 = 10.902, df = 4, p = .028)\). The effect size was .158. This significant association is attributed to variance in three functional areas: academic advising, residence life, and student affairs administration. For mothers who worked in academic
advising, more than expected disagreed to some extent that they were satisfied with their career success ($z = 2.1$). There was a significant relationship between career success satisfaction and working in residence life ($\chi^2 = 15.705$, $df = 4$, $p = .003$). The effect size was .190. There were more mothers than expected who worked in residence life who agreed to some extent ($z = 2.1$) that they were satisfied with their career success and fewer than expected who strongly agreed ($z = -2.4$) that they were satisfied with their career success. There was a significant relationship between career success satisfaction and working in student affairs administration ($\chi^2 = 16.251$, $df = 4$, $p = .003$). The effect size was .193. There were more mothers than expected who worked in student affairs administration who strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their career success ($z = 2.6$).

**Age of women.** There was a significant relationship between career success satisfaction and current age ($\chi^2 = 135.737$, $df = 40$, $p = .000$). The effect size was .177. This significant association is attributed to variance in the following age categories: 20-25, 26-30, 46-50, 51-55, and 56-60. For those ages 20-25, more than expected reported being uncertain about their career success satisfaction ($z = 2.8$). For those ages 26-30, fewer than expected ($z = -4.2$) reported that they strongly agreed with being satisfied with their career success satisfaction and more than expected reported that they agreed to some extent that ($z = 2.5$) they were satisfied with their career success. Among those ages 46-50, fewer than expected agreed to some extent ($z = -2.1$) that they were satisfied with their career success and more than expected strongly agreed ($z = 2.8$) that they were satisfied with their career success. For those ages 51-55, fewer than expected agreed to some extent ($z = -2.5$) and more than expected strongly agreed ($z = 4.1$) that they were satisfied with their career success. In the 56-60 year old age group, fewer than expected agreed
to some extent ($z = -2.2$) and more than expected strongly agreed ($z = 3.3$) to being satisfied with their career success.

Among mothers, there was a significant relationship between career success satisfaction and current age of the mother ($\chi^2 = 70.695$, $df = 36$, $p = .000$). The effect size was $0.202$. This significant association is attributed to variance in the following age categories of mothers: 26-30, 31-35, and 51-55. For mothers in the 26-30 year old category, fewer of them than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their career success ($z = -2.9$). For mothers in the 31-35 year old category, fewer of them than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their career success ($z = -2.1$). For mothers in the 51-56 year old category, more mothers than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their career success ($z = 2.9$).

**Non-significant associations.** There was not a significant relationship between career success satisfaction and six of the dependent variables. These variables included factors related to identity, motherhood, and institutional characteristics. These were the six variables that were not significantly associated with career success satisfaction: race/ethnicity, having elementary school age children, children across multiple ages, preschool and elementary school age children (those who have both), how long they had worked before having children, and size of institution.

**Overall career goals.** The second question, *I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my overall career goals*, included responses from 1076 women and the following paragraphs discuss where there was a significant relationship observed. In addition, there is a summary of chi-square results that have meaningful standardized residuals ($R$). The results for mothers can be seen in Table 3 and the results for all women can be seen in Table 4 below.
Table 3.
*Relationships with “Satisfaction with Progress Toward Meeting Overall Career Goals” Among Mothers (n=424)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$V$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children Living in the Home</td>
<td>41.60</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Attainment</td>
<td>44.83</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>20.26</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Age</td>
<td>74.04</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School Age Children</td>
<td>25.17</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Age Children</td>
<td>21.85</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School and Elementary Age Children</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Planning/Placement</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Missing values result in some variables not all adding up to the total sample of 435.

Table 4.
*Relationships with “Satisfaction with Progress Toward Meeting Overall Career Goals” (n=1076)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$V$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree attainment</td>
<td>77.59</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional area</td>
<td>155.59</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherhood status</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency of children</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school age children</td>
<td>25.17</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school age children</td>
<td>21.85</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school and elementary school age children</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>41.60</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of women</td>
<td>111.43</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Smaller $n$ due to missing response for progress toward meeting overall career goals.

**Number of children living in the home.** For mothers, there was a significant relationship between satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals and number of children living in the home ($\chi^2 = 41.596$, $df = 28$, $p = .047$). The effect size was .157. There were more mothers
than expected who had zero children living in the home who strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their career goals ($z = 2.3$).

**Degree attainment.** There was a significant relationship between satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals and degree attainment ($\chi^2 = 77.590, df = 8, p = .000$). The effect size was .190. This significant association is attributed to variance among women with master’s and doctoral degrees. For women who had a master’s degree, fewer than expected reported that they strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their progress toward meeting their overall career goals ($z = -2.7$). For women with a doctorate, fewer than expected were uncertain ($z = -2.8$) or agreed to some extent ($z = -3.1$) that they were satisfied with their progress toward meeting their overall career goals and more than expected strongly agreed ($z = 6.2$) with this statement.

For mothers, there was a significant relationship between satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals and degree attainment ($\chi^2 = 44.825, df = 8, p = .000$). The effect size was .228. There were fewer mothers than expected who had a master’s degree who strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their career goals ($z = -2.5$). For mothers who had a doctorate, fewer than expected agreed to some extent ($z = -2.0$) and more than expected strongly agreed ($z = 4.1$) that they were satisfied with their career goals.

**Race/ethnicity.** There was a significant relationship between satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals and race/ethnicity, specifically within the category of Black/African American and White/Caucasian. For women, there was a significant relationship between satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals and identifying as Black/African American ($\chi^2 = 11.528, df = 4, p = .021$). The effect size was .104. For those who identified as Black/African American, more than expected disagreed to some extent that they were satisfied
with their progress toward meeting their overall career goals ($z = 2.0$). There was a significant relationship between satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals and identifying as White/Caucasian ($\chi^2 = 11.428, df = 4, p = .022$). The effect size was .103. For those who identified as not White/Caucasian, more than expected disagreed to some extent that they were satisfied with their progress toward meeting their overall career goals ($z = 2.0$).

For mothers, there was a significant relationship between satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals and identifying as Black/African American ($\chi^2 = 20.259, df = 4, p = .000$). The effect size was .218. There were more mothers than expected who identified as Black/African American who disagreed to some extent ($z = 3.0$) and fewer than expected who agreed to some extent ($z = -2.3$) that they were satisfied with their career goals.

**Age of children.** There was a significant relationship between satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals and having pre-school age children ($\chi^2 = 25.166, df = 4, p = .000$). The effect size was .243. This significant association is attributed to variance among mothers with pre-school age and adult age children. There were more mothers with pre-school age children than expected who were uncertain ($z = 3.1$) and fewer than expected who strongly agreed ($z = -2.5$) that they were satisfied with their career goals. There was a significant relationship between satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals and having adult (18+ years old) children ($\chi^2 = 21.847, df = 4, p = .000$). The effect size was .226. There were fewer mothers with adult age children than expected who agreed to some extent ($z = -2.2$) and more than expected who strongly agreed ($z = 2.9$) that they were satisfied with their career goals. There was a significant relationship between satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals and having children who were pre-school and elementary school age ($\chi^2 = 11.573, df = 4, p = .021$). The effect size was .165. There were fewer mothers with children who were both pre-
school and elementary school aged than expected who disagreed to some extent that they were satisfied with their career goals ($z = -2.0$).

**Functional area.** There was a significant relationship between satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals and functional area ($\chi^2 = 155.587, df = 104, p = .001$). The effect size was .194. This significant association is attributed to variance in six functional areas: career planning/placement, orientation, residence life, religious programs, student affairs administration, and student activities. For women who worked in career planning/placement ($z = 2.9$) and orientation ($z = 3.3$), more than expected strongly disagreed that they were satisfied with their progress toward meeting their overall career goals, and for women who worked in residence life ($z = 2.4$), more than expected agreed to some extent that they were satisfied with their progress in this area, while fewer than expected in religious programs ($z = -2.1$) and residence life ($z = -2.4$) reported that they strongly agreed. More women than expected who worked in student affairs administration ($z = 2.9$) and student activities ($z = 2.4$) strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their progress toward satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals.

Among mothers, there was a significant relationship between satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals and working in academic advising ($\chi^2 = 12.116, df = 4, p = .017$). The effect size was .168. This significant association is attributed to variance in two functional areas: academic advising and career planning/placement. There were more mothers who expected who worked in academic advising who disagreed to some extent that they were satisfied with their career goals ($z = 2.7$). There was a significant relationship between satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals and working in career planning/placement ($\chi^2 = 12.353, df = 4, p = .015$). The effect size was .169. There were more mothers who worked
in career planning/placement than expected who strongly disagreed that they were satisfied with their career goals ($z = 3.2$).

**Age of women.** There was a significant relationship between satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals and current age ($\chi^2 = 111.429$, $df = 40$, $p = .000$). The effect size was .161. This significant association is attributed to variance among women in the following categories: 26-30 years old, 41-45 years old, 51-55 years old, and the 61-65 years old. For women in the 61-65 year old category, more women than expected strongly disagreed that they were satisfied with their satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals ($z = 2.0$). More women than expected who were in the 26-30 age category ($z = 3.5$) and fewer than expected in the 41-45 ($z = -2.3$) and 51-55 ($z = 2.0$) age categories were uncertain about their satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals. There were fewer than expected women in the 26-30 age category who strongly agreed ($z = -4.0$) that they were satisfied with their satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals, and more than expected who strongly agreed with in the 51-55 ($z = 2.9$) and 56-60 ($z = 3.0$) age categories.

For mothers, there was a significant relationship between satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals and current age of mother ($\chi^2 = 74.038$, $df = 36$, $p = .000$). The effect size was .207. This significant association is attributed to variance among women in the 26-30 year old category, 31-35 year old category, and 51-55 year old category. For mothers in the 26-30 year old category, more than expected were uncertain ($z = 3.1$) and fewer than expected ($z = -2.8$) were satisfied with their career goals. For mothers in the 31-35 year old category, fewer than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their career goals ($z = -2.2$). Among mothers ages 51-55, more women than expected strongly agreed ($z = 2.7$) that
they were satisfied with their career goals, and finally, among mothers ages 56-60, more than expected strongly agreed ($z = 2.7$) that they were satisfied with their career goals.

**Non-significant associations.** There was not a significant relationship between satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals and a woman’s partnership status; identifying as biracial/ethnic multiracial/ethnic, or Latina/Hispanic. There was also no significant relationship with having elementary school age children, middle/junior high school age children, or high school age children, or multiple ages chosen. Finally, there was not a significant relationship between satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals and how long women waited before having kids or the size of their institution.

**Income.** The third question asked the respondents to determine career satisfaction was regarding income. Specifically, it stated: I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for income. There were seven significant relationships observed. In addition to reporting specific information about significance, I will also provide details about the standardized residuals for each of these areas. There were 1079 women who answered this question. This can be seen in Table 5 for mothers and in Table 6 for all women below.

Table 5.
*Relationships with “Satisfaction with Progress Toward Meeting Goals for Income” Among Mothers (n=428)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$V$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Attainment</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Age</td>
<td>85.74</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School Age Children</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Age Children</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Administration</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Missing values result in some variables not all adding up to the total sample of 435.*
Table 6.  
*Relationships with “Satisfaction with Progress Toward Meeting Goals for Income” (n=1079)*\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(x^2)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
<th>(V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership status</td>
<td>34.83</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree attainment</td>
<td>110.03</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional area</td>
<td>170.28</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherhood status</td>
<td>26.52</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school age children</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult children</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of women</td>
<td>148.60</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Smaller \(n\) due to missing response for progress toward meeting goals for income.

**Partnership status.** There was a significant relationship between income satisfaction and partnership status \((x^2 = 34.826, df = 20, p = .021)\). The effect size was .090. For women who reported they were exclusively dating and not co-habitating, more of them than expected strongly disagreed \((z = 2.2)\) and more of this group than expected were uncertain \((z = 2.9)\) that they were satisfied with their income satisfaction.

**Degree attainment.** There was a significant relationship between income satisfaction and degree attainment \((x^2 = 110.027, df = 8, p = .000)\). The effect size was .226. This significant association is attributed to variance among who had bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degrees. There were more women than expected who had a bachelor’s degree and were uncertain \((z = 3.9)\) about their income satisfaction and fewer than expected who agreed to some extent \((z = -2.0)\) about their income satisfaction. Fewer women than expected who held master’s degrees strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their income \((z = -3.1)\). Among women who held doctorates, fewer than expected disagreed to some extent \((z = -3.4)\) or were uncertain \((z = -2.5)\) about their satisfaction with their income and more than expected strongly agreed \((z = 7.2)\) to being satisfied with their income.
Among mothers, there was a significant relationship between income satisfaction and degree attainment ($\chi^2 = 41.027, df = 8, p = .000$). The effect size was .217. For mothers, this significant association is attributed to variance among who had master’s and doctoral degrees. There were fewer mothers than expected who had a master’s degree who strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their income ($z = -2.5$). There were fewer mothers with a doctorate who disagreed to some extent ($z = -2.4$) and more mothers than expected who strongly agreed ($z = 4.1$) that they were satisfied with their income.

**Functional area.** There was a significant relationship between income satisfaction and functional area ($\chi^2 = 170.282, df = 104, p = .000$). The effect size was .203. This significant association is attributed to variance in three functional areas, including religious programs, student affairs administration, and student activities. Fewer women than expected who worked in religious programs strongly agreed ($z = -2.2$) that they were satisfied with their income and more than expected in both student activities ($z = 2.7$) and student affairs administration ($z = 5.7$) strongly agreed to being satisfied with their income. Among women in student affairs administration, fewer than expected either disagreed to some extent ($z = -2.0$) or were uncertain ($z = -2.2$) about their satisfaction in this area.

Among mothers, there was a significant relationship between income satisfaction and working in student activities ($\chi^2 = 11.647, df = 4, p = .020$). The effect size was .164. For mothers who worked in student activities, fewer than expected strongly disagreed that they were satisfied with their income ($z = -2.1$). There was a significant relationship between income satisfaction and working in student affairs administration ($\chi^2 = 30.225, df = 4, p = .000$). The effect size was .264. For mothers who worked in student affairs administration, more of them than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their income ($z = 4.3$).
Age of women. There was a significant relationship between income satisfaction and current age ($\chi^2 = 148.604, df = 40, p = .000$). The effect size was .186. This significant association is attributed to variance among women in the 20-25 year old category, 26-30 year old category, 36-40 year old category, 46-50 year old category, 51-55 year old category, and the 56-60 year old category. Among women who were 20-25, more than expected were uncertain ($z = 3.9$) and fewer than expected strongly agreed ($z = -2.0$) that they were satisfied with their income. For women ages 26-30, more than expected either strongly disagreed ($z = 2.1$) or disagreed to some extent ($z = 2.2$) that they were satisfied with their income and fewer than expected strongly agreed ($z = -4.1$) that they were happy with their income. Fewer than expected who were 36-40 were uncertain ($z = -2.5$) about their satisfaction in this category, and among 46-50 year olds, fewer than expected disagreed to some extent ($z = -2.2$) and more than expected strongly agreed ($z = 3.2$) that they were satisfied with their income. Finally, for women 51-55, more than expected strongly agreed ($z = 3.8$) that they were satisfied with their income, and for those 56-60, fewer than expected disagreed to some extent ($z = -2.1$) and more than expected strongly agreed ($z = 2.9$) to being satisfied with their income.

Among mothers, there was a significant relationship between income satisfaction and current age of mother ($\chi^2 = 85.740, df = 36, p = .000$). The effect size was .222. This significant association is attributed to variance among women in the 26-30 year old category, 31-35 year old category, 41-45 year old category, 51-55 year old category, and the 56-60 year old category. In the 26-30 year old category, there were more mothers than expected who strongly disagreed ($z = 2.8$), more than expected who disagreed to some extent ($z = 2.0$), and fewer than expected who strongly agreed ($z = -2.9$) strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their income. Among mothers ages 31-35, more than expected were uncertain about their income satisfaction ($z = 2.4$).
For women in the 41-45 year old category, fewer than expected strongly disagreed that they were satisfied with their income ($z = -2.2$). For mothers in the 51-55 year old category, more than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their income ($z = 2.5$). Finally, in the 56-60 year old category, fewer mothers than expected disagreed to some extent that they were satisfied with their income ($z = -2.4$).

**Age of children.** There was a significant relationship between income satisfaction and having adult (18+ years) age children ($\chi^2 = 12.085$, $df = 4$, $p = .017$). The effect size was .167. For mothers with adult age children, more than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their income ($z = 2.3$).

**Non-significant associations.** There was not a significant relationship between income satisfaction and race/ethnicity. There was also not a significant relationship between income satisfaction and whether children live with the mother the majority of the time, having elementary school age children, children across multiple ages, preschool and elementary school age children, or number of children living in the home with the mother. There was also no significant association with how long they had worked before having children or size of institution.

**Professional advancement satisfaction.** To measure women’s satisfaction with their advancement at work, I asked a fourth question. It stated: I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for professional advancement. There were 1076 women who answered this question. Details about significance and standard residuals are reported below. This can be seen below in Table 7 for mothers and Table 8 for all women.
Table 7.
Relationships with “Satisfaction with Progress Toward Meeting Goals for Professional Advancement” Among Mothers (n=425) \(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(x^2)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
<th>(V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Attainment</td>
<td>46.14</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Age</td>
<td>64.16</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School Age Children</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Age Children</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School and Elementary School Age</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Administration</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Missing values result in some variables not all adding up to the total sample of 435.

Table 8.  
Relationships with “Satisfaction with Progress Toward Meeting Goals for Professional Advancement” (n=1076) \(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(x^2)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
<th>(V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership status</td>
<td>33.85</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree attainment</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional area</td>
<td>166.13</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherhood status</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency of children</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Smaller \(n\) due to missing response for progress toward meeting goals for professional advancement

**Partnership status.** There was a significant relationship between professional advancement satisfaction and partnership status \((\chi^2 = 33.852, df = 20, p = .027)\). The effect size was .089. Among women co-habitating and exclusively dating, more than expected were uncertain that they were satisfied with their professional advancement \((z = 2.2)\). There were also more divorced women than expected who strongly disagreed that they were satisfied with their professional advancement \((z = 3.8)\).

**Degree attainment.** There was a significant relationship between professional advancement satisfaction and degree attainment \((\chi^2 = 73.332, df = 7, p = .000)\). The effect size was .185. This significant association is attributed to variance among women with master’s and doctoral degrees. Among women with master’s degrees, fewer than expected reported that they
strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their career advancement \((z = -2.8)\). For women who held doctorates, fewer than expected disagreed to some extent \((z = -2.6)\) or were uncertain \((z = -3.2)\) if they were satisfied with their career advancement, and more than expected reported that they strongly agreed \((z = 6.1)\) that they were satisfied with their advancement.

Among mothers, there was a significant relationship between professional advancement satisfaction and degree attainment \((\chi^2 = 46.143, df = 8, p = .000)\). The effect size was .231. This significant association among mothers is attributed to variance among women with master’s and doctoral degrees. For mothers who had a master’s degree, fewer than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their professional advancement \((z = -2.1)\). For mothers who had a doctorate, fewer than expected disagreed to some extent that they were satisfied with their professional advancement \((z = -2.7)\). For mothers who had a doctorate, more than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their professional advancement \((z = 3.5)\).

**Functional area.** There was a significant relationship between professional advancement satisfaction and functional area \((\chi^2 = 166.131, df = 104, p = .000)\). The effect size was .200. This significant association is attributed to variance in six functional areas, including academic advising, career planning and placement, student affairs administration, religious programs, residence life, and student activities. For women who worked in academic advising, there were more than expected who disagreed to some extent that they were satisfied with their professional advancement \((z = 2.0)\). More than expected strongly disagreed at being satisfied among women who worked in career planning and placement \((z = 2.3)\). Fewer than expected who worked in student affairs administration were uncertain about their professional advancement satisfaction \((z = -2.5)\). Among women who worked in religious programs \((z = -2.0)\) and residence life \((z = -2.1)\), fewer than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied and for women who worked in
student activities \((z = 2.6)\) and student affairs administration \((z = 4.3)\), more than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their professional advancement.

Among mothers, there was a significant relationship between professional advancement satisfaction and working in student affairs administration \((\chi^2 = 13.509, df = 4, p = .009)\). The effect size was .177. More mothers than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their professional advancement \((z = 2.1)\).

**Age of women.** There was a significant relationship between professional advancement satisfaction and current age \((\chi^2 = 118.344, df = 40, p = .000)\). The effect size was .166. This significant association is attributed to variance among women who were 20-25 years old, 26-30, 51-55, and 56-60 years old. Among 20-25 year olds, more than expected were uncertain about their professional advancement satisfaction \((z = 2.5)\). For 26-30 year olds, fewer than expected answered that they strongly agreed with the statement \((z = -3.5)\). For 51-55 year olds \((z = 3.8)\) and 56-60 \((z = 3.9)\) year olds, more women than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their professional advancement.

Among mothers, there was a significant relationship between professional advancement satisfaction and current age of women \((\chi^2 = 64.158, df = 36, p = .003)\). The effect size was .193. This significant association is attributed to variance among mothers ages 26-30, 51-55, and 56-60 years old. For mothers who were in the 26-30 year old category, more than expected disagreed to some extent \((z = 2.1)\) and fewer than expected strongly agreed \((z = -2.6)\) that they were satisfied with their professional advancement. For mothers who were in the 51-55 year old category, more than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their professional advancement \((z = 2.7)\). For mothers who were in the 56-60 year old category, more than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their professional advancement \((z = 2.4)\).
Age of children. There was a significant relationship between professional advancement satisfaction and adult age (18+ years of age) children ($\chi^2 = 19.683, df = 4, p = .001$). The effect size was .214. This significant association is attributed to variance among women adult age children, and those who both pre-school and elementary age children. For mothers who had children who were adults (18+ years of age), more than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their professional advancement ($z = 3.1$). There was a significant relationship between professional advancement satisfaction having both pre-school and elementary aged children ($\chi^2 = 9.528, df = 4, p = .049$). The effect size was .149. For mothers who had both pre-school and elementary aged children, more than expected agreed to some extent that they were satisfied with their professional advancement ($z = 2.1$).

Non-significant associations. There was not a significant relationship between professional advancement satisfaction and race/ethnicity. There was also no significant association with having elementary school age children or having children across multiple ages. Finally, there was not a significant relationship between professional advancement satisfaction and number of children living in the home, how long women worked before having kids, or size of institution.

New professional skills. To measure new professional skills satisfaction, the following question was asked: I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for the development of new professional skills. There were 1077 women who answered this question. These data are reported below in Table 9 for mothers and in Table 10 for all women.
Table 9. *Relationships with “Satisfaction with Progress Toward Meeting Goals for Development of New Professional Skills” Among Mothers (n=425)* \(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(x^2)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
<th>(V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Attainment</td>
<td>39.63</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Age</td>
<td>73.47</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School Age Children</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Age Children</td>
<td>29.97</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Missing values result in some variables not all adding up to the total sample of 435.

Table 10. *Relationships with “Satisfaction with Progress Toward Meeting Goals for Development of New Professional Skills” (n=1077)* \(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(x^2)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
<th>(V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree attainment</td>
<td>80.34</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherhood status</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency of children</td>
<td>19.39</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school age children</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult children</td>
<td>29.97</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of women</td>
<td>96.65</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Smaller \(n\) due to missing response for progress toward meeting goals for development of new professional skills

**Degree attainment.** There was a significant relationship between new professional skills satisfaction and degree attainment (\(\chi^2 = 80.339, df = 8, p = .000\)). The effect size was .193. This significant association is attributed to variance among women with bachelor’s, master’s and doctoral degrees. Among women who had bachelor’s degrees, more of them than expected agreed to some extent (\(z = 2.1\)) that they were satisfied with their progress of gaining new professional skills and fewer than expected strongly agreed (\(z = -2.2\)) with this statement. For women who had master’s degrees, fewer of them strongly agreed with the statement (\(z = -2.2\)). Finally, for those who held doctorates, fewer than expected disagreed to some extent (\(z = -3.7\)) or were uncertain (\(z = -3.0\)) about their satisfaction with their progress of gaining new professional skills, while more than expected strongly agreed (\(z = 5.6\)) with this statement.
Among mothers, there was a significant relationship between new professional skills satisfaction and degree attainment ($\chi^2 = 39.633$, $df = 8$, $p = .000$). The effect size was .214. Among mothers who had doctorates, fewer women than expected disagreed to some extent ($z = -3.1$), fewer women than expected were uncertain ($x = -2.5$), and more women than expected strongly agreed ($z = 3.2$) that they were satisfied with their development of new professional skills.

**Age of women.** There was a significant relationship between new professional skills satisfaction and current age ($\chi^2 = 96.649$, $df = 40$, $p = .000$). The effect size was .150. This significant association is attributed to variance among women ages 26-30, 36-40, 51-55, and 56-60. Among 26-30 year olds, more than expected disagreed to some extent ($z = 2.3$) and fewer than expected strongly agreed ($z = -2.9$) that they were satisfied with their progress of gaining new professional skills. For those 36-40, more than expected disagreed to some extent with this statement ($z = 2.1$). For women aged 51-55, fewer than expected disagreed to some extent about their satisfaction in this area ($z = -2.0$). Among 56-60 year olds, there were more than expected who strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their progress in this area ($z = 3.3$).

Among mothers, there was a significant relationship between new professional skills satisfaction and current age of women ($\chi^2 = 73.474$, $df = 36$, $p = .000$). The effect size was .206. This significant association is attributed to variance among women ages 26-30, 36-40, 41-45, and 56-60. Among mothers who were 26-30 years old, more women than expected disagreed to some extent that they were satisfied with the development of new professional skills ($z = 2.0$). For women ages 36-40, more women than expected disagreed to some extent that they were satisfied with the development of new professional skills ($z = 2.1$). For women ages 41-45, more women than expected were uncertain that they were satisfied with the development of new
professional skills ($z = 2.1$). For women ages 56-60, more women than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the development of new professional skills ($z = 2.8$).

**Non-significant associations.** There was not a significant relationship between new professional skills satisfaction and partnership status, race/ethnicity, or functional area. There was also no relationship between new professional skills satisfaction and having elementary school age children, children across multiple ages, or preschool and elementary school age children. There was also not a significant relationship with number of children living in the home, how long mother had worked before having children, or size of institution.

**Prediction Models**

To answer my research questions about the relationship among demographic variables and career satisfaction, I used ordinal regression method to model the relationship between different levels of career satisfaction and the demographic variables and motherhood, which were the predictor variables. The outcome variable for career satisfaction was measured through a five-point Likert scale that included ‘strongly disagree’, ‘disagree’, ‘uncertain’, ‘agree to some extent’, and ‘strongly agree’. The predictor variables I analyzed included motherhood status, number of children, current age of women, age when first became a mother, partnership status, degree attainment, race/ethnicity, residency of children, functional area of student affairs, age of child(ren), institutional size, and length of tenure in the field when you became a mother.

I decided to create two candidate models to compare. The first model included all of my explanatory variables that are listed above. The second model included just variables related to motherhood, and included the following: motherhood status, residency of children, age of children, number of children living in the home, and length of tenure in the field when you first became a mother. I examined one candidate model at a time through the test of parallel lines.
This is a fundamental step to evaluate the validity of the model (Chen & Hughes, 2004). I also had to look at the model fitting statistics.

The two most commonly used link functions are logit link and complementary log-log (cloglog) link (Chen & Hughes, 2004). To make an initial determination of which was more appropriate for my data, I first looked at the frequency distribution of ordered categorical outcomes. When I did this, I found that the data points were not evenly distributed across the five categories. If they had been, logit link would be most appropriate (Chen & Hughes, 2004). The frequency distribution showed that a large percent of the respondents were in higher categories such as ‘agree to some extent’ and ‘strongly agree’. In this case, the cloglog link function is typically most appropriate. However, as I will explain, for each of my career satisfaction questions, the most appropriate function depended on the question and was not the same for each.

There were three things I had to review to interpret the ordinal regression model. First, I looked at the model fitting information to determine if the final significance for each of the career satisfaction questions was indeed significant at the $p < .05$ level. If it was, I then looked at the Pearson chi-square significance value. If it was not significant then it meant that the observed model did not significantly deviate from the expected model, so the model appropriately fit the data. From there I needed to review the test for parallel lines. If this was not significant, it meant that the model did not violate the assumption of parallel lines necessary for ordinal regression. In other words, the test of parallel lines is used to make a judgment about the adequacy of the model, and is the fundamental piece of judging the validity of the model assumption (Chen & Hughes, 2004). If the test of parallel lines is not significant, then that indicates that there is no significant difference between the model where the regression lines
have to be parallel for each level of the ordinal dependent compared to the model where the regression lines are able to be estimated without being parallel (Garson, 2010). “The assumption is not violated if this test returns a finding of nonsignificance, meaning there is no significant difference between the model where the regression lines are constrained to be parallel for each level of the ordinal dependent… compared to the model where the regression lines are allowed to be estimated without a parallelism constraint” (Garson, 2010, p. 8).

I did these three things for each of my models, and determined that no appropriate model existed based on my data for my first career satisfaction question about career success satisfaction. For my second question regarding satisfaction with career goals, I determined that the complementary log-log link using all of the variables was the most appropriate to build the ordinal regression model. For the career satisfaction question that addressed income satisfaction, the complementary log-log link function using only the motherhood variables was the most appropriate; however, using logit link also worked. I made a final decision about which of these two was the best fit by looking at the -2 log likelihood to see which number was smaller and considering the fact that the frequency distribution not normally distributed. A measure equal to zero would indicate a perfect model, therefore, a smaller value for the -2 log likelihood indicates a model that fits the data better (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). In addition, I considered the fact that complementary log-log is typically most appropriate when frequency distributions are not normally distributed, which was the case in this situation. For the question regarding professional advancement satisfaction, the model using complementary log-log and the motherhood variables was the best fit. However, using logit link using only motherhood variables was also an appropriate model for this question. I looked at the -2 log likelihood, and found that the logit link was a better fit, as the -2 log likelihood was lower. It was a small
difference, so I also took into consideration the fact that the frequency distribution was not
normally distributed, which indicated that complementary log-log is appropriate. Taking all of
this into consideration, I determined that the complementary log-log model was the best fit.
Finally, for the question regarding new professional skills satisfaction, the model using logit link
and the motherhood variables met the criteria. Each of these career satisfaction questions had
predictor variables based on different models based on the model fitting information, the Pearson
significance, and test for parallel lines. Therefore, there is no one model that is the most
appropriate for career satisfaction in general.

To interpret the ordinal regression results, I had to look at the signs of the regression
coefficients. According to Chen and Hughes (2004), “These signs give a great deal of insight
into the effects of the explanatory variables on the ordinal outcome” (p. 5). A positive regression
coefficient showed that there was a positive effect on the ordinal outcome by the explanatory
variable. Regression coefficients that were negative indicated that there was a negative effect on
the explanatory variable by the ordinal outcome.

**Overall Career Goals**

Using the model with all of the explanatory variables and the cloglog link, I found that for the
second question I asked “I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my overall
career goals,” all three requirements were met. The pseudo $R^2$ showed that the explanatory
variables accounted for the proportion of variations in the outcome variable (Chen & Hughes,
2004). The pseudo $R^2$ for Nagelkerke in the complete model using complementary log-log was
.30.

The other model fitting statistic, the Pearson’s chi square ($\chi^2 = 126.50, df = 52, p = .000$)
for the complete model with complimentary log-log demonstrated that the observed data were
consistent with the estimated values in the fitted model. For the model using only motherhood variables and the complimentary log-log link, the Pearson’s chi-square test statistic ($x^2 = 54.07, df = 16, p = .000$) indicated that the observed data were consistent with the estimated values in the fitted model.

To judge the model’s adequacy, I used the test of parallel lines. For this career satisfaction question and using the full model with the complimentary log-log link, the model assumption of parallel lines was not violated. The test of parallel lines was not significant ($p = .535$). For the model with only motherhood variables and the complimentary log-log link, the model assumption of parallel lines was not violated ($p = .406$). Next I looked at the -2 log likelihood. For the motherhood variables reduced model, it was 451.032. For complete model, the -2 log likelihood was 778.940. Therefore, the complete model using the complementary log-log was a better model compared to the reduced model with the motherhood variables. Once I determined this, I looked at which explanatory variables were significant. This shows which variables predicted satisfaction with the progress toward meeting overall career goals.

The following explanatory variables had a significant effect on satisfaction with overall career goals and had a positive regression coefficient: Academic advising ($β = .604, p = .032$); religious programs ($β = .911, p = .028$). The following explanatory variables were significant and had a negative regression coefficient: Master’s degree ($β = -.535, p = .004$); White/Caucasian ($β = -.896, p = .04$); elementary school age children ($β = -.745, p = .027$); zero children living in the home ($β = -17.911, p = .000$); one child living in the home ($β = -17.765, p = .000$); two children living in the home ($β = -17.940, p = .000$); three children living in the home ($β = -18.102, p = .000$); current age 20-25 ($β = -19.502, p = .000$); current age 26-30 ($β = -19.637, p = .000$); current age 31-35 ($β = -18.934, p = .000$); current age 36-40 ($β = -19.022, p = .000$);
current age 41-45 ($\beta = -18.590$, $p = .000$); current age 46-50 ($\beta = -18.588$, $p = .000$); current age 51-55 ($\beta = -17.997$, $p = .000$); current age 56-60 ($\beta = -18.296$, $p = .000$). These can be seen in Table 11 below.

Table 11. 
*Explanatory Variables Associated with “Satisfaction with Progress Toward Meeting Overall Career Goals” (n=1080) Based on the Motherhood Model with the Complementary Log-Log Link.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Programs</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>-.535</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>-.896</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Age Children</td>
<td>-.745</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero Children Living in the Home</td>
<td>-17.911</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Child Living in the Home</td>
<td>-17.765</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Children Living in the Home</td>
<td>-17.940</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Children Living in the Home</td>
<td>-18.102</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Age of Mother 20-25</td>
<td>-19.502</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Age of Mother 26-30</td>
<td>-19.637</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Age of Mother 31-35</td>
<td>-18.934</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Age of Mother 36-40</td>
<td>-19.022</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Age of Mother 41-45</td>
<td>-18.590</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Age of Mother 46-50</td>
<td>-18.588</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Age of Mother 51-55</td>
<td>-17.997</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Age of Mother 56-60</td>
<td>-18.296</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Income.* Using the model with just the motherhood variables and the complementary log-log, I found that for the third question I asked “I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for income,” all three requirements were met. The pseudo $R^2$ showed that the motherhood variables accounted for the proportion of variations in the outcome variable (Chen & Hughes, 2004). The model that used the motherhood variables and logit link also met all three requirements. The pseudo $R^2$ for Nagelkerke (.123) in the motherhood model using complementary log-log was the same as the pseudo $R^2$ for Nagelkerke (.123) in the model using only motherhood variables and the logit link.
The other model fitting statistic, the Pearson’s chi square ($x^2 = 49.865, df = 16, p = .000$) for the model using only motherhood variables with complementary log-log demonstrated that the observed data were consistent with the estimated values in the fitted model. For this question, however, using the model using only motherhood variables and the logit link, the Pearson’s chi-square test statistic ($x^2 = 51.4059, df = 16, p = .000$) also indicated that the observed data were consistent with the estimated values in the fitted model. This meant that other criteria needed to determine which was the best model. So, I proceeded to also compare the test of parallel lines for both models.

For this career satisfaction question and using the motherhood model with complementary log-log, $p = .406$ and for the reduced model using on the motherhood variables and the cloglog link, $p = .830$. I then looked at the -2 Log Likelihood for each of these models to determine which was a better fit. The model that used complementary log-log -2 Log Likelihood was 337.324 and the -2 Log Likelihood for logit link was 449.492. Based on the -2 Log Likelihood values, I chose to use the complementary log-log motherhood model.

Once I determined this, I looked at which explanatory variables were significant, satisfaction with income. The following explanatory variables were significant and had a negative regression coefficient: Zero children living in the home ($\beta = -17.912, p = .012$); one child living in the home ($\beta = -18.195, p = .000$); two children living in the home ($\beta = -18.101, p = .000$); three children living in the home ($\beta = -17.950, p = .000$); worked 0-5 years in the field prior to having children ($\beta = -17.950, p = .000$). There were no variables that were significant with a positive regression coefficient. These data can be seen below in Table 12.
Table 12.
Explanatory Variables Associated with “Satisfaction with Progress Toward Meeting Goals for Income” (n=1080) Based on the Motherhood Model with the Complementary Log-Log Link.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero Children Living in the Home</td>
<td>-17.912</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Child Living in the Home</td>
<td>-18.195</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Children Living in the Home</td>
<td>-18.101</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Children Living in the Home</td>
<td>-17.950</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked 0-5 Years Prior to Having Children</td>
<td>-.673</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Advancement**

Using the model with the motherhood variables and the logit link, I found that for the fourth question I asked “I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for professional advancement,” all three requirements were met. The pseudo R² showed that the explanatory variables accounted for the proportion of variations in the outcome variable (Chen & Hughes, 2004). The pseudo R² for Nagelkerke (.131) in the motherhood model using logit link was larger than the pseudo R² for Nagelkerke (.129) in the model using only motherhood variables and complementary log-log.

The other model fitting statistic, the Pearson’s chi square ($x^2 = 53.812$, $df = 16$, $p = .000$) for the motherhood model with the logit link demonstrated that the observed data were consistent with the estimated values in the fitted model. For this question, however, using the model using only motherhood variables and complementary log-log, the Pearson’s chi-square test statistic ($x^2 = 53.072$, $df = 16$, $p = .000$) also indicated that the observed data were consistent with the estimated values in the fitted model. Therefore, other criteria needed to determine which model was the best, so I proceeded to compare the test of parallel lines for both models.

To judge the model adequacy, I used the test of parallel lines. For this career satisfaction question and using the motherhood model with complementary log-log, the model assumption of
parallel lines was not violated because $p = .567$. In the reduced model using on the motherhood
variables and the logit link, the assumption of parallel lines was not violated because $p = .618$. Because both models met all of the criteria, I then looked at the -2 Log Likelihood. For the
model using motherhood variables and logit link, the -2 Log Likelihood was 358.114 and for the
model using motherhood variables and complementary log-log, it was 360.082. Because these
numbers were very close, I decided that the complementary log-log model was the most
appropriate because my frequency distribution was not normally distributed. Once I determined
this, I looked at which explanatory variables were significant, and therefore predicted satisfaction
with professional advancement.

The following explanatory variables were significant and had a negative regression
coefficient: Zero children living in the home ($\beta = -17.596, p = .000$), one child living in the home
($\beta = -18.173, p = .000$), two children living in the home ($\beta = -18.025, p = .000$), three children
living in the home ($\beta = -18.020, p = .000$), four children living in the home ($\beta = -17.035, p =
.000$). There were no variables that were significant and had a positive regression coefficient.

These data can be seen below in Table 13.

Table 13.  
Explanatory Variables Associated with “Satisfaction with Progress Toward Meeting Goals for
Professional Advancement” (n=1080) Based on the Motherhood Model with the Complementary
Log-Log Link.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero Children Living in the Home</td>
<td>-17.596</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Child Living in the Home</td>
<td>-18.173</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Children Living in the Home</td>
<td>-18.025</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Children Living in the Home</td>
<td>-18.020</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Children Living in the Home</td>
<td>-17.035</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Professional Skills

Using the model with motherhood variables and the logit link, I found that for the fifth question I asked “I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for the development of new professional skills,” all three requirements were not met. The pseudo $R^2$ showed that the motherhood variables did not account for the proportion of variations in the outcome variable (Chen & Hughes, 2004). The pseudo $R^2$ for Nagelkerke was .098 in the motherhood model using logit link. None of the other models met all three requirements.

The other model fitting statistic, the Pearson’s chi square ($x^2 = 38.975, df = 16, p = .001$) for the motherhood model using logit link did demonstrate that the observed data were consistent with the estimated values in the fitted model. To judge the model adequacy, I used the test of parallel lines. For this career satisfaction question and using the model with motherhood variables and the logit link, the model assumption of parallel lines was not violated based because the Pearson Significance was $p = .707$. I then looked at which variables were significant and therefore predicted satisfaction with new professional skills.

The following variables were significant and had a negative regression coefficient: Zero children living in the home ($\beta = -193.123, p = .000$); one child living in the home ($\beta = -18.774, p = .001$); two children living in the home ($\beta = -18.860, p = .000$); three children living in the home ($\beta = -18.651, p = .000$); worked 0-5 years in the field prior to having children ($\beta = -1.309, p = .001$); worked 6-10 years in the field prior to having children ($\beta = -1.058, p = .009$); worked 11-15 years in the field prior to having children ($\beta = -1.091, p = .014$). There were no variables that were significant and had a positive regression coefficient. These data can be seen below in Table 14.
Table 14. 

*Explanatory Variables Associated with “Satisfaction with Progress Toward Meeting Goals for Development of New Professional Skills” (n=1080) Based on the Motherhood Model with the Logit Link.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero Children Living in the Home</td>
<td>-19.123</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Child Living in the Home</td>
<td>-18.774</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Children Living in the Home</td>
<td>-18.860</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Children Living in the Home</td>
<td>-18.651</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked 0-5 Years Prior to Having Children</td>
<td>-1.309</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked 6-10 Years Prior to Having Children</td>
<td>-1.058</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked 11-15 Years Prior to Having Children</td>
<td>-1.091</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

There was a significant relationship ($p < .05$) between all five career satisfaction areas and motherhood status, degree attainment, age of children in the home, and the age of women. In addition, there was a significant relationship between career success, career goals, professional advancement, and new skills and the residence of children, but not with income satisfaction. There was a significant relationship between partnership status and career success, income, and professional advancement. The variables race and number of children in the home were both significantly related only to career goals. Finally, functional area was significantly related to respondents’ satisfaction with career success, career goals, income, and professional advancement, but not with satisfaction with the development of new professional skills.

I utilized a variety of models and link functions to determine the best model to predict career satisfaction. I was not able to determine a good model for the question of career success satisfaction. However, I was able to determine a good model for the individual career questions that would predict satisfaction for the following questions: progress toward meeting overall
career goals, goals for income, goals for professional advancement, and goals for development of new professional skills.
CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION

I studied five areas of career satisfaction to better understand the impact of career satisfaction and motherhood for women who work in student affairs. I presented descriptive data and looked at differences based on a number of demographic variables for women who were mothers and those who were not. In this chapter, I will explicitly answer my five research questions, discuss implications for practice, share the limitations of my research, and provide suggestions for areas of future research.

As I concluded my data analysis and looked at the factors that impacted career satisfaction that I studied, I was surprised to learn that motherhood was not a statistically significant factor related to career satisfaction for women in student affairs. Based on the qualitative research that has been completed and my own experience as a mother, I expected that motherhood would be a significant factor for career satisfaction. Although there were some motherhood variables that were related to career satisfaction, generally it was the other variables that were statistically significant ($p < .05$).

**Discussion of Findings**

I asked five research questions to understand the relationship between motherhood and career satisfaction for women who work in student affairs. Through my research, I determined which factors are significantly associated with career satisfaction, which factors affect career satisfaction, what combination of variables produces the best predictive model of career satisfaction for women working full-time in student affairs, what the statistically significant difference in levels of career satisfaction between mothers and non-mothers who work full-time in student affairs, and the statistically significant differences among mothers in student affairs.
Factors Significantly Associated with Career Satisfaction

My first research question asked whether there is a difference between the levels of career satisfaction for women who work full-time in student affairs based on partnership status, degree attainment, race/ethnicity, functional area, institutional size, and motherhood status. There were a number of areas where a significant relationship between demographic variables and the five areas of career satisfaction. Overall, there were statistically significant relationships among the five areas of career satisfaction and degree attainment and motherhood status. None of these relationships were powerful, as the effect sizes were small; therefore I would caution using these findings to make significant policy changes prior to conducting additional research.

Factors Affecting Career Satisfaction

My second research question asked to what degree are the following variables predictive of career satisfaction for women working full-time in student affairs: partnership status, degree attainment, race/ethnicity, functional area of student affairs, institutional size, and motherhood status. There were no variables associated with career success satisfaction. Working in academic advising and religious programs were both positively associated with satisfaction with progress toward meeting overall career goals. Having a master’s degree, identifying as White/Caucasian, having elementary school age children, having zero, one, two, or three children living in the home, and current age of 20-25, 26-30, 31-35, 36-40, 41-45, 46-50, 51-55, and 56-60 all were negatively associated with satisfaction with progress toward meeting overall career goals. Zero, one, two, or three children living in the home and working 0-5 years in the field prior to having children were all negatively associated with satisfaction with progress toward meeting goals for income. There were no variables that were positively associated with satisfaction with progress toward meeting goals for income. Working 0-5 years in the field prior
to having children was negatively associated with satisfaction with progress toward meeting goals for professional advancement. Working 6-10 years in the field prior to having children was positively associated with meeting goals for professional advancement. Having zero, one, two, or three children living in the home, and working 0-5, 6-10, and 11-15 years in the field prior to having children were all negatively associated with satisfaction toward meeting goals for development of new professional skills. There were no variables that were positively associated with satisfaction toward meeting goals for development of new professional skills.

**Predictive Models for Career Satisfaction**

My third research question asked what combination of variables produces the best predictive model of career satisfaction for women working full-time in student affairs. I was able to develop models for satisfaction with progress toward meeting overall career goals, satisfaction with progress toward meeting goals for income, satisfaction with progress toward meeting goals for professional advancement, and satisfaction toward meeting goals for development of new professional skills.

**Differences Between Mothers and Non-Mothers**

My fourth research question asked if there is a statistically significant difference in levels of career satisfaction between mothers and non-mothers who work full-time in student affairs. More mothers than expected either strongly agreed or agreed to some extent that they are satisfied with their career success while among non-mothers, fewer than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their career success. More mothers than expected strongly agreed they were satisfied with the progress they had made toward meeting their goals for income and fewer of them than expected were uncertain about satisfaction with the progress they had made toward meeting their goals for income. Among non-mothers more than expected were
uncertain about their satisfaction with the progress they had made toward meeting their goals for income and fewer than expected strongly agreed that they were satisfied. Fewer mothers than expected were uncertain about their satisfaction with the progress they had made toward meeting their goals for professional advancement satisfaction.

**Differences Among Mothers**

My fifth research question asked if there a statistically significant difference in levels of career satisfaction of mothers who work full-time in student affairs based on the following variables: number of children, age of women, age when first became a mother, partnership status, degree attainment, race/ethnicity, functional area of student affairs, age of child(ren), institutional size, length of tenure in the field when first became a mother, and residency of children. There were statistically significant differences in levels of career satisfaction for mothers in the following areas: degree attainment, current age of mother, having pre-school age children, and having adult age children. None of these relationships were powerful, as the effect sizes were small.

Overall, women were satisfied or very satisfied with four of the career satisfaction areas: career success, meeting overall career goals, professional development goals, and the development of new professional skills. However, this was not true for progress toward meeting goals for income. Additionally, my data led to different conclusions than have been found in previous qualitative research. Previous research on the topic of motherhood and career has been qualitative in nature and the findings have suggested that family and career are intertwined, and that having a family does impact the professional and personal lives of women who work in higher education and have children (Marshall, 2002; Nobbe & Manning, 1997). I asked different
questions in my study and had different variables, and based on those variables, I found that motherhood is not a critical factor for career satisfaction.

**Implications for Practice**

Given these findings, there are some improvements that can be made in practice in higher education. However, it is necessary to point out that the strength of associations for items that were statistically significant in my study were not large. As Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) discussed, “Although there is some disagreement of what constitutes a practically significant effect size, the consensus seems to be that those less than .30 are ‘small’, those between .30 and .70 are ‘moderate’, and those above .70 are ‘large’” (p. 649). None of the effect sizes in my study were in the moderate or large range. The small effect sizes do not invalidate the fact that there were many areas of statistical significance, but because the strength of the relationships were not large in some areas, major policy changes should be made with caution, or be preceded by further research.

**Goals for Income and Career Satisfaction**

As a profession and as a culture, we must continue to address salary inequity for women. Although current practices regarding salary are embedded in our society, we cannot accept that it cannot be changed. As I discussed in previous chapters, there are a variety of reasons why women are paid less than men, including systemic discrimination (Blackhurst, 2000). However, as a profession we need to not only talk about why this is, but also work to change this. One piece of salary inequity is related to negotiation of salary. It is imperative that we begin teaching women how to negotiate for their salary. According to *Women Don’t Ask* (Babcock & Laschever, 2007), if people do not effectively negotiate their first salary, by the age of 60 they stand to lose over $500,000. In addition, men are four times more likely to negotiate a first salary than
women and 20% of adult women have reported that they do not negotiate at all. These statistics are concerning, but as a profession we can begin to change this through education. Developing additional presentations for professional conferences about salary negotiation specifically for women and having intentional conversations with graduate students prior to beginning their post-graduation job search are essential to making these changes and empowering women to receive the salary they deserve.

As I discussed in my literature review, salary inequities are a concern in the workplace for women. Women working full-time earn 80% as much as men one year out of college, and 69% as much as men at the ten year mark (Dey & Hill, 2007). More specifically, in Blackhurt’s (2000) research, 60% of her sample of women student affairs professionals reported salary inequity based on gender. Salary inequity is especially concerning because it impacts both job performance and job satisfaction (Aguirre, 2000). Although I did not compare men and women in my sample, my finding that women are not satisfied with their progress toward meeting income goals is in line with the literature.

There were six demographic areas where there was a significant relationship with satisfaction progress toward meeting goals for income: partnership status, degree attainment, functional area, motherhood status, age of children, and age of women. Although not surprising, the data showed that higher levels of degree attainment were associated with satisfaction with progress toward meeting goals for income. Specifically, women who held doctorates were more likely to strongly agree that they were satisfied with progress toward meeting goals for income. The same was true for mothers who had obtained a doctorate. This speaks to the importance of supporting women in obtaining additional education for economic mobility. There are many reasons why it is important for student affairs as a profession to support women who want to
pursue a terminal degree. Not only could it lead to increased career satisfaction, but having more women with doctorates would likely lead to more women in higher level positions that require a terminal degree. I believe that if we have more women in leadership positions in higher education, we will have an environment that is more supportive of women in general. In addition, an increase in women in leadership would provide additional mentors for younger women in the profession to look up to and utilize as role models.

The data also showed that women were satisfied with their progress toward meeting goals for income when they were older. The 46-50 year old category was the first group to report satisfaction with progress toward meeting goals for their income, and women in every category up to age 60 were satisfied. This makes sense that women would be more satisfied with progress toward meeting goals for their income as they aged, because they likely are in higher level positions with larger salaries. However, because I did not specifically inquire about professional level, it is not possible to say this with certainty. Finally, mothers with adult age children tended to be more satisfied with progress toward meeting goals for their income. This could be related to the mothers’ professional level or possible be related to how they have to spend their income. With younger children not yet in school, childcare can be a significant expense, for example. Although some institutions provide childcare on campus, not all institutions do so, for a variety of reasons. However, providing such a service could assist those who work in higher education and have children. A campus daycare could be subsidized by the school through teacher education programs where students work as part of their field experience, thus making is less expensive for parents and providing students with valuable work experience. In addition, the proximity could offer an additional benefit for parents: they would more easily be able to visit
with their child during the day or for new mothers to nurse throughout the day, could also assist women.

It is also important to consider the possibility that mothers’ dissatisfaction with their income could be related to the costs of childrearing. Money that could otherwise be disposable income is now going toward costs like childcare and other expenses toward raising a child. As a profession, I believe we need to challenge why women are not receiving equal pay, as well as insist upon additional resources on campuses, like daycare services. This would help both mothers and fathers who work in higher education.

**Degree Attainment and Career Satisfaction**

I also found a significant association between degree attainment and career satisfaction. In particular, I found that more women than expected who held doctoral degrees reported being satisfied with the success they have achieved in their careers. Previous research has found that mentors play a critical role in encouraging mentees to pursue advanced degrees. In light of this and given my findings, it is essential that women are provided opportunities to have mentors because of the benefits of mentoring, which includes achieving advanced degrees (Twale & Jelink, 1995). If more women could participate in mentoring relationships, it is possible that they would be more inclined to achieve an advanced degree. Although mentoring likely has a multitude of benefits, including satisfaction with income, it could also be connected back to career satisfaction. From personal experience, I know that such relationships have tremendous positive outcomes. Seeing other mothers in leadership positions who have been successful not only encourages mid-level and entry-level women to pursue leadership positions, but mentoring relationships can also help younger women develop additional networking contacts and learn more about how to negotiate the political landscape in higher education. Having someone to
share resources and tips for success is invaluable and I believe it can have a major impact on women’s success and career satisfaction. It is important for younger women to attempt to develop these relationships, and it is also essential for more seasoned professionals to reach out to women who are attempting to climb the career ladder. Women must help each other achieve career success.

In addition to utilizing mentoring relationships to encourage women to pursue doctoral degrees, it is also important to ensure that they are supported throughout their process so they successfully complete their degree. In their study of individuals who did not complete their doctoral degrees, Jacks, Chubin, Porter, and Connolly (1983) reported that a poor relationship with a committee or advisor was a significant reason for leaving school without completing a degree. According to the *Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac* (Almanac, 2010), 46.1% of doctorates were earned by women. Between 2007-2008 and 2019-2010, enrollment in doctoral programs is projected to increase 68% for women (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). Although women make up a large number of doctoral students, they tend to take longer to complete doctoral programs than do other students (Council of Graduate Schools, 2008). This same study also found that the gap between women and men in doctoral attainment would be even larger if women were not willing to stay in programs for as long as it takes to finish. Schmidt (2008) pointed out that many women in doctoral programs are trying to juggle demands in the home and with school, and are starting families in many cases. He posited that women in such situations would benefit from support from universities in their family roles. Providing women, mothers and non-mothers, with the support necessary to persist to graduate in doctoral programs is important to helping them find satisfaction in their careers.
Obtaining a doctoral degree was associated with satisfaction with success achieved in career; however, women tend to take longer to graduate and do not persist to graduation at the same level as men (Council of Graduate Schools, 2008). This is a concern for women because it is related to career satisfaction. It is also a concern due to the lack of women in higher levels of leadership in higher education. If more women complete doctorates, they may be able to obtain higher level positions. As a profession, it is essential that we support women if they have a desire to obtain a doctoral degree. Making sure there are mentors, supportive advisors and faculty members, as well as support in the home all are vital for the success of women. Doctoral programs should be intentional about creating mentoring programs, which will help all students, not just women. Acknowledging students’ lives outside of their doctoral program in conversations in the classroom, and through social events that encourage students to bring family members are two ways to support women. Creating formal or informal mentoring relationships can also be effective in encouraging women to continue their programs. In my personal experience, one of the biggest support systems in my doctoral program was having a formal mentor who helped me through any struggles or questions. To create a culture of support in doctoral programs, it is essential for faculty to understand that students may either have children prior to starting their degrees or while they are completing their degrees. Beyond that, faculty members also need to be aware that the needs of students who do have children may be different from students who do not have children.

**Functional Area and Race/Ethnicity and Career Satisfaction**

Women who identified their functional area as student affairs administration also tended to be more satisfied with the success they have achieved in their careers than women in other functional areas. This could be a proxy for women who are in senior level positions in student
affairs, which could explain some of the results. However, because I did not ask about their professional level (entry, mid, senior), it is not possible to make that claim.

There was a significant relationship between women who identified as Black/African American and satisfaction with progress toward meeting overall career goals for mothers and for women over-all. More Black/African American women and more Black/African American mothers than expected disagreed to some extent that they were satisfied with their progress toward meeting their overall career goals. Fewer Black/African American mothers than expected agreed to some extent that they were satisfied with their progress toward meeting overall career goals. This may reflect the types of goals that Black/African American women make for their careers and possible increased barriers, but this is certainly an area for further research. However, these data should be interpreted with caution because the cell sizes were very small, both for Black women respondents to the survey and among them, those Black women who identified as mothers. There were only 38 women who identified as Black/African American, which is a small percentage of the whole sample, and likely too small on which to draw substantive conclusions from the data or on which to suggest policy changes.

Identity and Career Satisfaction

Because there were only a few variables that were significantly related to career satisfaction and the predictive models for the various areas of career satisfaction included both motherhood and non-motherhood variables, I think it is important to discuss identity. In my literature review, I discussed the danger of oversimplifying identity by placing someone into one category (Acker, 2006). There are many areas of identity that impact the experiences of women who work in student affairs, including motherhood status, race / ethnicity, and age are all examples of identities. Motherhood is part of the identity for women who have children, but
there are other identity factors that are salient as well. It is important to consider this when making decisions about policy and practice for women who work in student affairs.

**Motherhood and Career Satisfaction**

I found that women with pre-school age children were less satisfied in a number of career areas. There could be some overlap with the age of the mothers because, although it is not always the case, women who have younger children may be younger themselves and therefore in more mid-level positions. If that is the case, they may not be as satisfied with, for example, their professional skill development because many resources are focused on new or entry-level professionals for skill development. Although additional research needs to be conducted to confirm this, it is worth stressing that as a profession we need to help women at various levels develop their professional skills. It is logical to provide professional skill development for entry-level professionals, but assisting women at mid-career is also necessary. It is also appropriate to consider the needs of mothers with pre-school age children. They may need additional support or flexibility in their jobs in order to be successful. Once again, mentoring relationships could be particularly helpful in this situation.

**Implications for Research**

In the next section, I will discuss the impact of possible suppressor effects, limitations of my study, and areas for future research. These three areas will provide additional information and further understanding of my study, as well as areas for future researchers to explore.

**Suppressor Effects** While I was analyzing my data for the ordinal regression I conducted, I found that there were a number of variables that had meaningful standardized residuals ($z$ greater than ±2.00)
but were not statistically significant \( (p < .05) \). According to Woolley (1997), a variable can sometimes raise the total correlation coefficient while still having a minor correlation with the dependent variable and a strong correlation with the other predictor variables. The variable that increases the total correlation coefficient when added as another predictor is a suppressor variable. This is important to be aware of when considering my findings, because there were many variables that were not statistically significant but did have meaningful standardized residuals. For example, within career success satisfaction, number of children living in the home and size of institution; within income satisfaction, mothers who worked for 16-20 years prior to becoming a mother, and size of institution; within professional advancement satisfaction, women whose children did not live with them the majority of the time, number of children living in the home, and size of institution; and for professional skills satisfaction, identifying as Black/African American, functional area, children living in the home, and number of children. It is difficult to understand why these particular variables were not statistically significant but did have meaningful standardized residuals; however, many of these variables were related to motherhood. According to Woolley (1997), “One way of explaining how certain events predict an outcome is by measuring how predictive variables are when they are combined together” (para. 2). As I discussed previously, career satisfaction was predicted by a model that included all of my variables, and not just motherhood variables. All of the variables above likely contributed, but perhaps were not noteworthy enough to show significance.

**Limitations**

There are limitations of this study that should be noted. For the ages of children, I used “pre-school” to include all children who were not yet in school. In hindsight, I should have included an infant category. In my personal experience as a mother, there are different
challenges involved in mothering an infant versus mothering a two year old child. For example, when mothering infants, they are 100% reliant for care, versus two year olds who are able to do some things for themselves. There also are differences in sleep patterns, eating patterns, and development for infants (Mayo Clinic, 2011a) versus toddlers (Mayo Clinic, 2011b).

The categories I used for partnership status were also created a challenge in my data analysis. I provided women with the option to select ‘divorced’ as well as ‘single, dating,’ ‘co-habitating, exclusively dating,’ and ‘exclusively dating, not co-habitating.’ Providing these options gave women the opportunity to choose how they identified; however, women who were previously divorced may consider themselves single and dating. In other words, there were multiple options that women could have chosen that were not discrete categories.

There were some areas where I was not able to make comparisons due to small sample sizes in certain cells. For example, there were certain functional areas where I could not compare mothers due to the small cell size. Although I had a good sample size and response rate, it was still prohibitively small for some areas.

The portion of my research instrument to gather information about career satisfaction was an existing instrument (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990) that did not ask a question about overall career satisfaction because they averaged scores to determine overall career satisfaction. However, I think it would have been beneficial to have asked a question about the overall career satisfaction. There are other aspects of career that could contribute to one’s perception of career satisfaction that I could have addressed if I asked an overall career satisfaction question.
Areas for Future Research

One potential area for future research is a quantitative study that focuses on the barriers and support structures for mothers who work in student affairs. Previous qualitative research has found that women who are mothers have challenges combining their roles of mother and professional. I wonder if my results would have been different had I included questions about institutional and other forms of support. Conducting a study of this nature might help to explain the disparity between the results of my study and the results of previous qualitative research.

I also found that there was a significant relationship between career success satisfaction and having pre-school age children. Although I did not ask about professional level, there is likely a link between having young children and being in entry-level positions. In addition, there has been qualitative research conducted on senior level women (Nobbe & Manning, 1997; Marshall, 2002), but there is a lack of research on motherhood and entry-level women. Conducting such research would shed additional light on the implications of motherhood and career specifically for new professionals.

Further, it has been found in previous qualitative research that women who work in higher education either considered or changed their career goals and plans after becoming mothers (Marshall, 2009; Nobbe & Manning, 1997; Ting & Watt, 1999; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). Additional research could add to the existing research to find out if there is a statistically significant association between motherhood and attrition for women in student affairs and further whether there is a predictive relationship between these variables. Depending on the findings, this could shape policy to better serve mothers in student affairs.

Although I did not specifically ask the question of why women were or were not satisfied with their achievement of career success, career goals, professional development goals, and
development of new professional skills, it could be related to what previous research has found for mothers. Research has shown that women turned down promotions or jobs that were not beneficial to their family’s needs (Collins, 2009; Marshall, 2009; Ting & Watt, 1999), they postponed or decided not to pursue an advanced degree, and limited their participation with professional associations because of the challenge of balancing family and work (Marshall, 2009). Qualitative research also discovered that women who worked in higher education either considered or actually changed their career plans and goals once they became mothers (Marshall, 2009; Nobbe & Manning, 1997; Ting & Watt, 1999; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). Conducting further quantitative research about why women are satisfied or not is important.

Due to the fact that I had inadequate cell sizes in many of the functional areas, I think it would be helpful to study women in specific functional areas. It would be useful to study some of the areas that had inadequate cell sizes to determine if there is indeed a relationship between that functional area and career satisfaction. Alternatively, this research could be on career satisfaction for women who work in academic advising, which is one of the areas in which there was a relationship with career satisfaction.

As I discussed above, fewer mothers than expected who identified as Black/African American agreed to some extent that they were satisfied with their career goals. It would be interesting to conduct a study to look specifically at the role race and ethnicity play in career satisfaction in general, and in satisfaction with progress toward achieving their career goals specifically. Do there tend to be different goals for women related to race and ethnicity?

To address the suppressor variables and find out why they raised the total correlation coefficient in my study, it would be beneficial to conduct additional research. One area would be to conduct a study on career satisfaction and institutional factors specifically, including size of
institution. Asking specific questions to drill down to how institutional size impacts career satisfaction could lend additional information to the literature base that does not currently exist.

Finally, although this study focused on women specifically, there is a need for research on this topic for fathers as well. As the role of fatherhood has evolved for a variety of reasons, including women working outside of the home, there is a need understand the experience of fathers as workers. There are men who work in the profession of student affairs and it would be beneficial to understand how their career satisfaction is potentially impacted by their role as a father.

Conclusion

Both motherhood and a career in student affairs can be challenging – separately and together. This study used a valid and reliable instrument and critical paradigm to study career satisfaction and the relationship to motherhood. Motherhood did not appear to be a critical factor in career satisfaction based on the variables I used and questions I asked.

In general, women were very satisfied or satisfied with career success, meeting their overall career goals, their progress toward meeting their professional development goals, and their development of new professional goals; however, the same was not true for their goals for their income. With the exception of income concerns, these are positive findings for the profession. Although motherhood was not a key factor in career satisfaction based on this study, there were variables related to motherhood that were related to career satisfaction. Specifically, women with pre-school age children were less satisfied in multiple areas of career satisfaction. As a profession, we need to consider what mothers of pre-school age children might need to be successful in their career. In addition, understanding that women have many identities and experiences that impact their career satisfaction is essential, and conducting additional research
as discussed above can further clarify why these areas impact career satisfaction. Women who
work in student affairs, regardless of motherhood status, need support throughout their careers to
achieve career satisfaction.
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APPENDIX A: Recruitment Email #1

Subject line: Motherhood and Career Satisfaction Survey

Dear Colleague,

I hope this email finds you well. My name is Kacee Ferrell Snyder and I am a doctoral student in Bowling Green State University’s Higher Education Administration program. I am conducting a national study about the relationship between motherhood and career satisfaction of student affairs professionals in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree in higher education administration at Bowling Green State University. The data collected from this survey will be published in my doctoral dissertation.

You have been identified as a student affairs professional based on your most recent ACPA membership profile and are being asked to participate in this study based on your self-identification as a woman. You are being asked to give information about your perceptions of your career satisfaction. Additional demographic questions are also included.

You are invited to participate in a research study that allows me to explore the relationship between motherhood and career satisfaction for women who work in student affairs. The information gleaned from this research will be used in order to develop recommendations for practice about how to improve the workplace for women who work in student affairs. It is my hope that the suggestions will be used by employers and impact career satisfaction in a positive manner for mothers who work in student affairs.

There is very little statistical data available about the relationship between motherhood and career satisfaction for women who work in student affairs. Your participation in this study will help fill that gap in our knowledge and the literature. The information gathered from this research will be used in order to develop recommendations for practice about how to improve the workplace for women who work in student affairs. If used appropriately, the information from this study could be used to impact polices in the workplace for individuals who have children. Finally, completing the survey will offer you an opportunity to share information about yourself, and your perception of how satisfied you are with your career. Once I publish my dissertation, the participants will be able to learn more about the differences in career satisfaction for women who have children and those who do not and whether there are differences based on various demographic factors. Employers would also have greater information about career satisfaction for women, both mothers and non-mothers, which could lead to more useful professional development plans. The survey will be administered online and will be available for you to complete for a two week window, from October 19, 2010 to November 2, 2010. The survey should take you approximately 10 minutes to complete. Completion and submission of this survey indicates your consent to participate in this study. Please remember to clear your browser cache and page history upon completion of the survey.

Electronic communication and email are not 100% secure; however, your responses will be anonymous – no personally identifiable information will be collected. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you can refrain from answering any questions without
penalty. You may withdraw your consent to participate in this study or discontinue participation in this study at any time without penalty. Neither your affiliation with ACPA, your employer, or BGSU will be impacted by your participation in this study. Deciding not to participate in this study will not impact grades, class standing, or your relationship with BGSU or your institution. The anticipated risks to you are no greater than those normally encountered in daily life.

If you have any questions about your participation in this study, you can contact Kacee Ferrell Snyder, Doctoral Student, Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs, Bowling Green State University, at kaceef@bgsu.edu, 419-372-9317, or my dissertation chairperson, Dr. Dafina Lazarus Stewart, at dafinas@bgsu.edu, 419-372-6876. If you have questions about the conduct of this study or your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of Bowling Green State University’s Human Subjects Review Board at 419-372-7716 (hsrb@bgsu.edu).

Please click here to complete the survey http://survey.bgsu.edu/surveys/studentlife/careersatisfaction/careersatisfaction.htm. The survey will be available from October 19, 2010 to November 2, 2010.

Thank you for your participation,

Kacee Ferrell Snyder  
Doctoral Student  
Higher Education and Student Affairs  
Bowling Green State University

Vernon A. Wall  
Director of Educational Programs & Publications  
ACPA - College Student Educators International  
National Center for Higher Education  
One Dupont Circle NW  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20036-1188  
USA  
tel 1 202 835 2272 x608  
vwall@acpa.nche.edu
Subject line: Career Satisfaction Survey

Dear Colleague,

Greetings! Last week you received a request to participate in a study exploring the career satisfaction for women who work in student affairs and what relationship, if any, exists between career satisfaction and being a mother. Both mothers and non-mothers are invited to participate in this research. I appreciate that your time is valuable and that you have many competing demands. If you have completed this survey already, thank you so much for your time and the helpful information you provided.

If you have not completed the survey yet, there is still time for you to do so. The survey will be accessible through November 2, 2010 and should only take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Please go to the following website to access the survey: [http://survey.bgsu.edu/surveys/studentlife/careersatisfaction/careersatisfaction.htm](http://survey.bgsu.edu/surveys/studentlife/careersatisfaction/careersatisfaction.htm)

This research is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree in higher education administration at Bowling Green State University. Completion and submission of this survey indicates your consent to participate in this study. Please remember to clear your browser cache and page history upon completion of the survey. When you click the “submit” button upon completing the survey, you will be redirected to the home page for BGSU’s Higher Education Administration doctoral program.

Electronic communication and email are not 100% secure; however, your responses will be anonymous – no personally identifiable information will be collected. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you can refrain from answering any questions without penalty. You may withdraw your consent to participate in this study or discontinue participation in this study at any time without penalty. Neither your affiliation with ACPA, your employer, or BGSU will be impacted by your participation in this study. Deciding not to participate in this study will not impact grades, class standing, or your relationship with BGSU or your institution. The anticipated risks to you are no greater than those normally encountered in daily life.

If you have any questions about your participation in this study, you can contact Kacee Ferrell Snyder, Doctoral Student, Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs, Bowling Green State University, at kaceef@bgsu.edu, 419-372-9317, or my dissertation chairperson, Dr. Dafina Lazarus Stewart, at dafinas@bgsu.edu, 419-372-6876. If you have questions about the conduct of this study or your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of Bowling Green State University’s Human Subjects Review Board at 419-372-7716 (hsrc@bgsu.edu).

Please click here to complete the survey: [http://survey.bgsu.edu/surveys/studentlife/careersatisfaction/careersatisfaction.htm](http://survey.bgsu.edu/surveys/studentlife/careersatisfaction/careersatisfaction.htm). The survey will be available through November 2, 2010.
Thank you for your participation,

Kacee Ferrell Snyder  
Doctoral Student  
Higher Education and Student Affairs  
Bowling Green State University

Vernon A. Wall  
Director of Educational Programs & Publications  
ACPA - College Student Educators International  
National Center for Higher Education  
One Dupont Circle NW  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20036-1188  
USA  
tel 1 202 835 2272 x608  
vwall@acpa.nche.edu
APPENDIX C: Research Instrument

[This information appeared on the welcome screen for the survey. Respondents were informed that submitting their completed survey would constitute their consent to participate.]

You are invited to participate in a research study that allows me to explore the relationship between motherhood and career satisfaction for women who work in student affairs. The information gleaned from this research will be used in order to develop recommendations for practice about how to improve the workplace for women who work in student affairs. It is my hope that the suggestions will be used by employers and impact career satisfaction in a positive manner for mothers who work in student affairs.

In addition, there is very little statistical data available about the relationship between motherhood and career satisfaction for women who work in student affairs. Your participation in this study will help fill that gap in our knowledge and the literature. The information gleaned from this research will be used in order to develop recommendations for practice about how to improve the workplace for women who work in student affairs. If used appropriately, the information from this study could be used to impact policies in the workplace for individuals who have children. Finally, completing the survey will offer you an opportunity to share information about yourself, and your perception of how satisfied you are with your career. Once I publish my dissertation, the participants will be able to learn more about the differences in career satisfaction for women who have children and those who do not and whether there are differences based on various demographic factors. Employers would also have greater information about career satisfaction for women, both mothers and non-mothers, which could lead to more useful professional development plans.

This research is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree in higher education administration at Bowling Green State University. Your responses will be anonymous – no personally identifiable information will be collected. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you can refrain from answering any questions without penalty. You may withdraw your consent to participate in this study or discontinue participation in this study at any time without penalty or injury to your employment or relationship with ACPA. Deciding not to participate in this study will not impact grades, class standing, or your relationship with BGSU or your institution. The anticipated risks to you are no greater than those normally encountered in daily life. This study may benefit you in terms of allowing you to explore your experience as a mother and student affairs professional. Submitting your completed survey constitutes your consent to participate in this research and the questionnaire should take no more than 10 minutes to complete. To prevent others from accessing your responses, please delete your cache and browsing history, and close your browser window after submitting the survey.

If you have any questions about your participation in this study, you can contact Kacee Ferrell Snyder, Doctoral Student, Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs, Bowling Green State University, at kaceef@bgsu.edu, 419-372-9317, or my dissertation chairperson, Dr. Dafina Lazarus Stewart, at dafinas@bgsu.edu, 419-372-6876. If you have questions about the conduct
of this study or your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of Bowling Green State University’s Human Subjects Review Board at 419-372-7716 (hsrb@bgsu.edu).

Thank you again for taking the time to fill out the following survey. Please keep in mind that by “mother” and “motherhood” I am including all of those who self-identify as women parents of children by any means, including foster, adoptive, guardian, and biological.

*Please note that faculty should not complete this survey.*

1. Please indicate your partnership status according to the following options:
   a. Single, not dating (never married, divorced, widowed, legally separated)
   b. Single, dating
   c. Long-term committed partnership (marriage, civil union, domestic partnership)
   d. Co-habitating, exclusively dating
   e. Exclusively dating, not co-habitating
   f. Divorced

2. Please indicate your level of degree attainment according to the following options:
   a. High School
   b. Bachelor’s Degree
   c. Master’s Degree
   d. Doctorate

3. Please indicate your race/ethnicity:
   a. Black/African American
   b. Asian American/Pacific Islander
   c. Native American/American Indian
   d. White/Caucasian
   e. Biracial/Multiracial
   f. Latino/Hispanic
   g. Arab/Middle Eastern
   h. Bi-ethnic/Multiethnic
   i. Not listed: ________________

4. Please indicate the functional area in which you are currently employed according to the following options:
   a. Academic Advising
   b. Admissions
   c. Admissions/Enrollment Management
   d. Adult Learner Services
   e. Assessment/Research
   f. Career Planning/Placement
   g. Commuter Services
   h. Counseling
   i. Disabled Student Services
   j. Financial Aid
k. Food Services  
l. Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual/Transgender Awareness  
m. Greek Affairs  
n. Health/Drug and Alcohol  
o. International Students  
p. Intramural/Recreation Sports  
q. Judicial Affairs  
r. Leadership Development  
s. Multicultural Affairs  
t. Orientation  
u. Religious Programs  
v. Residence Life  
w. Service Learning  
x. Student Activities  
y. Student Affairs Administration  
z. Student Union  
aa. Women’s Resources  

5. Are you a biological, step-, foster, or adoptive parent or guardian for any children?  
   a. Yes  
   b. No  

6. If you answered “A” to Q5 above, do those children live with you the majority of the time?  
   a. Yes  
   b. No  

7. If you answered “A” to Q6 above, please indicate the ages of your children according to the following options (check all that apply):  
   a. Pre-school age  
   b. Elementary school-age  
   c. Middle/Junior High school-age  
   d. High school-age  
   e. Adult (18+ years of age)  

8. If you have children living in the home with you, how many?  
   a. 0  
   b. 1  
   c. 2  
   d. 3  
   e. 4  
   f. 5  
   g. 6  
   h. 7  
   i. 8  
   j. 9
k. 10 or more

9. How long had you worked in the field of student affairs before you became a mother?
   a. 0-5 years
   b. 6-10 years
   c. 11-15 years
   d. 16-20 years
   e. 21-25 years
   f. 26+ years

10. Please indicate your current age:
    a. 20-25
    b. 26-30
    c. 31-35
    d. 36-40
    e. 41-45
    f. 46-50
    g. 51-55
    h. 56-60
    i. 61-65
    j. 66-70
    k. 71 and above

11. What size is the institution at which you are currently employed?
    a. 1,000-2,499 FTE
    b. 2,500-4,999 FTE
    c. 5,000-9,999 FTE
    d. 10,000-14,999 FTE
    e. 15,000-19,999 FTE
    f. 20,000-29,999 FTE
    g. 30,000-39,999 FTE
    h. 40,000 and above

12. I am satisfied with the success I have achieved in my career.
    a. Strongly Disagree
    b. Disagree to Some Extent
    c. Uncertain
    d. Agree to Some Extent
    e. Strongly Agree

13. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my overall career goals.
    a. Strongly Disagree
    b. Disagree to Some Extent
    c. Uncertain
    d. Agree to Some Extent
    e. Strongly Agree
14. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for income.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree to Some Extent
   c. Uncertain
   d. Agree to Some Extent
   e. Strongly Agree

15. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for professional advancement.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree to Some Extent
   c. Uncertain
   d. Agree to Some Extent
   e. Strongly Agree

16. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for the development of new professional skills
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree to Some Extent
   c. Uncertain
   d. Agree to Some Extent
   e. Strongly Agree

Please note that upon clicking "Submit" you will be redirected to the BGSU HIED Doctoral Program website, at which point your responses have been collected. You should clear your browser history and close your browser before continuing online, particularly if you are on a shared computer.
[This information appeared on the welcome screen for the survey. Respondents were informed that submitting their completed survey would constitute their consent to participate.]

You are invited to participate in a research study that allows me to explore the relationship between motherhood and career satisfaction for women who work in student affairs. There are benefits to the women who complete this survey. The information I glean from conducting this study will be used to develop suggestions for employers in higher education about how to better accommodate mothers who work in the field of student affairs. It is my hope that the suggestions will be used by employers and impact career satisfaction in a positive manner for mothers who work in student affairs. In addition, completing the survey will offer these women an opportunity to share information about themselves, and their perception of how satisfied they are with their career. Once I publish my dissertation, the participants will be able to learn more about the differences in career satisfaction for women who have children and those who do not and whether there are differences based on various demographic factors.

This research is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree in higher education administration at Bowling Green State University. Your responses will be anonymous – no personally identifiable information will be collected. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you can refrain from answering any questions without penalty. You may withdraw your consent to participate in this study or discontinue participation in this study at any time without penalty or injury to your employment or relationship with ACPA. Deciding not to participate in this study will not impact grades, class standing, or your relationship with BGSU or your institution. The anticipated risks to you are no greater than those normally encountered in daily life. This study may benefit you in terms of allowing you to explore your experience as a mother and student affairs professional. Submitting your completed survey constitutes your consent to participate in this research and the questionnaire should take no more than 10 minutes to complete. To prevent others from accessing your responses, please delete your cache and browsing history, and close your browser window after submitting the survey.
If you have any questions about your participation in this study, you can contact Kacee Ferrell Snyder, Doctoral Student, Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs, Bowling Green State University, at kaceef@bgsu.edu, 419-372-9317, or my dissertation chairperson, Dr. Dafina Lazarus Stewart, at dafinas@bgsu.edu, 419-372-6876. If you have questions about the conduct of this study or your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of Bowling Green State University’s Human Subjects Review Board at 419-372-7716 (hsrb@bgsu.edu).

Thank you again for taking the time to fill out the following survey. Please keep in mind that by “mother” and “motherhood” I am including all of those who self-identify as women parents of children by any means, including foster, adoptive, guardian, and biological.

*Please note that faculty should not complete this survey.*
## APPENDIX E: Tables

Table 15. 
*Research Questions, Independent Variables, Dependent Variables, and Statistical Tests Used.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Test Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Is there a difference between the levels of career satisfaction for women who work full-time in student affairs based on the IVs and DVs? | Satisfaction with career success  
Satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals  
Satisfaction with progress toward meeting income goals  
Satisfaction with progress toward achievement of professional advancement goals  
Satisfaction with progress toward achievement of new professional skill goals | Degree attainment  
Race/ethnicity  
Functional area  
Institutional size  
Motherhood status  
Partnership status | Chi-square Tests of Independence                                                  |
| To what degree are the DVs predictive of career satisfaction for women working full-time in student affairs? | Satisfaction with career success  
Satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals  
Satisfaction with progress toward meeting income goals  
Satisfaction with progress toward achievement of professional advancement goals  
Satisfaction with progress toward achievement of new professional skill goals | Degree attainment  
Race/ethnicity  
Functional area  
Institutional size  
Motherhood status  
Partnership status | Ordinal Regression                                                               |
| What combination of the DVs produces the best predictive                          | Satisfaction with career success  
Number of children  
Current age of women | Number of children  
Current age of women | Ordinal Regression                                                               |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Test Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model of career satisfaction for women working full-time in student affairs?</td>
<td>Satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals</td>
<td>Age when first became a mother</td>
<td>Chi-Square Tests of Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with progress toward meeting income goals</td>
<td>Partnership status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with progress toward achievement of professional advancement goals</td>
<td>Degree attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with progress toward achievement of new professional skill goals</td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a statistically significant difference in levels of career satisfaction between mothers and non-mothers who work full-time in student affairs?</td>
<td>Satisfaction with career success</td>
<td>Motherhood status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals</td>
<td>Current age of women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with progress toward meeting income goals</td>
<td>Age when first became a mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with progress toward achievement of professional advancement goals</td>
<td>Partnership status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with progress toward achievement of new professional skill goals</td>
<td>Degree attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a statistically significant difference in levels of career satisfaction of mothers who work full-time in student affairs based on the variables below?</td>
<td>Satisfaction with career success</td>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>Chi-Square Tests of Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with progress toward meeting career goals</td>
<td>Current age of women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with progress toward meeting income goals</td>
<td>Age when first became a mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree attainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question</td>
<td>Dependent Variables</td>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td>Test Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with progress toward achievement of professional advancement goals</td>
<td>Functional area</td>
<td>Age of child(ren)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with progress toward achievement of new professional skill goals</td>
<td>Institutional size</td>
<td>Length of tenure in field when first became mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16.
Frequency Table of Reported Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Demographics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnership status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, not dating</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, dating</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term committed partnership</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-habitating, exclusively dating</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusively dating, not co-habitating</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/American Indian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-racial/Bi-ethnic/Multi-racial/Multi-ethnic</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina/Hispanic</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Middle Eastern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity not listed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advising</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions/Enrollment management</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult learner services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment/Research</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career planning/Placement</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability student services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual/Transgender awareness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek affairs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Drug and alcohol</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramural/Recreation sports</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial affairs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership development</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural affairs</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious programs</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Demographics</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence life</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service learning</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student activities</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student affairs administration</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student union</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherhood status (Biological, step-, foster, or adoptive parent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children live with mother majority of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle/Junior high school</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult (18+ years of age)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple ages</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school and elementary school</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long working before becoming a mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 or more years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 and above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Demographics</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-2,499 FTE</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500-4,999 FTE</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-9,999 FTE</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-14,999 FTE</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-19,999 FTE</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-29,999 FTE</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-39,999 FTE</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 FTE and above</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with career success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree to some extent</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree to some extent</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with meeting overall career goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree to some extent</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree to some extent</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with income goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree to some extent</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree to some extent</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with professional advancement goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree to some extent</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree to some extent</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with new professional skills development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree to some extent</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree to some extent</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Missing values result in some variables not all adding up to the total sample of 1,080.*
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