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ABSTRACT

This study investigates the number of dual-career faculty couples hired at Baccalaureate I colleges over a five-year period, and further examines how programs, policies, procedures and circumstances are associated with employing dual-career faculty couples. Chief academic officers of all Baccalaureate I colleges in the United States were surveyed. Despite interest in dual-career faculty couples, little information exists about the frequency of hiring these couples at colleges in the United States.

The findings indicate that between 1993 and 1998, approximately the same number of dual-career faculty couples are hired at Baccalaureate I colleges each year: approximately 10% of the new faculty hired annually. Four inhibitors were identified that impact the number that are hired: geographic location of the college and the need for partner assistance; low interaction between academic departments and the use of search committees in hiring; residual effects of former antinepotism policies; and the existence of formal and informal dual-career couple programs.
Findings also indicate that while some professional bureaucracy characteristics were found in the way Baccalaureate I colleges were organized, the organizational structure principally is that of a collegium, with decentralized approaches to such administrative activities as faculty hiring. This structure effects the way in which these colleges respond to hiring dual-career faculty couples. Rather than establishing a formal program or response to hiring such couples, these colleges instead respond to each possibility for a dual-career faculty couple hiring in an ad hoc fashion. This evidence of a collegium provides an explanation for the majority use of ad hoc approaches to the issue of dual-career faculty couple hiring. The institution relies upon a bureaucratic model for general coordination of campus-wide work, but delegates responsibility for faculty hiring to individual departments.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the field of higher education, dual-career faculty couples present a challenge to hiring officials when both members of the couple are seeking employment at the same or geographically close colleges (Helmick, 1992; Hornig, 1997; Loeb, 1997). The number of dual-career faculty couples in academe is large. One recent national study found that 35% of male faculty members and 40% of female faculty members had academic spouses (Astin and Milem, 1997) while a second study of faculty found that 55 percent of the faculty at public and private colleges and universities in Illinois had a partner employed at an academic institution at some time during their faculty careers (Bellas, 1997). Thus, the challenge often faced by hiring officials attempting to recruit a faculty member is to find a second suitable teaching position for a partner on faculties of limited numbers (Blanshan and Gee, 1993; Bruce, 1990; Bruce and Reed, 1991; Weiler and Yancey, 1992).

Typically both partners in dual-career faculty couples have earned a graduate degree and often the terminal degree in the same field or discipline (Miller-Loessi and Henderson, 1997). Therefore, their skills and research interests tend to be in a single, narrowly
defined field. This narrow scope makes their ability to find teaching positions more challenging than if they were able to pursue careers or work in a variety of disciplines or in the business sector. The many considerations colleges should make in filling faculty vacancies, such as a commitment to an established search process utilizing a search committee, limited funding and limited job opportunities in some fields and some communities, challenge an institution's ability to satisfy dual-career faculty couples' employment needs (Hornig, 1997; Shoben, 1997; Wilson, 1999). This challenge can be insurmountable for the couple as well as the college (Astin and Milem, 1997; Brooker-Gross and Maraffa, 1989; Bruce, 1990; Gee, 1991; Weiler and Yancey, 1992; Wilson, 1998). Yet many higher education officials are finding it necessary to address this challenge as the successful recruitment of new faculty in colleges and universities, more frequently in the 1990s than even a decade earlier, involves consideration of such dual-career faculty couple issues as placement of the prospect's partner (Blanshan and Gee, 1993; Bruce and Reed, 1991; Burke, 1988; Gee, 1991; Hornig, 1997).

To further complicate the hiring picture, higher education institutions are facing challenges in the recruitment and retention of a quality workforce. Focusing on faculty, Lozier and Dooris (1991) projected a 24-44% increase in the retirement rate of current post-secondary faculty members between 1987 and 2003, with the largest numbers of faculty retiring between 1998 and 2003. Recent experience suggests this is the case. Many colleges are finding they are retiring a generation of faculty members who were hired in the 1960s and early 70s to teach members of the post-World War II baby boom (Magner, 2000). Not all of these vacancies created by retirements have been filled,
however. Budget cuts faced by many colleges during the 1990s resulted in some vacancies going unfilled (Mooney, 1991; Nicklin, 1992; Schneider, 1998) though there have been some reports of increased faculty hiring recently (Schneider, 1998). Further compounding the problem, studies indicate a decline in the next twenty years in the number of individuals completing doctorates and pursuing careers in academe (Bowen and Sosa, 1989; El-Khawas, 1991; Jacobs, 1990; Kerr, 1990; Lozier and Dooris, 1991; Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education [WICHE], 1992). Given these projections, a growing concern about faculty scarcity has led the academy to focus on the "academic marketplace" and how to recruit and retain the best faculty (Burke, 1988; Matier, 1991; WICHE, 1992). The best faculty talent is needed if colleges are to continue to succeed in the development, advancement, and transmission of knowledge (Blanshan and Gee, 1993). These concerns also call for an increased level of understanding of the factors that are considered by both interviewer and job applicant in the hiring process in higher education, including factors brought forth by dual-career faculty couples such as job search assistance for the partner, commuter arrangements, or child care issues if the couple has children (El-Khawas, Marchese, Fryer, Cartwright and Corrigan, 1990; Helmick, 1992; Shanahan, 1994).
Purpose of the Study

This study investigates the number of dual-career faculty couples that are being hired at Baccalaureate I colleges over a five-year period, and further investigates how programs, policies and procedures are associated with employing dual-career faculty couples.

Statement of the Problem

In spite of interest in higher education media in publications such as *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Academe* about dual-career faculty couples, information has been unavailable about the frequency of hiring these couples until recently (Perry and Perry, 2000; Wilson, 1998). Accounts of the consideration of dual-career issues in hiring exist, but little is known about whether such faculty couples are being hired, and in what proportion to overall faculty hiring (Helmick, 1992; Robbins, 1992; Schneider, 1998; Shanahan, 1994). The issue of dual-career faculty couple hiring, however, should be far from peripheral in higher education. The increase in the number of dual-career faculty couples who desire to make their homes together while also pursuing their academic careers makes this issue crucial to academic hiring situations (Astin and Melim, 1997; Miller-Loessi and Henderson, 1997; Stephan and Kassis, 1997; Wilson, 1996). Additionally, projected faculty shortages indicate that hiring officials in higher education should look to address factors that influence faculty career decisions (Burke, 1988).

1 The Carnegie Classification system utilizes survey data from the United States Department of Education's Integrated Post secondary Education Data System (IPEDS), the National Science Foundation, The College Board, and the 1998 Higher Education Directory published by Higher Education Publications, Inc. in determining the classification of an institution of higher education. The variables employed in determining selectivity for Baccalaureate I Colleges (Liberal Arts) are: entrance examination scores for fall 1996 first-year students and the percentage of fall 1996 first-year students who ranked in the top quarter and top half of their class. Colleges that lack some of these criteria are included if they demonstrate considerable strength in any one category. (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1997)
Matier, 1991). The issues of dual-career faculty couples are such factors. Scholars and journalists have conducted several studies and written articles focusing on specialized aspects of the issue, such as scholarly productivity, the effect of work-family policies upon dual-career faculty couples, the effect of partner job assistance, the lack of traditional gender roles between partners, or career sacrifices of partners (Bellas, 1997; McNish, 1994; Raabe, 1997; Robbins, 1992). But the programs, policies, procedures and circumstances that influence organizational responses to dual-career faculty couples have been overlooked.

**Research Questions**

In order to determine the scope of dual-career faculty couple hiring in Baccalaureate I colleges, and the programs, policies, procedures and circumstances that are associated with dual-career faculty couple hirings, two major research questions guide this research:

1. How many dual-career faculty couples were hired in Baccalaureate I colleges between 1993 and 1998?

2. What programs, policies, procedures and circumstances do chief academic officers perceive as influencing hiring practices of dual-career faculty couples?
Significance of the Study
The literature provides much information from the perspective of the dual-career faculty couples about how they view their relationship and their careers, but little from the perspective of the organization (Ferber and Loeb, 1997; Hornig, 1997). This study provides information from the perspective of the college and with this information, college leaders and faculty couples can gain insights about dual-career faculty couple hiring from the college’s perspective. Administrators and faculty members involved in hiring processes, as well as dual-career faculty couples will have more information about whether such couples are being hired, and college leaders may be able to draw upon this study to better assess the kinds of policies, programs, procedures or circumstances that may assist them in the recruitment and retention of academics who are part of a dual-career faculty couple. Also, dual-career faculty couples will obtain information about how one category of colleges responds to dual-career faculty couples.

Research Plan
In order to answer the research questions, chief academic officers of Baccalaureate I colleges were surveyed about dual-career faculty hiring in relation to total faculty hiring in each of five years, 1993-1998. They were also asked about programs, policies and procedures and institutional considerations in their college that might affect dual-career faculty hirings. The chief academic officers at the one hundred and sixty-six Baccalaureate I colleges were surveyed.
A brief introduction to the literature regarding to Baccalaureate I colleges, professional bureaucracies, and chief academic officers provides insight into how these three areas relate to dual-career faculty hiring. Chapter 2 contains a more extensive analysis of the literature.

**Baccalaureate I Colleges**

Baccalaureate I colleges were chosen to be studied for several reasons. Unlike many other categories of colleges, Baccalaureate I colleges have remained true to the educational mission upon which they were created: to provide a liberal arts education. To a large extent they have not changed their mission to offer degrees in professional areas such as nursing, teaching, accounting or computer technology (Blau, 1994; Breneman, 1994). In addition, they continue to offer primarily undergraduate education, provide a favorable student-to-faculty ratio, admit a high caliber student, and employ a reward structure that favors teaching. (Breneman, 1994; Frank, Shofer and Torres, 1994). Taken together, these conditions create a college setting that values its individual members, emphasizes community, and allows faculty to focus on their individual disciplines, making these colleges a favorable place for faculty members to teach. Clark (1983) describes the institutional culture of certain liberal arts colleges as a vibrant one, with all components of the college pulling together in order to enact the college's approach to education. He goes on to discuss how the long, rich history of these colleges results in the faculty, administration, students and alumni sharing a “credible story of uncommon achievement” (p. 82). Such stories of shared struggle and long history result in a sense of institutional pride, cohesive community and value for individual members of the
community. When this sense is present, such colleges can be seen as among the most desirable teaching settings. It is reasonable to assume the hiring process at these colleges would likewise share this sense of pride and community, and dual-career faculty couples would be a welcome entity.

Chief Academic Officers

This study relies upon the chief academic officers of Baccalaureate I colleges as institutional respondents. These individuals were selected because of their central role in the faculty hiring process (Jugenheimer, 1993; Mech, 1997). Because of their broad administrative involvement in colleges of this size, chief academic officers are likely to be knowledgeable about faculty life and faculty desires and knowledgeable about faculty hiring across the institution (Mech, 1997). They would, therefore, likely be knowledgeable about dual-career faculty couples in their applicant pools.

Professional Bureaucracies

The perspective of professional bureaucracies (Blau, 1994; Mintzberg, 1979; Weick, 1976) provides an organizing scheme for explicating the organizational behavior of Baccalaureate I colleges in this study. An underlying principle associated with professional bureaucracies is that professionals employed by them control the functioning of the organization (Mintzberg, 1979). Professional bureaucracies, like other forms of bureaucracy, utilize specialization, rules, records, impersonal decision making and pre-established programs, policies and procedures to achieve efficiency (Mintzberg, 1979; Weick, 1976). Such pre-established responses, however, may not address unique
situations that arise, such as those involving dual-career faculty couples (Mintzberg, 1979; Satow, 1975). Thus, the organizing principles and structure of a professional bureaucracy were expected to enrich the description about the hiring of dual-career faculty couples in Baccalaureate I institutions.

The remaining chapters will further describe this study and its methodology, the literature pertinent to the study and will present and discuss the findings. Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature, Chapter 3 details methodology, Chapter 4 reports the results of the analyses, and Chapter 5 includes a discussion of the findings, recommendations, and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The literature on dual-career couples in American society first appeared in the early 1970s, and has largely examined dual-career couple issues from the standpoint of the dual-career couple (Bird and Bird, 1987; Gilbert, 1985, 1988, 1993; Hall and Hall, 1979; Hochschild, 1989, 1997; Hood, 1983; Pleck, 1985; Pleck and Staines, 1982; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971; Sekaran, 1986; Shimberg and Beach, 1981; Silberstein, 1992). Many scholarly studies have been undertaken about the changing nature of marriage and family, coping mechanisms employed by partners in dual-career relationships, the encroachment of home life and work life upon one another, and the amount of time each partner spends performing household duties (Astin and Melim, 1997; Bruce, 1990; Gilbert, 1988, 1993; Hall and Hall, 1979; Hochschild, 1997; Kanter, 1977; Orthner and Pittman, 1986; Pleck, 1985; Rapoport and Rapoport, 1971; Vannoy-Hiller and Philliber, 1989).

There is a small body of literature, however, that includes issues associated with dual-career couples from the perspective of organizations (Ferber, O'Farrell and Allen, 1991; Gee, 1991; Helmick, 1992; Vanderkolk and Young, 1991). Dual-career couples are seen as dependent on social, political and economic forces, such as programs, policies and
procedures in use, to address their needs. It is this body of literature that most directly defines the need for this study. Implicit in this literature is the idea that employers understand the problems dual-career partners face as well as the benefits they bring to the workplace. There are even calls for employers to consider dual-career couple needs when hiring and designing benefits programs so that members of such couples do not suffer setbacks in their careers as a result of the multiple demands they have on them as a member of a couple and individual pursuing a career (Blanshan and Gee, 1993; Bruce and Reed, 1991; Ferber and Loeb, 1997; Swoboda, 1993; Weiler and Yancey, 1992). The issues of dual-career faculty couples in higher education begin to appear consistently in this body of literature (Astin and Milen, 1997; Blanshan and Gee, 1993; Ferber and Loeb, 1997; Helmick, 1992; Gee, 1991).

This particular body of literature, however, does not examine the hiring processes that are used or would be used for hiring dual-career faculty couples. Only one study (Helmick, 1992) comes close to analyzing hiring processes from both the college’s and the dual-career faculty couple’s perspective with an examination of the appropriateness and frequency of discussing dual-career issues in the academic interview process. This study, however, is limited in that it looks at dual-career topics, such as partner’s career or issues about children, and their appropriateness in academic interviews. One finding from this study salient for the current research is that even though some of these topics are considered appropriate in academic interviews, neither interviewees nor interviewers initiate them very frequently. Another study (Shanahan, 1994) investigates the effects of dual-career issues on faculty decisions to accept faculty positions at public research
universities. This study, however, is limited in that it focuses on the dual-career faculty couple rather than the institution.

This lack of focus on dual-career faculty couple hiring from the perspective of the college is worrisome, as the growing size of the literature from the perspective of the couple would indicate that this indeed is an issue that colleges need to address. Furthermore, how colleges are configured and how they relate to dual-career faculty couples may impact whether such couples are hired at all, yet this has not been addressed in the available literature.

In order to address the research questions for this study, three areas of literature need to be reviewed. They are the literature on dual-career faculty couples in higher education, the literature on the process for hiring faculty, and the literature describing professional bureaucracies and their programs, policies and procedures. In addition, a more in-depth look at the literature describing Baccalaureate I colleges and the role of the chief academic officers is presented.

Dual-Career Faculty Couples in Higher Education

Academe adds its own unique set of issues, such as finding suitable employment for both partners in the same community, to the more general issues that dual-career faculty couples face, such as multiple role demands and the encroachment of home and work life upon one another (Blanshan and Gee, 1993; Bruce, 1990; Gee, 1991; Miller-Loessi and Henderson, 1997; Wilson, 1998). Such unique issues stem, in part, from the fact that
many colleges are located in communities where they may be the only viable employment option for both partners in a dual-career faculty couple, yet they may not have two available positions or both partners may not be viable candidates if there are two available positions (Miller-Loessi and Henderson, 1997; Perry and Perry, 2000; Raabe, 1997; Wilson, 1996, 1999).

In addition, after they have secured a full-time, tenure-track position, continued employment for faculty members is dependent upon their meeting expectations for promotion and tenure (Astin and Milem, 1997; Blau, 1994; Brakeman, 1983). If one partner fails to have his or her contract renewed, it is likely that the partner will seek another teaching position at another school and their partner will follow them, thus causing greater faculty turnover as a given institution would be losing two, rather than one, faculty member (Blanshan and Gee, 1993; Bruce, 1990; Ferber and Loeb, 1997; Gappa, O'Barr and St. John-Parsons, 1980; Hensel, 1991; McNish, 1994; Shanahan, 1994). Also, for faculty members to advance in their careers, it is typically necessary for them to pursue their careers in full-time, tenure-track higher education positions. If the only available position for a dual-career partner is less than full-time and not on a tenure-track, the partner may have a difficult time pursuing his or her career (Ferber and Hoffman, 1997).

Careers in fields such as higher education, medicine or law, are highly salient for those pursuing them. Individuals in such fields often define themselves in relation to their
career – one is an English professor, not just pursuing a career as an English professor.

For an example, consider Austin and Pilat’s (1990) description of an English professor:

Most professors regard their work not as a job that can be separated from their other responsibilities and interests but rather as a central thread woven through all aspects of their lives, blurring the boundary between the personal and the professional. The interaction of the faculty member's private life with the particular characteristics of the professorial role can be stressful in itself; resulting tensions are exacerbated by current organizational and societal pressures. (p. 38)

While a career in any field is often a large component of a professional’s self-definition (Silberstein, 1992), in academia career success necessitates a round-the-clock pursuit of knowledge in one's field (Kanter, 1977). Faculty must use their "off hours" to prepare for classes, research and write, and perform those duties that their institution considers service to the community. Hensel (1991) states, "a faculty career is demanding; the average professor works 55 hours per week. When child care and home responsibilities are added, a woman can work 70 or more hours per week" (p. iv).

Kanter (1977) describes the career of a full-time faculty member to be absorptive: it pervades all aspects of the faculty member's life. In the situation of a dual-career faculty couple, where there are two people in the same household pursuing career and family activities simultaneously, the situation is further compounded.
In the promotion and tenure process, the typical progression for a new faculty member in a four-year college is to advance from assistant professor to associate professor with tenure, and then to be promoted to full professor (Austin and Pilat, 1990; Caplow and McGee, 1958). This progression is, in part, contingent upon the ability of a faculty member to do research, publish scholarly work, perform service activities, and teach. Of these three, research and publication seem to be of primary importance in some institutions of higher education (Ferber and Green, 1982) while teaching and service may be more highly valued in others (Blau, 1994; Breneman, 1994).

The roles played in the dual-career faculty home may impact the partners’ ability to keep abreast of research and course preparation. Seeborg (1990) studied the sharing of household tasks among dual-career faculty couples at a variety of colleges. Both partners were employed in teaching positions, though not necessarily at the same college. These couples were employed at research universities, community colleges and liberal arts colleges. The findings point to the problems some faculty members, especially faculty women face – they spend more time than their husbands on household tasks. One conclusion from this study is that faculty women have less uninterrupted time to devote to research, writing and course preparation, and thus may encounter more obstacles in their pursuit of their careers.

While responsibilities at home and paid work appear to cause difficulties for both partners, women in dual-career relationships seem to have an especially difficult time in
higher education because higher education has been traditionally a male bastion established by and largely run by men (Hensel, 1991; Maitland, 1990). Among the obstacles to women's achievement in higher education, Maitland includes the following: lack of preparation, lack of sponsorship, overt discrimination, competing obligations and obstacles to productivity. While she argues that these obstacles face all women in academe, and potentially all women in general, competing obligations speak directly to dual-career issues for women. She points out that "women who work still assume an unequal [large] share of the responsibility for housework and child care" (p. 251).

This is not to imply, however, that faculty men in dual-career relationships are immune from the negative aspects of work-family issues. Ferber and Huber (1979) in their study of couples with doctoral degrees, found that men with doctorates married to women at the same educational level published fewer articles than men married to less educated women. It is also possible that men have identified other priorities they wish to pursue. Ferber and Huber, however, are refuted by the work of Bellas (1997), that finds both members of academic couples are actually more productive in scholarly work than are academics married to non-academics. If these couples were pursuing academic careers and we carried this finding to a possible conclusion, it could be said that men in dual-career couple have a difficult journey as well in their pursuit of a career in academe.

In other research focused on the different experiences of partners in a dual-career couple, Bruce (1990) combined research from government and the corporate/private sector with that on dual-career issues in higher education. She surveyed a random sample of the
membership of the American Society for Public Administration about their attitudes on dual-career couples in the workplace and the hiring and promotion policies that affect such couples. When Bruce analyzed responses from university faculty only, she found more faculty women lived apart from their partners than faculty men, a situation that speaks to the likelihood of commuter relationships among dual-career faculty couples. Of the faculty men surveyed, only 57.5% were members of a dual-career faculty couple, compared to 88.2% of the faculty women.

Bruce surmises that women and men in dual-career faculty relationships have different experiences. She found that male members tended to "view the difficulties as positive" (p. 10) while women tended to reflect "a concern about the difficulties of child rearing and the strain on relationships" (p. 11). While Bruce senses a "confused" attitude about dual-career faculty couples, she also clearly sees that each partner must "go it alone rather than have the support of a traditional spouse" (p. 12). She points to a frequently heard comment from both men and women: "I need a wife!" meaning they need a traditional, stay-at-home wife to attend to life's details. Support for this situation can be found in Kanter's (1977) research when she points out that professors work more hours and take more work home than do individuals in other professions.

Faculty men in traditional relationships (an employed male with a stay-at-home partner) often have a "two person career" (Bruce, 1990; Hensel, 1991), meaning the man has a partner at home providing support for his research, writing, teaching and other personal and professional obligations instead of working in the paid labor force. In contrast, dual-
career faculty couples find that they must pursue their careers without this same kind of support at home (Bruce, 1990). In other words, whereas home and family responsibilities were once the domain of one partner and work responsibilities the domain of the other, dual-career faculty couples are faced with having to meet responsibilities in both domains.

Blanshan and Gee (1993) summarized, in part, the financial issues faced by dual-career couples in higher education. Drawing upon their knowledge of higher education in general, they point out that rarely in higher education is one's salary sufficient to pay for the many services that would make living a dual-career lifestyle more easily managed. Services such as car phones, laundry service, restaurant meals, house cleaning, child care or lawn care would begin to deal with the role overload that dual-career couples face. but as Blanshan and Gee state "it is the rare salary in higher education that provides the financial resources to pay for such services" (p. 106). From studies on faculty in research universities, it has been demonstrated that it is also the rare salary that allows for a commuting arrangement, whereby some faculty couples live apart, maintaining two residences in distant communities from one another, in an effort to allow both partners an opportunity to progress in their careers (Bruce, 1990; Gilbert, 1988).

Raabe (1997) examines numerous aspects of how, and to what degree, colleges and universities structure their institutional policies to better accommodate the needs of both single- and dual-career families. Synthesizing recent scholarship, including surveys, case studies, and overarching theories of change, Raabe offers data on family-oriented policies
and programs ranging from maternity leaves to child care to extended tenure policies which have been implemented to address work and family needs. Her work is perhaps the single most comprehensive assessment of institutional responses to family and career issues, but the "family issue" which Raabe minimizes or overlooks is the issue of hiring. In many ways, her article is symptomatic of the larger field of study; much is done of the "after-hire" family issues, but little attention is given to whether, or how often, colleges and universities hire dual-career faculty couples.

Robbins (1992) offers another insight into institutional policies in his study on the effects of "trailing spouse" job assistance on dual-career couples. His study, however, looks at one particular policy, that of job assistance for dual-career partners, and addresses the quality of life issues of dual-career couples who did and did not utilize trailing spouse job assistance when they relocated for a career position for one member of the couple. The study suggests a need to create an environment through programs and practices in organizations that is more supportive of people's personal lives to assist in their successful transition to a new environment.

Other studies are limited by the samples they studied. The dual-career faculty couple literature is based upon the policies and programs mainly at large research universities, despite the fact that a large number of college and university faculty hirings occur at colleges other than research universities. According to U.S. Department of Education figures for Fall 1997, nearly one million persons were employed to teach either full- or part-time at two- and four-year public and private colleges, not research universities, in
the United States (Chronicle of Higher Education, January 28, 2000). Therefore, the experiences of dual-career faculty couples at smaller institutions, institutions with presumably fewer resources and a more intimate community, is missing.

In a recent article, Loeb (1997) cites data from a review of documents and records about partner hiring at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, a research university. Then, despite the inclusive title of *The Art of Hiring in America's Colleges and Universities*, editors Stein and Trachtenberg (1993) also seem to emphasize the problems, policies, and programs common to the large research university, with far less consideration or discussion of other types of colleges. The information their volume provides on colleges centers on the role of the academic dean and search committee in faculty hiring.

Other recent theorists, including Ferber and Hoffman (1997) reflect a similar emphasis on research universities. Bellas (1997), however, offers information from a study of twenty-two institutions in Illinois that represent the nine categories of the Carnegie classification system for higher education. Her work addresses the issue of publication patterns, and specifically looked for differences in faculty productivity between faculty members who were members of dual-career faculty couples and those who were not. While she included a variety of colleges throughout the state of Illinois in her sample, her findings were not specific to the institution at which the various faculty members were employed. Still, aside from Bellas, the faculty hiring literature is narrowly focused on the research university.
An analysis of the literature on dual-career faculty couples suggests there is a long-standing need for higher education officials to address the dilemmas faced by such couples. As long as two decades ago, Gappa, O’Barr and St. John-Parsons (1980) argued that changes were needed in the traditional family as well as the institutional structure if career and family are to prosper in a family with a dual-career faculty couple. In a recent article, Perry and Perry (2000) stated that in 1983 they suggested that individuals at both the academic department and college level should be more imaginative about what they can do to better help establish dual-career faculty couples in academic positions. Smart and Smart (1990) state quite strongly that:

Indeed. if the university were fulfilling its role as social leader and innovator. it would be far ahead of other employment sectors, showing companies how to keep their top talent and how to facilitate above-average performance through new career arrangements. (p. 33)

But even beyond this leadership role, self-interest and self-preservation dictate a need to address the issue of accommodating dual-career couples in higher education (Schneider, 1998). As Blanshan and Gee (1993) remark,

The significant other has become most significant with respect to an institution's ability to attract and retain ordinary, much less prime candidates for faculty and staff positions. Few colleges or universities have developed, much less perfected,
the art of hiring in the context of the dual-career couple. Yet certainly their
success, and for some even their survival, may depend on this very talent. (p. 101)

One decade earlier, Brakeman (1983) foreshadowed Blanshan and Gee’s (1993)
supposition. Brakeman discussed the illusion of a buyer’s market for faculty in higher
education and pointed out that college administrators should take an active and positive
approach if they hope to attract the best candidates for their faculty positions; some of
whom may be members of dual-career faculty couples. While outlining the complexities
of dual-career couple arrangements, such as commuting marriages, Brakeman called
attention to the increasing numbers of dual-career faculty couples. He also suggested that
colleges, especially those in relatively isolated geographic areas, need to find creative
solutions to this dual-career circumstance as a way of maintaining a quality faculty.

From this literature, it appears there are few answers and many questions raised when
institutions are considering hiring dual-career faculty couples. Blanshan and Gee’s (1993)
call for a response has been virtually unheeded.

The Faculty Hiring Process in Higher Education

To understand how dual-career faculty couples can be accommodated in the hiring
process in higher education, the literature on organization career systems and the hiring
process provides some insights. Three themes emerge from this literature: labor markets
exist in higher education organizations; hiring in higher education organizations is
governed by an agreed upon set of policies and practices; and career patterns in higher
education are highly variable for administrators, though well defined for faculty. The themes in this particular body of literature may provide an understanding of the programs, policies and procedures that affect the process by which persons get matched to positions in higher education.

The first theme, the existence of labor markets in higher education, is borrowed from manufacturing organizations and adapted for professional organizations (Granovetter, 1974; Johnsrud, Sagaria and Heck, 1992). In higher education, labor markets are divided into internal and external markets. Internal markets are comprised of those employees within either the organization or the specific career or occupation from which the organization draws employees. Faculty candidates for teaching positions are members of internal labor markets as they must be credentialed in specific academic disciplines to be considered for positions in that discipline. External markets, on the other hand, are those persons outside of the organization or occupation, but within geographic arenas that the organization draws from (Johnsrud, Sagaria and Heck, 1992; Rosenbaum, 1984; Twombly, 1988). Several studies since 1958 (Brown, 1967; Burke, 1988; Caplow and McGee, 1958; Johnsrud, Sagaria and Heck, 1992; Ross and Green, 1990; Sagaria, 1988; Twombly, 1990) have established the existence of internal labor markets in higher education, confirmed the tendency to promote employees in administrative positions and to allow entry into the labor market principally at lower levels of the organization. Faculty members are typically hired into a college as “assistant professors” or “instructors,” the lowest levels of faculty hierarchy. There is an implication in this theme for hiring dual-career faculty couples – if faculty members are typically hired at the
lowest levels of faculty hierarchy, dual-career faculty couples may be more likely to be considered for employment during earlier stages of both partner's careers.

The second theme, the existence of policies and practices for hiring, centers around the idea that the accepted practice for hiring and occupational mobility in higher education is for vacancies to be advertised and selection to be made by a search committee (Greenberg, 1993; Volkmann, 1993). Greenberg points out that the desire to democratize the hiring process and increase participation in hiring has led hiring officials to rely on search committees for most positions on campus, but especially for faculty positions. The normative practice for faculty hiring is for an individual to apply for an advertised position and have the application materials screened by a search committee (Long, Allison and McGinnis, 1979; Ross and Green, 1990; Van Ommeren, Sneed, Wulfemeyer and Riffe, 1991).

Following the search committee paper screening process is the selection interview, one of the most widely used techniques for obtaining new employees (Caruth, Noe and Mondy, 1988; Schneider and Schmitt, 1986). The interview serves as a way for the faculty candidate and the organization to obtain information about one another so that both can make an informed employment decision. Typically, most faculty candidates interview with two and three interviewers, and some with as many as four to six (Cox, Schlueter, Moore and Sullivan, 1989; Greenberg, 1993). In faculty searches, in addition to the search committee interview, a common practice is for a candidate to interview with
students, departmental faculty members, the academic dean and possibly the college president (Greenberg, 1993).

A sensitive issue associated with the selection interview, as well as the position offer negotiation, is that both interviewer and interviewee are frequently unclear about appropriate topics to communicate about (Helmick, 1994; Stewart and Cash, 1982). Affirmative action guidelines call for only questions that are job related, and thus a discussion of a candidate's "personal situation" may fall into a gray area, with each side not knowing what issues can and should be addressed (Greenberg, 1993; Helmick, 1994; Shoben, 1997). Helmick's (1994) study of dual-career faculty and administrators at two research universities demonstrated that though both faculty candidates and interviewers felt certain topics affecting dual-career couples, such as vacation schedules and promotions, were appropriate to discuss, both faculty candidates and their interviewers were reluctant to initiate the topic in the interview process. Therefore, issues that are crucial to both the dual-career couple and the organization in their decision making may not be discussed.

Overall, the faculty hiring process literature provides helpful insights for both dual-career faculty couples and higher education organizations. It suggests that dual-career faculty couples need to consider the stage each partner is at in their career when they apply for positions (Brown, 1967; Burke, 1988; Caplow and McGee, 1958; Johnsrud, Sagaria and Heck, 1992; Ross and Green, 1990; Sagaria, 1988; Twombly, 1990) and a need for all
parties to gain comfort discussing dual-career faculty couple issues in the interview process (Helmick, 1994).

Programs, Policies and Procedures of Professional Bureaucracies

The literature on professional bureaucracies (Blau, 1994; Mintzberg, 1979; Weick, 1976) provides a framework for understanding the organizing structure of Baccalaureate 1 colleges and how the programs, policies and procedures they have in place affect the hiring of dual-career faculty couples. Scholarship about professional bureaucracies assumes that control for the internal functioning of the organization is in the hands of the professionals employed there – faculty and administrators. Thus, if a dual-career faculty couple were being considered for positions at a college, it is professional colleagues who decide whether or not to offer a position to a candidate. This process is unlike what is typically found in business organizations where a specialist, such as a human resources officer, would screen, interview and ultimately hire a candidate for any position in the organization (Bruce, 1990; Bruce and Blackburn, 1992; Burack, 1993).

Blau (1994) posited that organizations typically have administrative machinery with a staff that maintains and coordinates the activities of its members. The term "bureaucracy" is often used to refer to the organizational and administrative aspects of organizations, including their hierarchy (Blau, 1994; Iannello, 1992). Some theorists have described colleges and universities as having a bureaucratic organizing structure, but one of a professional nature, thus a professional bureaucracy (Mintzberg, 1979; Satow, 1975; Weick, 1976).
Professional bureaucracies are characterized as flat, decentralized structures whose functions are controlled by professionals. In colleges and universities which are disciplinary-oriented or highly selective, such as Baccalaureate I colleges, the professionals exercising control over hiring are both faculty and administrators (Blau, 1994; Boland, 1973; Bolman and Deal, 1991; Mintzberg, 1979). The professionals are socialized to values, norms and professional practices, in part, through their graduate experiences and participation in scholarly/professional organizations (Mintzberg, 1979; Perrow, 1970; Satow, 1975). Because of this socialization of faculty from outside their college of employment, a faculty member’s primary allegiance is to his or her profession or academic discipline, and not necessarily to the college at which they serve (Perrow, 1970; Satow, 1975). The adherence to professional values is the glue that binds the members of a professional bureaucracy together and coordinates their work. In colleges this coordination is possible because academic disciplines have similar values and norms such as autonomy, peer review, academic freedom, and low coordination of faculty activities, and the coordination of the organization’s work is achieved through this (Clark, 1983, 1991).

The professional values underpinning faculty roles and work make the decentralized governance of a professional bureaucracy possible (Mintzberg, 1979; Satow, 1975). However, traditional bureaucratic features coexist with values of the professoriate in professional bureaucracies (Blau, 1994). For example, traditional bureaucratic features such as policies, programs and procedures are put into place to carry out the work of the
organization. These policies, programs and procedures result in standardized responses to a variety of predetermined situations such as a request for employment assistance for a faculty candidate’s partner and further allow the organization to quickly respond to requests or situations. These policies, programs and procedures are known as “pigeonholes” in professional bureaucracies (Mintzberg, 1979; Perrow, 1970; Weick, 1976) and coexist with the values identified by the professorate. If, for example, the professorate identifies hiring dual-career faculty couples as something they value, they will work to create a dual-career faculty couple pigeonhole for that situation.

Problems of innovation arise for institutions that do not have pigeonholes in place for unique or unanticipated situations (Mintzberg, 1979). In faculty hiring, this could mean that when an applicant brings a unique situation, such as the introduction of employment assistance for a dual-career faculty partner, a new response must be formed quickly. This, however, may be difficult for an institution to do since the work of the college is shaped by academic norms that faculty reinterpret from their graduate socialization and professional and disciplinary referent groups, rather than from their organization of employment. When organizational responses are influenced by the academic profession, it is difficult and slow for the organization to change (Mintzberg, 1979). As a result, a professional bureaucracy may be somewhat inflexible. This inflexibility, when combined with a reluctance on the part of both interviewer and interviewee to discuss dual-career faculty couple issues in the interview process (Helmick, 1994), suggests that the creation of a pigeonhole which can be useful for hiring members of dual-career faculty couples may never occur.
In the hiring process for faculty, faculty members and administrators are the professionals who consider the needs of dual-career faculty couples. Since a professional bureaucracy utilizes pigeonholing, the pigeonholes present, such as the use of prescriptive search procedures and search committees, may not address unique situations that arise, such as dual-career faculty hiring situations (Perrow, 1970; Weick, 1976). In other words, professional bureaucracies tend not to be problem solving structures; and therefore they tend not to change their established ways (Mintzberg, 1979).

Baccalaureate I Colleges

Baccalaureate I colleges were chosen to be studied for a variety of reasons. Unlike many other categories of colleges, Baccalaureate I colleges have maintained their commitment to providing traditional, liberal arts educations. They have not turned toward more immediately marketable subjects, such as those in technology or other vocational areas, but rather have continued to offer "education for education's sake" (Blau, 1994; Breneman, 1994; Delucchi, 1997). Their mission of educating undergraduate students makes them desirable for faculty seeking teaching positions in the liberal arts (Breneman, 1994).

In addition, these colleges are small with enrollments of typically 1,500 or less, further making them desirable places to teach. A student body of this size results in a student-faculty ratio rarely higher than fifteen to one (Breneman, 1994), which offers an intimate setting in which to teach. Still other reasons for choosing this category of college for this
study include a faculty reward structure that favors excellent teaching and selective admissions that favor a high caliber undergraduate student (Blau, 1994; Breneman, 1994).

Overall, this commitment to providing traditional, liberal arts undergraduate education to high caliber students in a small setting that rewards excellent teaching, portrays the Baccalaureate I college setting as an intimate, personal one that fosters close interaction and emphasizes community. As such, it is reasonable to speculate that the faculty hiring process might also favor more personal interaction and attention to individual needs. If personal interaction and community are valued and encouraged in the hiring process at these colleges, it is likely they would be receptive to hiring dual-career faculty couples.

Chief Academic Officers

Chief academic officers were selected as the individual to respond on behalf of the college because among the many roles of chief academic officers, hiring personnel can entail a considerable amount of time (Jugenheimer, 1993; Mech, 1997). Colleges may have some variations in their search procedures, but it is unlikely that the chief academic officer would be bypassed in the faculty hiring process (Jugenheimer, 1993). At the very least, chief academic officers are often the final arbiters of faculty hiring decisions, and are usually privy to the entire process of recruitment, interviewing, and post-offer negotiation (Blau, 1994; Breneman, 1994; Jugenheimer, 1993).
Mech (1997), in his study of the managerial roles of chief academic officers, found that such individuals serving in smaller colleges likely have a wider span of control over various managerial functions, including the interviewing and hiring of new faculty. In addition, he found that this larger span of control required greater interpersonal skills to generate good will, obtain favors or to procure services, activities which may be needed in a hiring situation. It is reasonable to expect that the chief academic officer in a Baccalaureate I college is more knowledgeable about all aspects of faculty life and hiring than in a highly decentralized or large institution of higher education. Thus, asking the chief academic officer to respond to a questionnaire about faculty hiring practices on behalf of the college is appropriate.

This review of the literature demonstrates that dual-career faculty couple hiring is an issue facing higher education institutions. It also demonstrates that the standard hiring process in colleges organized as professional bureaucracies, including the use of search committees and the selection interview, may not provide an adequate response for the college to use if they decide to hire such couples. The literature review further demonstrates that dual-career faculty couple hiring is also influenced by circumstances such as the size of the community in which the college is located.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The literature review noted a lack of studies on dual-career faculty couples from the perspective of the college, as well as a lack of understanding about how programs, policies and procedures may help or hinder hiring couples. This study seeks to report the number of dual-career faculty couples hired in Baccalaureate I colleges over a five-year period in relation to the total number of faculty hired. Further, it seeks to determine whether the institution’s programs, policies, procedures and circumstances that are perceived by chief academic officers as being associated with hiring decisions had any impact on hiring such couples.

The study examines dual-career faculty couples in which one or both partners were being considered for a faculty position at a given college, but where both partners were actively seeking employment at the same time. Even though the study addresses dual-career faculty couple hiring, the unit of analysis is the college, and information is sought from the chief academic officer on behalf of the college. In order to provide a single-time description of dual-career faculty couple hiring, a modified cross-sectional survey design was used (Babbie, 1990). The design was modified to survey the entire population of
Baccalaureate I colleges, rather than a sample of this population, because the number of
colleges (166) was manageable.

Research Questions

The study addresses two research questions:

1. How many dual-career faculty couples were hired in Baccalaureate I colleges
   between 1993 and 1998?

2. What programs, policies and procedures do chief academic officers perceive
   as influencing hiring practices of dual-career faculty couples?

The first research question inquires about the number of dual-career faculty couples hired
in five recent years, 1993 through 1998. Respondents were asked two questions which
provided the data to answer this question: how many full-time faculty positions were
filled at their institution during each academic year under study and then, did they hire
any members of dual-career faculty couples to fill these positions. The data were
analyzed to show the relationship of dual-career faculty couple hiring to total faculty
hiring, and further, was analyzed to determine if there is significant change in this
relationship from year to year.

The second research question investigates whether there are programs, policies or
procedures that chief academic officers perceive influence the hiring practices of dual-
career faculty couples. Several programs, policies and procedures frequently found in colleges were identified in the literature, and chief academic officers responded to questions about the extent to which they believe each affect the hiring of dual-career faculty couples. The data were analyzed to show which programs, policies and procedures most encouraged and which least encouraged dual-career faculty couple hiring.

Instrument

The questionnaire (Appendix A) was developed to obtain general information about the college, such as size of the community in which the college is located, but its primary purpose was to obtain data to answer the research questions. The data sought included the number of faculty hired in each year under study, the number of that total who were members of a dual-career faculty couple, and information regarding programs, policies and procedures which may influence dual-career faculty couple hiring. The Human Subjects Review Committee of The Ohio State University reviewed and approved the questionnaire.

The questionnaire contains three sections and could be completed by most chief academic officers in approximately 45 minutes. Section I, which contains six multiple-choice questions, requests demographic information from the chief academic officers about themselves and their colleges. This information – gender, race, age, years in current position, years at particular institution, and geographic location of institution – is designed to describe the instrumental designated respondent as well as the institution
itself. Other descriptive information about the colleges was obtained from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Survey, an annual survey conducted by the United States Department of Education of all colleges and universities in the country; the Chronicle of Higher Education, Facts and Figures; the 1999 Barron’s Guide to Colleges; and from data collected annually by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Information on faculty hiring is elicited in Section II. Specifically, this section contains four yes/no and short answer questions about the total number of faculty persons hired in each of five academic years: 1993-94 through 1997-98. Following this initial question, respondents are asked if they hired any members of dual-career faculty couples to fill these positions, and if they were aware of any such individuals in the applicant pools for their faculty positions. If the respondents had hired a member of a dual-career faculty couple, they were also asked to provide employment information about the individual’s partner, if this information was known. This section is designed to address research question 1.

Section III is designed to gather three kinds of information, and asks a total of seven questions. The first four questions, which are asked in a yes/no or don’t know format, seek information about programs or plans that may have been in place, either formally or informally, which serve to address the needs of dual-career faculty couples. The remainder of this section asks respondents to communicate their perceptions about programs, policies and procedures or other factors such as campus environment, staffing issues or salary considerations present at their colleges that may have an effect on the
hiring of dual-career faculty couples. The fifth question, which includes eight components, presented in a Likert-type scale, inquires about the extent to which various factors, such as the location of the institution or the presence of resources, encouraged or discouraged the hiring of dual-career faculty couples. The sixth question, which also includes eight components asked on a Likert-type scale, seeks information regarding the programs, policies and procedures present at an institution that may have influenced, either positively or negatively, the hiring of dual-career faculty couples. The seventh question in this section asks respondents to share, in an open-ended format, any other thoughts they may have regarding dual-career faculty couples.

**Pilot Study**

In December 1998, a pilot study of the questionnaire was pretested with the chief academic officers of eight "Baccalaureate II" colleges. Dillman (1978) recommends that mail questionnaires can be pretested with, among others, a group of potential users of the data, or a group of potential respondents. The purpose of pretesting is to answer several questions about whether the survey questions measure what they are intended to measure. Such questions include whether the words are understood, whether the questions are interpreted similarly by all respondents, does the questionnaire motivate people to answer it and does the questionnaire suggest bias on the part of the researcher (Dillman, 1978). In effect, the pretest should test the questionnaire as well as the questions.

The pretest sample for this study was eight Baccalaureate II colleges, and was similar to the full study with the colleges selected closely matched to Baccalaureate I colleges on
the criteria of mission, degrees offered, and selectivity in the admission of new students.
The researcher called chief academic officers by telephone to ask them to participate in
the survey, and eight questionnaires were distributed. Participants agreed to complete the
questionnaire twice, with a one-week interval between administrations, in order to
address the pretest concerns outlined by Dillman (1978). In addition, the researcher spoke
by telephone with the chief academic officers at the six colleges who ultimately
responded. The outcome of pretesting confirmed that the questionnaire yielded the type
of information needed to study the actual hiring of dual-career couples and the programs,
policies and procedures that impact such hiring and that it was understood and questions
interpreted as the researcher intended. The response rate for the pilot study was 75%
(n=6).

Population
The 166 colleges classified as Baccalaureate I were the institutions studied, with the
entire population surveyed. Typically, a survey examines a sample from a population
(Babbie, 1990), but because of the relatively small and manageable size of the
Baccalaureate I population, the entire population was surveyed. The chief academic
officer was designated the institutional respondent. The listing of these colleges was
obtained from The Chronicle of Higher Education, Almanac issue 1997-1998. The
colleges surveyed are diverse in terms of size of the geographical community in which
they are located, urban/rural location, and sources of funding, with some colleges being
privately funded and others receiving assistance from their state budgets. These colleges
have somewhat similar enrollments: most enroll between 1500-2500 undergraduate students (Chronicle of Higher Education, January 28, 2000).

Data Collection

Data for the study were collected through a mail questionnaire and follow-up telephone interviews of selected survey respondents. Utilizing a modified Total Design Method (Dillman, 1978), questionnaires and a pre-addressed, stamped return envelope were sent to the 166 chief academic officers in late February 1999. Each questionnaire was coded so institutional characteristics would be available for analysis, and to facilitate follow-up to non-respondents. The cover letter outlined the purpose of the research and provided assurances of the anonymity of responses. (Appendix A)

Electronic mail reminders were sent to individuals in the sample who had not yet returned a questionnaire two weeks after the initial mailing. Six weeks after the initial mailing, a second complete packet was sent to those who had not yet responded. In mid-June 1999, a questionnaire was sent via electronic mail to those who had still not yet responded. (Appendix B)

Sending questionnaires via electronic mail was not as efficient as utilizing the U.S. mail system. It may be that the technical expertise of the respondents varied, or that formatting between electronic mail systems varied and the questionnaire was not user friendly once received, and thus telephone follow-ups were necessary to complete some questionnaires that were returned via electronic mail. Twenty-six responses were received electronically,
consisting of either a completed questionnaire or an explanation of why the respondent
was unable to respond to this request.

Data Analysis

The first research question determines the number of dual-career faculty couples hired in
Baccalaureate I colleges between 1993 and 1998. Specifically, respondents were asked
how many dual-career faculty couples were hired between 1993 and 1998 at their
colleges in relation to the total number of faculty hired during these years.

The analysis of this section was conducted by first generating descriptive statistics to
determine the percentage of dual-career faculty couples hired in relation to the total
faculty hired in each of the years under study. Then, the data were analyzed to determine
which variables were identified by the chief academic officer as impacting, either
positively or negatively, the hiring of dual-career faculty couples. The variables which
appeared to have the strongest impact were size of the community in which the college is
located, the kind of employment that the dual-career faculty partner found, and the
perception of the quality of the partner by the chief academic officer.

The second research question asks what programs, policies, procedures and
circumstances of professional bureaucracies do chief academic officers perceive
influence their hiring or not hiring of dual-career faculty couples. Respondents were
asked for three kinds of information to address this research question: information
regarding formal or informal programs or plans that may be or have been in place to
address the needs of dual-career faculty couples; information regarding the extent to which various factors, such as location of institution or the presence of resources, encourage or discourage the hiring of dual-career faculty couples; and third, information regarding policies, practices or circumstances present at an institution that may also impact the hiring of dual-career faculty couples.

The analysis of this section was conducted by generating mean scores to determine what programs, policies and procedures the chief academic officers felt encouraged or did not encourage the hiring of dual-career faculty couples. Then, the data about programs, policies, procedures and circumstances which were found to have an impact, as well as those which were found to not have an impact, were analyzed for the patterns they suggested and these patterns were described.

In analyzing data to answer both research questions, descriptive statistics were generated, but the analysis did not extend beyond this type of quantification. Adams and Schvaneveldt (1991) discuss the types of statistics researchers use to help make decisions. They point out that descriptive statistics are often the sole type of statistical information that is needed to describe the population being studied, and that many times the opinion or central attitude of a specific group is sufficient for answering research questions. Because the purpose of this study is to inquire about the number of dual-career faculty couples hired and the chief academic officer’s opinion on programs, policies, procedures and circumstances that may affect such hiring, descriptive statistics are sufficient for answering the research questions. In addition, descriptive statistics are
appropriate for this study, rather than inferential statistics, because the entire population was studied, rather than a sample of the population (Adams and Schvaneveldt, 1991; Babbie, 1990).

Response Rate

The response rate was calculated by eliminating the ineligible contacts (Dillman, 1978), thus the response rate is: the number of usable questionnaires returned (n=49) divided by the number in the sample (n=166) minus the number noneligible and nonreachable participants (n=7) multiplied by 100. A 30.8% response rate was achieved. Calculating the response rate in this way accounts for those questionnaires that were unable to reach the intended respondent, due to circumstances beyond the researcher’s control. Participants were determined to be either noneligible or nonreachable because either the chief academic officer’s position was vacant, the incumbent was not at the institution, or the incumbent was on a sabbatical leave during the period the study was conducted.

Trustworthiness and Reliability

Two procedures were employed to enhance the trustworthiness and reliability of the data and findings (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Marshall and Rossman, 1995; Patton, 1990) and to provide more in-depth data. These procedures are follow-up interviews and member checks with survey respondents. Babbie (1990) cautions that the methods for maximizing reliability in survey research are straightforward: ask people only questions they are likely to know the answers to, ask about things relevant to them, and be clear in what is
being asked. Data from ten (10) follow-up interviews and member checks yielded responses that were similar to the completed questionnaires.

Of the 49 questionnaires that were suitable for analysis, 20.41% (n=10) respondents were selected for follow-up telephone interviews. Those colleges selected were chosen purposefully so that they could also serve as a member check for the data collected (Patton, 1990) because they represented the various community sizes that Baccalaureate I schools are located in, as well as a broad spectrum of experience with hiring dual-career faculty couples. These telephone interviews were completed during August and September 1999.

In preparing for these interviews, each questionnaire was read to determine whether the institution had hired dual-career faculty couples, and for comments that were representative of patterns in the data. Specifically, respondents were asked to expand upon their written responses, clarify information reported in their questionnaire, and to discuss the survey questions in more depth or to verify the researcher’s interpretation of the data they provided. It was determined that follow up interviews would be attempted with colleges that represented a cross section of experience with hiring dual-career faculty couples. That is, some colleges had hired dual-career faculty couples and some had not. Also, the colleges are located in communities of diverse sizes, ranging from rural communities of less than 2,500 people to very large cities of 500,000 people or more.
Comparison of Respondents to Non-Respondents

A random sample of 40 non-respondent colleges was drawn so that non-respondent and respondent institutions could be compared to determine if the two groups were statistically similar and therefore the survey responses of the respondents could be generalized to non-respondents. Although the Carnegie Foundation measures each college in its classification system against the same criteria, such as selectivity in admissions, colleges within classifications share many common characteristics (Carnegie Foundation, 2000). Four characteristics that might influence the nature of the responses of institutions were identified (Breneman, 1994): full-time headcount size of the student body, full-time headcount size of the faculty, annual tuition cost, and size of the community in which the institution is located.² In order to apply the findings drawn from this study to all Baccalaureate I colleges, it is necessary to show that there are no statistical differences between the sets of respondent colleges and non-respondent colleges, so data were compared on these variables.

The variable of tuition was eliminated because of influences present in colleges that can impact tuition rates, and result in wide variability in tuition costs (Delucchi, 1997). Examples of these influences include size of endowment, an institution’s spending rate on their endowment, and whether a college receives financial assistance from their state’s government. Because the data on these influences would have been difficult to obtain, this variable was not considered in this comparison.

² Information for this comparison was obtained from four sources: the Chronicle of Higher Education, Facts and Figures edition (January 28, 2000); The Carnegie Foundation’s world-wide web site
Two of the remaining variables, full-time faculty headcount and full-time student headcount, are frequently presented in relationship to one another, as a faculty-to-student ratio. One common characteristic of Baccalaureate I colleges is a low faculty-to-student ratio (Breneman, 1994; Delucchi, 1997). Because of this, it was decided to measure the extent to which the two variables may be related. A correlation analysis was performed to determine the strength of the relationship between two variables (Anderson, Sweeney and Williams, 1987; Galfo, 1983). Results of the analysis indicate the two variables are correlated in a positive linear sense, and thus there is no statistical value in utilizing both variables for further analysis. The researcher chose to use full-time student headcount as the variable to be analyzed.

The values of the population variances in the population of Baccalaureate I colleges are unknown. Because sample sizes are small, it is necessary to make certain assumptions about the underlying population (Anderson, Sweeney and Williams, 1987; Galfo, 1983). These assumptions include: the population of Baccalaureate I schools, including both respondent and non-respondent schools, is normal; the sample of the respondents and non-respondents is a normal random sample, with each set independent of the other; and the population variances of each set of data, respondents and non-respondents, are assumed to be equal.
A t-test was calculated to compare respondents and non-respondents on the variable of full-time student headcount. The average headcount enrollment of respondent colleges was 1185.84 (SD=747.8) and the average of non-respondent colleges is 1443.84 (SD = 526.7). Results of the t-test indicate the respondent colleges and non-respondent colleges are similar on the variable of full-time student headcount and thus it is reasonable to apply findings from this study to all Baccalaureate I colleges. Appendix C contains detailed information on t-test results.

Similarly, there is little difference between respondent and non-respondent colleges in terms of the size of the communities in which they are located. Figure 3-1 depicts the locations of respondent and non-respondent colleges.

**Figure 3-1.** Geographic Community Size of Respondent and Non-Respondent Colleges.
An analysis of Figure 3-1 shows both respondent and non-respondent schools distributed very similarly throughout the various community sizes. The greatest difference between the two samples is in the number of schools located in large towns as compared to the number located in small cities. Among respondent colleges, there are 11 more colleges located in large towns than small cities, whereas in non-respondent colleges, the difference between colleges located in large towns versus small cities is much smaller, with 2 more located in large towns rather than small cities.

Limitations

A limitation of this study is the low response rate. Dillman (1978) discusses several common reasons for low response rates, including poor timing of the survey, lack of interest on the part of the respondent, or difficulty in getting the questionnaire to the correct individual. All three of these reasons could be at play in this study.

The questionnaire was mailed to respondents in early spring, which may have been a busier time of the academic year for chief academic officers as they prepared for spring commencements and the close of an academic year. Presumably, the first round of questionnaires arrived around the time of the college’s annual spring break. It is possible that the workload at this time of the academic year, coupled with the possibility that some chief academic officers were off-campus, was greater than at other times of the academic year and completing the questionnaire was not a priority (Mech, 1997).
Because recipients of mail questionnaires have an opportunity to examine the questionnaire in its entirety prior to deciding to respond (Bassie, 1990; Dillman, 1978), it is possible that if they are not interested in the topic, they would discard the questionnaire. If the topic of the questionnaire is of interest to the potential respondent, or they have experience with the topic, they are more likely to respond.

It is also possible that the questionnaire may not have been delivered to the chief academic officer if another staff member opened it. Frequently chief academic officers have support staff who open and sort their mail, and questionnaires may not always get passed along to chief academic officers.

Another limitation is the reliance upon the recall of respondents. In many cases, the chief academic officers relied on recall, rather than institutional records, to provide information about faculty hiring. Bassie (1990) cautions that relying on recall can be problematic. Those who completed the questionnaire may have recalled only the more successful of their hirings, which could result in an underreporting of the actual numbers of members of dual-career faculty couples hired. Also, some chief academic officers had not been at their colleges for the entire five-year period under study and thus were not able to provide data for all five years.

Bassie (1990) also cautions that questions that are irrelevant to potential respondents are likely to produce unreliable answers. In the same way, if chief academic officers saw no
relevance in the survey topic, they may not have responded. Or, if they did respond, the data provided may be unreliable.

The study is also limited by a lack of diversity in the number of responses from each school. Some survey questions inquired about programs, policies, procedures or circumstances present in these colleges and the respondent’s perception about how these impact dual-career faculty couple hiring. Given that the questionnaire was completed by only one individual – the chief academic officer – the responses provided are based upon the limited viewpoint of one individual and may not be an accurate reflection of the issue of dual-career faculty couple hiring. Others involved in hiring – department chairs or perhaps even dual-career faculty couples themselves – may bring different perspectives.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Introduction

The purposes of this study were to determine how many dual-career faculty couples were hired in recent years at Baccalaureate I colleges and to determine whether there were programs, policies, procedures or circumstances at these colleges that influence the hiring practices of such couples. The findings are presented in this chapter.

The Number of Dual-Career Faculty Couple Hirings In Baccalaureate I Colleges

This study found that approximately the same number of dual-career faculty couples are hired at Baccalaureate I colleges each year. Members of dual-career faculty couples comprised approximately 10% of the total faculty hired in each year. Section II of the questionnaire contained questions regarding the number of faculty hired overall and the number of members of dual-career faculty couples hired in each of the five years.

Overall, from 1993-1998, chief academic officers reported a total of 1728 full-time, tenure-track faculty hired. Of this number, a reported 10.2% (n=176) were members of dual-career faculty couples. The change in percentage from year to year under study was small. In 1993-94, 10.9% (n=35) of the faculty hired were members of dual-career faculty
couples; 8.9% (n=29) were in 1994-95; in 1995-96, 9.5% (n=32); in 1996-97, 9.6% (n=33); and in 1997-98, 11.7% (n=47). Figure 4-1 illustrates the raw number comparison of dual-career faculty couple hiring to non dual-career faculty hiring from 1993-1998.

![Figure 4-1: Comparison of Dual-Career Faculty Couple Hiring to Non Dual-Career Faculty Couple Hiring at Baccalaureate I Colleges Responding to Survey](image)

To further understand the pattern of dual-career faculty couple hiring in comparison to overall faculty hiring, it is helpful to examine circumstances that affect such hiring. Findings from this study indicate three circumstances are pertinent to this issue. They are: the population size of the community in which the college is located, the employment opportunities available for the dual-career faculty partner in the community, and perceptions held by the college – as articulated by the chief academic officer - regarding the quality of dual-career faculty partners.
Location of College

Baccalaureate I colleges are located in communities ranging in size from rural communities to very large cities. In analyzing the data, a comparison was made of the number of dual-career faculty couples hired to the geographic location of the college within each category of community sizes.

The findings indicate colleges located in large towns (population 10,000-49,999) hired more faculty members than colleges located in other kinds of locations, with 37% (n=66) of such hirings happening at these colleges. Colleges located in small towns (population 2,500-9,999) were the next most active, with 27% (n=47); followed by colleges in small cities (population 50,000-249,999) with 18% (n=31); those in rural communities (population under 2,500) with 10% (n=17); those in very large cities (population over 500,000) with 5% (n=9) and finally those in large cities (population 250,000-499,999) with 3% (n=6). Figure 4-2 illustrates this community size information.

Figure 4-2: Dual-Career Faculty Couple Hiring by Community Size
When asked about various factors, including location, over half of the chief academic officers were clear that location was the most significant factor in that their location either encouraged or discouraged to some degree their hiring of dual-career faculty couples. Of the respondents, 32.7% (n=16) said that their location either “strongly discouraged” or “discouraged” hiring members of dual-career faculty couples. Conversely, 24.5% (n=12) said that their location either “encouraged” or “strongly encouraged” the hiring of dual-career faculty couples. For 42.8% (n=21), location was seen as having no effect. These findings support those in the literature which point to the importance of location in dual-career faculty couple hiring with respect to employment possibilities for partners (Hornig, 1997; Szafran, 1984).

**Opportunities For Dual-Career Faculty Partners**

Further understanding of the pattern of dual-career faculty hiring related to overall faculty hiring comes from an examination of the type of employment opportunities available for partners. It is reasonable to expect that if suitable employment opportunities are not available for partners at or near the same college as their partner, the hiring of dual-career faculty couples will be unlikely. Conversely, if suitable employment opportunities are available, such hiring will be more likely to occur.

It is also reasonable to expect that partners in a dual-career faculty couple would be seeking some type of teaching position. This may not always be the case, however. Findings indicate that nearly half (49%) of the partners during this period were employed in either non-teaching positions or employed outside of the geographic location the
college was in. If employed outside of the geographic community, it is possible they were engaged in a teaching position, but this information is not known. This study found a large percentage of dual-career faculty partners, 37% (n=65), were employed in a teaching capacity by the college who hired their partner, though both partners may not have been hired in the same year. It is not known what the partner was doing in 14% of the cases. Figure 4-3 illustrates the employment situations of the dual-career faculty partners.

![Figure 4-3. Employment Situations of the Dual-Career Faculty Partner](image)

Of those partners hired by the same institution as their partner, 49.2% (n=32) were hired into full-time teaching appointments; 29.2% (n=19) were hired into part-time teaching appointments; and 21.3% (n=14) were hired into a joint teaching appointment with their faculty partner. It is not known whether those partners hired to teach full-time were hired
into tenure-track positions. Figure 4-4 illustrates the employment situations of the dual-career faculty partners who were hired as faculty at the same institution as their partner.

Figure 4-4: Employment Situations of Dual-Career Faculty Partners Hired to Teach at Same Institution

Perception Regarding Qualifications

A third aspect of the pattern in dual-career faculty couple hiring related to overall faculty hiring is the chief academic officer’s perception regarding the quality of dual-career faculty partners. An overwhelming sentiment that emanates from the data is a concern for maintaining a high quality faculty and the potential for diminishing this quality if dual-career faculty partners are hired. This concern centers on a perception of uneven quality between the partners in a dual-career faculty couple. Respondents shared in-depth comments based on their experiences or worries:
In 98-99 we have had 4 couples apply for shared positions, but we will make no offers. Both [are] not equally suitable.

We have had one case that I know of where we tried to get the spouse hired as we had an opening in her area, but she just didn’t have the qualifications. And as much as we wanted him, there was just no way we could make it work for her.

One of the concerns that the faculty voiced was that sometimes the spouse isn’t as qualified. There was a lot of resentment toward the idea of having to hire a spouse, but there was agreement that it could be done on a case-by-case basis, looking at the qualification of each individual spouse.

Concern over the quality of the dual-career faculty partner may account for why approximately only 10% of the faculty hired during the period 1993-1998 were members of dual-career faculty couples.

These three inhibitors – the location of the college, the opportunities available for the dual-career faculty couple partner in the location, and perceptions held by the college regarding the qualifications of dual-career faculty couple partners – are crucial to understanding and explaining dual-career faculty couple hiring. All three are inhibitors in hiring that are largely out of the college’s control.
Influence of Programs, Policies, Procedures and Circumstances On Hiring Dual-Career Faculty Couples

Eight programs, policies, procedures and circumstances typically found in Baccalaureate I colleges were identified through the literature and presented to respondents. Chief academic officers were asked to indicate the extent to which they believed each encouraged or discouraged dual-career faculty couple hiring. These programs, policies, procedures and circumstances include affirmative action policies, personnel policies, interaction between departments, search committees, career assistance, particular positions, fellowships, and other programs which may be present at the college.

Of the programs, policies, procedures or circumstances presented to respondents, departmental interaction was found to most positively encourage hiring dual-career faculty couples. To a lesser extent, the use of search committees and the presence of affirmative action policies and personnel policies were seen as positive encouragers. Respondents indicated the other programs, policies, procedures and circumstances provided little positive encouragement for such hiring. Figure 4-5 shows the mean scores for the eight programs, policies, procedures and circumstances, and shows departmental interaction as the strongest encourager of dual-career faculty couple hiring, followed by personnel policies and the use of search committees.
The data indicate that most departments, 94.4% (n=34), interact with one another when considering hiring a dual-career faculty couple. Respondents indicated that such interaction encouraged such hiring to some degree at 63.3% (n=31) of the respondent colleges. In follow-up interviewing, one respondent shared that departmental interactions have increased in the past five years as a result of the need to cooperate to accommodate dual-career faculty couple needs.

Nearly all respondents, 97.9% (n=48), indicated they had personnel policies in place at their institutions, and 44.9% (n=22) considered their personnel policies to either encourage or strongly encourage dual-career faculty couple hiring. Only 2% (n=1),
viewed their personnel policies as discouraging such hiring while the majority of respondents, 53.1% (n=26), considered their personnel policies to have no effect on this issue.

All respondents reported using search committees when screening and interviewing candidates for faculty positions. More than half of the respondents, 59.2% (n=29), viewed search committees as either having no influence or in 8.2% (n=4) of the responses working to discourage such hiring. The remaining 32.6% (n=16), perceived the use of search committees for faculty hiring as an encouraging influence on hiring dual-career faculty couples. Affirmative action policies were seen as an encourager to some degree in 36.7% (n=18) colleges, while 61.2% (n=30) respondents viewed them as having no effect and in one case actually discouraging such hiring.

The tables presented in Figure 4-6 depict the level of encouragement of each of the eight programs, policies, procedures and circumstances and show more clearly the stronger encouragement provided by departmental interaction, personnel policies, and the use of search committees on dual-career faculty couple hiring. More than two-thirds of the respondents felt that the particular position, fellowships, the presence of a career service office for employee use and other programs had no effect on such hiring.
Figure 4.6: Responses for Level of Encouragement for Programs, Policies, Procedures, and Circumstances
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Figure 4-6 (continued): Responses for Level of Encouragement for Programs, Policies, Procedures and Circumstances.
To further understand the influence of programs, policies, procedures and circumstances on dual-career faculty couple hiring, it is helpful to look at the findings about whether colleges respond to the possibility of hiring dual-career faculty couples through a formal program, an informal program or through ad hoc assistance.

**Formal and Informal Dual-Career Programs**

Respondents were asked about the presence of formal or informal programs for dual-career faculty couples. The definition of what constitutes a "formal" or "informal" program was left up to respondents. The findings show only 4.1% (n=2) have formal dual-career faculty couple programs, while 40.8% (n=20) have informal programs. In a comparison, the data was reviewed to see whether colleges with either formal or informal dual-career programs had hired dual-career faculty couples. The findings show that fewer than half, 43.2% (n=76), of the 176 reported dual-career faculty couple hirings occurred at colleges with either a formal or informal program. It is unclear, however, what role the formal or informal dual-career program played in encouraging these hirings.

The following comments, from chief academic officers with informal dual-career programs, are somewhat typical of others received and help to provide a context for what an informal program might look like at Baccalaureate I colleges:

Once we hired a faculty couple, how we did it became our informal program.

We’re in a pretty good area for finding other professional positions, but for someone coming from out of town, it can be tough to get the information about
jobs. We just started providing information to candidates, and since we always have a need for part-time faculty, that’s how pretty much how we got started. We hired spouses to teach on a part-time basis, or in a couple of cases, hired them to teach full-time. Then, we get them in touch with schools or businesses in the area that may have a suitable position for the spouse. What our candidates tell us is that we do more than other places in helping their spouses to find suitable work. It all came down to what we needed to do in order to get good faculty to teach here.

...we do point out our location and provide contact information for [dual-career faculty couples] if they ask for it. Our location really helps us with this issue. It might be different if we were remote. When I came here, it was relatively easy for my wife to find an adjunct position almost immediately. She’s now interviewing for a full-time, tenure track position at another school.

From these illustrative comments, informal programs appear to involve providing information to dual-career faculty candidates about opportunities for their partners. If a formal or informal program was in place, respondents were asked to share whether the program was designed specifically or in part to recruit women and members of minority groups. Of those with formal or informal programs, 26.53% (n=13) indicated that they were not designed for the purpose of recruiting women or people of color while 14.29% (n=7) indicated that their programs were designed specifically for this purpose.
Ad Hoc Responses

Several comments from respondents indicate they respond to dual-career faculty couple hiring in an ad hoc fashion. When asked on the mail questionnaire to share thoughts regarding dual-career faculty couples, 19.4% (n=7) of the thirty-six comments received had to do with responding to dual-career faculty couple hiring in an ad hoc fashion. Two comments that are typical of those who respond in an ad hoc fashion are:

We’ve dealt with situations in an ad hoc fashion. Principles have emerged that are workable and flexible, I believe.

I don’t know that it [a formal program] would be used any more often than the kind of ad hoc assistance we offer now. And I don’t know that our faculty would want that, or that it would be in keeping with our affirmative action practices.

Since slightly less than half (44.9%) of the respondents had either formal or informal dual-career programs, it can be assumed that more than half of the respondents utilize an ad hoc approach if they were to hire dual-career faculty couples.

In summary, the analyses indicate that dual-career faculty couples are hired in modest numbers when compared to overall faculty hiring in Baccalaureate I colleges, at approximately 10% of the overall hiring. When the programs, policies, procedures and circumstances present in these colleges are considered in relation to dual-career faculty
couple hiring, the findings indicate departmental interaction and the use of search committees in faculty hiring have the strongest influence. However, chief academic officers did not identify any program, policy, procedure or circumstance as being significantly influential to dual-career faculty couple hiring. It was also noted that most colleges did not have a formal or informal dual-career program in place and thus likely utilized an ad hoc approach to dual-career faculty couple hiring. The findings further identified three circumstances: the location of the institution, the employment opportunities available to the dual-career faculty partner in the location and the perceived quality of the dual-career faculty partner, as being pertinent to understanding dual-career faculty couple hiring. These findings are discussed in detail in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Introduction

Hiring faculty members is of great importance to colleges as they seek to provide an exceptional education for their students (Blanshan and Gee, 1993). The topic of faculty hiring is of particular interest to higher education officials due to anticipated faculty shortages caused by increasing retirements among faculty (Lozier and Dooris, 1991; Manger, 2000), a decline in the number of people pursuing doctoral degrees and beginning an academic career (Lozier and Dooris, 1991; WICHE, 1992), and an increase in the number of dual-career faculty couples (Astin and Milem, 1997). Dual-career faculty couples are of interest because of the challenge they present to hiring officials in colleges in finding two suitable teaching positions in close geographic proximity to one another.

While hiring faculty is of importance to the college, it is equally important to understand and appreciate the dilemma faced by dual-career faculty couples as they make decisions about whether to accept a position or positions at a college. Faculty members who are also members of dual-career couples are not likely to make decisions about whether to accept a position without considering the career of their partner (Helmick, 1992; McNish,
1994; Shanahan, 1994). This is another reason why colleges should consider the needs of dual-career faculty couples when making offers of employment to a potential faculty member. The college may not be able to attract their first-choice candidate if the career needs of the candidate's partner are unable to be met.

The findings presented in Chapter 4 provide the basis for further discussion and recommendations about the number of dual-career faculty couples hired in comparison to overall faculty hiring at Baccalaureate I colleges and about the influence of programs, policies, procedures and circumstances present in these colleges upon this issue.

The Number of Dual-Career Faculty Couples Hired

The findings show a steady number of dual-career faculty couples hired at Baccalaureate I colleges. Members of dual-career faculty couples were hired every year in the five-year period under study, at approximately 10% of the total faculty hired each year. Both partners in the couple, however, were not necessarily hired in the same year at the same institution.

This number of dual-career faculty couples hired is not surprising given what is known about faculty hiring in general: a search committee is formed, the available faculty position is advertised in relevant journals or news publications, candidates are screened and interviewed and a successful candidate is chosen (Brakeman, 1983; Greenberg, 1993; Volkmann, 1993). This method of hiring is influenced by affirmative action requirements, put in place to ensure fairness in hiring so that all qualified candidates have
an equal opportunity to become the successful candidate (Shoben, 1997). The general assumption is that the hiring process assures the most qualified candidate will become an institution’s choice to fill a vacant position.

Considering dual-career faculty partners for a position outside of a regular search process may appear to some that the institution is abandoning a carefully designed process and the most qualified candidate may not be offered the available position. This study suggests that chief academic officers do not always perceive the dual-career faculty partner to be the most qualified candidate and thus they may not be hired. Many chief academic officers volunteered comments that said, in essence, the dual-career partner may not be as qualified as a candidate who is selected through regular search processes. Thus, there appears to be some question in the minds of chief academic officers as to whether partners in dual-career faculty couples are viable candidates for faculty positions.

Four influences were associated with the hiring of dual-career faculty couples. They are: location and partner assistance; departmental interaction and the use of search committees in hiring; residual effects of former antinepotism policies; and formal and informal dual-career couple programs.

**Location and Partner Assistance**

This study found the size of the community in which a college is located and whether an attempt is made by institution to help the candidate’s partner find suitable employment were perceived as influencing dual-career faculty couple hiring. From the data and
comments shared by respondents, it seems that these two variables are linked. That is, colleges located in large cities or very large cities hired the fewest members of dual-career faculty couples. It may be that chief academic officers at colleges in these geographic locations are not aware of hiring members of such couples because the couple may not need assistance in locating a suitable position for the partner given the variety of opportunities present in communities of this size. One respondent located in a very large city (population over 500,000) shared that:

Most of our faculty are members of dual-career couples. As an institution, we do very little to assist both individuals. Occasionally a faculty member leaves because of this – or a prospective faculty member does not come. We are very small and have little flexibility. We are in a large metropolitan area – and there are opportunities here for spouses.

Colleges located in large towns or rural communities may have hired more faculty couples, or at least been aware of doing so, because their location is relatively remote and there are fewer career opportunities readily identifiable for the partner. The college, therefore, may have had to or took the initiative to offer assistance to the partner in attempting to locate suitable employment. One respondent, located in a large town (population 10,000-49,999), indicated that:
We are located in an area that doesn’t have much for the other partner. We generally recognize that we have to “sweeten the deal” by being open to such things as dual-career hirings. But that’s easier said than done.

Support for the importance of an institution’s location to hiring members of dual-career faculty couples is found in the literature. This finding is consistent with Hornig (1997), who points out that:

...an institution’s location remains perhaps the salient issue ... in a few large cities or other areas within reach of multiple employment opportunities, academic or nonacademic, no serious problems may arise when an institution wants to hire or retain only one partner. (p. 260)

Conversely, location becomes a major obstacle for dual-career faculty couples when the institution is the only viable employment choice in the geographic area yet no opportunities for the partner exist there.

Findings indicate that dual-career faculty partners are frequently hired into teaching positions at the same college as their partner. The teaching positions partners held spanned the range of possible teaching appointments: from part-time, adjunct appointments to full-time, tenure-track positions and joint appointments with their partner. Several colleges reported they hire dual-career faculty partners to teach part-time. Hornig (1997) points out that such part-time teaching can be a "high-risk solution
for anyone planning on eventually developing a standard academic career” (p. 258).

Further, Hornig also points out that few couples would see such an arrangement as palatable enough to accept the deleterious career risks involved. For an academic to be seen as progressing in his or her career, he or she needs to pursue a full-time teaching position which offers an opportunity for promotion and tenure (Astin and Milem, 1997; Blau, 1994; Brakeman, 1983; Ferber and Hoffman, 1997). Thus, assisting a dual-career faculty partner by hiring them to teach part-time may be a reasonable solution for some colleges, but it is unlikely to be a long-term solution for the dual-career faculty couple. If this is the case, it is likely that faculty turnover will either remain or become an issue for the institution, and the turnover will be more serious because the institution will be losing two faculty members.

Departmental Interaction and the Use of Search Committees

The findings demonstrate that of the programs, policies, procedures and circumstances presented to chief academic officers, departmental interactions had the strongest influence on hiring dual-career faculty couples. Because of the nature of departmental interactions, as well as search committee work, these findings suggest that communication among institutional units matters. Since more than half of the respondents reported they address the issue of dual-career faculty couple hiring in an ad hoc fashion, communication among the department heads, chief academic officer, and even the partners in the couple, is essential. In addition, each dual-career faculty couple situation is has particular circumstances such as employment needs for the partner or family issues
and thus the needs and desires of each couple are likely to be different, emphasizing even more the importance of communication.

Residual Effects of Former Antinepotism Policies

A common practice in colleges, as in many other organizations, has been to prohibit a family member from directly supervising another family member (Shoben, 1997), a practice known as antinepotism. Antinepotism rules prohibited dual-career faculty couples in some cases from employment at the same institution and in other cases from employment in the same department and most assuredly from an employment situation where one partner would supervise the other (Shoben, 1997). Regardless of one's qualifications or credentials for a particular position, if placing a person in a particular position meant they would be in a direct reporting relationship to a family member, the placement would not occur.

Such antinepotism rules are now largely nonexistent in colleges or have been replaced with partner preference programs, which seem to acknowledge the potential for colleges and universities if they hire dual-career faculty couples (Shoben, 1997). Even given these positive strides in consideration of dual-career faculty couple needs in hiring, however, findings from this study show there still is still concern among Baccalaureate I colleges about hiring such couples. Comments from the questionnaires and follow-up interviews indicated that even when antinepotism do not exist, a mentality of antinepotism was at work. Such comments include: “Our rules against nepotism prohibit couples from reporting to each other or to the same immediate supervisor” and “I support such hiring
efforts as long as they will be in different departments and one is not in a supervisory position over the other.”

This study found that many chief academic officers were clear they would not support placing dual-career faculty couples in a direct supervisory relationship of one over another, regardless of college policies. Dual-career faculty couples could, however, share a faculty position. Many respondents indicated their college had provisions for joint faculty appointments in the same department, and they had placed dual-career faculty couples in such appointments. Allowing joint faculty appointments appears to be a common method that most colleges have formalized, if they have formalized anything, when the possibility of hiring a dual-career faculty couple occurs. This assumes, however, that both partners will be in the same discipline, an assumption that may not always be correct.

The Existence of Formal and Informal Dual-Career Couple Programs

Findings indicate very few colleges have formal dual-career couple programs in place for faculty members, and among the few that do, very few dual-career faculty couples were hired. In fact, one college reported that although they had a formal dual-career program, no members of a dual-career couple were hired. Another respondent shared that while their college had a formal dual-career program, it was of little use. In their experience, the needs of the dual-career faculty couples they dealt with were diverse and their program did not address this diversity of needs. The majority of the respondents reported their
institutions did not have a dual-career program, either formal or informal and many did not see the need for such programs. One chief academic officer explained:

I don’t know that it [a dual-career program] would be used any more often than the kind of ad-hoc assistance we offer now. And I don’t know that our faculty would want that, or that it would be in keeping with our affirmative action practices.

When analyzing why such programs would be of little use, it appears from the data that each dual-career situation is unique and the most effective way of addressing issues in the hiring of dual-career faculty couples is on an ad hoc, case-by-case basis. In discussing what has been done to address dual-career faculty couple needs, one chief academic officer put it this way: “It all came down to what we needed to do in order to get good faculty to teach here.” This statement seems to imply support for the uniqueness of each dual-career situation and the need to utilize an ad hoc approach for such hiring.

Among respondents, there seems to be an awareness of the desire of dual-career faculty couples to want to stay and live together, and a desire among the chief academic officers to want to help couples do that. There also seemed to be no overwhelming desire or strong need to create a program to address such needs, likely due to the unique situation of, and thus the unique response needed for, each dual-career faculty couple.
Whether a dual-career program existed or not, chief academic officers are concerned about the parameters they should be working within when it comes to advocating for a dual-career faculty partner. Based upon questions asked of the researcher in follow-up interviews, such as "what do other colleges do," the researcher sensed that chief academic officers felt they are walking a fine line between suggesting or advocating for the partner while at the same time respecting the autonomy and needs of departments within their colleges. It was not unusual for a chief academic officer to ask me researcher, "What are other colleges doing in this regard?" as a way of not only gathering ideas, but also a way to set their own boundaries of what is acceptable to do.

Taken together, these inhibitors provide a context for understanding why the number of dual-career faculty couples hired has been steady and why it may well remain steady for some time to come, at approximately 10% of the faculty members hired in Baccalaureate I colleges. The geographic community size in which the college is located is beyond the control of the college, yet the size of the community is important to whether dual-career faculty couples can accept positions at some colleges as there may not be viable employment options for partners in smaller communities. These two circumstances are, therefore, unlikely to change and help to explain the steady number. The influence of past or present antinepotism policies and the negligible influence of dual-career faculty couple programs are circumstances that can be changed by the college, but it is unclear if the number of dual-career faculty couples hired would change as a result of any changes in these circumstances.
Professional Bureaucracies and Collegiums

This study assumed that Baccalaureate I colleges were organized as professional bureaucracies. While this organizing scheme is present and certain aspects of professional bureaucracies, such as the use of pigeonholes, were found to be in use in these colleges when hiring dual-career faculty couples, many more colleges approached the issue of dual-career faculty hiring in an ad hoc fashion. This finding, combined with the finding that institutional communication is important in hiring dual-career faculty couples, raises the question of whether Baccalaureate I colleges are, in fact, organized as professional bureaucracies or whether they are principally organized as collegiums.

While theoretically the organization itself might be described as a professional bureaucracy, the literature about faculty organization and autonomy also suggest that these institutions are collegiums. Clark (1991) suggests that while elements of a bureaucracy in colleges are strong, they do not dominate the campus. Rather, while the major form of organization of colleges has been either bureaucratic or collegial, it may be that this form of organization can be viewed as a collegium, where many clusters of disciplinary experts coexist and campus wide coordination is achieved through some bureaucratic means. Clark posits that it appears colleges have moved away from a “community of scholars” and toward segmentation, professionalization and individualization. Faculty participation in campus government is segmented into departmental work, with the center of commitment for faculty located in their departments. Further, faculty are experts in their disciplines, with their primary identity found in their discipline and in the “academic profession” second. Then, given that
faculty often pursue funding for their academic pursuits externally, they are individual entrepreneurs with allegiances beyond the college at which they are employed.

Finkelstein (1991) further adds that professional autonomy for faculty is the operating norm in the academic system. One dimension of this autonomy is the locus of control over faculty hiring at the departmental level (Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker and Riley, 1991).

The collegium structure and the locus of control for faculty hiring at the departmental level is consistent with the majority of respondents reporting that their colleges use ad hoc approaches to deal with dual-career faculty couple hiring. The college may rely upon a bureaucratic model for coordination of campus-wide work, but given that the locus of control for faculty hiring is departmentally-based implies that departments have to communicate with one another and cooperate if they wish to hire a dual-career faculty couple. Such interdepartmental communication would likely be outside the purview of bureaucratic coordination.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

As with any research study, there is the potential for questions to arise which need to be answered. This study is no exception. Several areas for future research have been identified and are presented here.

An area not addressed in this study was that of diversity within the category “dual-career couple.” To complete the picture of what pattern dual-career couple hiring is taking in higher education, further research needs to be done on dual-career couples beyond faculty
couples. Administrative couples, same-sex couples, dual-career couples of color and even divorced partners with shared custody of their children will offer a more diverse and thorough picture of dual-career couple issues facing higher education. For each kind of dual-career couple, it is possible that there is a wide variety of responses and fewer institutional structures in place to address their needs. Colleges that want to recruit and retain employees from the largest applicant pool possible could benefit from a thorough understanding of issues faced by all dual-career couples.

Since some dual-career partners were hired by the same institution as their partner, research on the success of this partner hiring would be helpful. The question needs to be asked whether partners are achieving tenure or some other measure of success in their field. This particular area of research would be informative to dual-career couples and higher education administrators alike as it will provide information about whether this response to the overall issue of hiring dual-career couples is an appropriate one. It would also be helpful to study what an institution is willing to do to retain faculty members who are at risk of leaving because their partner was unable to locate satisfactory employment.

Comparative studies of the experiences of the “trailing” male partner as compared to the “trailing” female partner would also be beneficial. There may be gender differences in problems faced by partners, as well as differences in what the institution is willing to do to accommodate partners based upon their gender.
Other areas of further research include whether the attitudes of hiring officials are impacted by their own personal situation vis-à-vis dual-career couples. It is reasonable to expect that their own personal situation may influence what they are willing to do, or feel they must do, to address relevant issues.

Still other areas include research on differences in numbers of dual-career faculty couples between academic fields or disciplines. It may be that some disciplines contain more possibilities for dual-career faculty couples than others. The literature suggests that the natural sciences provide the most options for dual-career faculty couples (Hornig, 1997). A comparison of the natural sciences to other fields may be helpful for future couples. For example, over the past several years, women have been the fastest growing population among recent humanities Ph.D. recipients, thus a decrease in the number of humanities positions would have a disparate effect on women, who now constitute 42% of that doctorate pool. In English and foreign languages, women were awarded 57% and 59% of doctorates respectively in 1992 alone (Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology, 1994).

The importance of dual-career faculty couple issues in Baccalaureate I colleges has been documented by this study. If Gee’s (1991) prediction holds true, and dual-career faculty couples continue to become even more important to higher education, then research on dual-career issues and how they impact organizational structure and policy will play a key role in guiding academic leaders through the dilemmas that arise. It is important that higher education leaders continue to address dual-career faculty couple needs and issues in order to recruit and retain the highest quality faculty.
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Section 1: Please provide some general background information about yourself and your institution for research purposes only. Your answers will be complete confidential.

Gender: 
- Female 
- Male  

Race: 
- African American 
- Asian American 
- Caucasian, Non-Hispanic 
- Foreign National 
- Hispanic 
- Native American 

Your Age: _____  
Years in Current Position: _____  
Years at this institution: _____  

Check the one response that best describes the location of your institution:  
- Very Large City (over 500,000)  
- Large City (250,000-499,999)  
- Small City (50,000-249,999)  
- Large Town (10,000-49,999)  
- Small Town (2,500-9,999)  
- Rural Community (under 2,500)  

Definition of pertinent term: 

*Dual-Career Couple:* For the purposes of this study, a dual-career couple includes any two persons in a committed relationship, regardless of their marital status. This research study is looking at dual-career faculty couples, although it is understood that both partners may not be working in faculty positions.
Section II: Please respond to the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many full-time faculty positions were filled at your institution during the academic year indicated in each column? (Indicate number)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you hire any members of dual-career couples to fill these positions? (Yes/No; How many?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the candidate pool from which you hired, were you aware of any dual-career couple candidates as applicants? Please indicate the number (or estimate) if you recall, or a &quot;?&quot; if you are unsure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you did hire a dual-career candidate(s) for a faculty position, please indicate what their partner is doing (i.e., hired by institution in what capacity, accepted position in community, not employed, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section III: Please respond to the following questions:

To your knowledge, between the years 1993 and 1997...

1. Did your institution have a formal program or plan to respond to the needs or desires of dual-career couples seeking employment at your institution?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - Don't Know  
   - N/A

2. Did your institution have an informal program or plan to respond to the needs or desires of dual-career couples seeking employment at your institution?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - Don't Know  
   - N/A

3. If you answered "yes" to either question 1 or 2, was your program designed specifically or in part to recruit women and minorities?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - Don't Know  
   - N/A

4. Did your institution hire any dual-career couples in cooperation with another organization or institution?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - Don't Know  
   - N/A
5. Please indicate the extent to which the following have served as a factor for hiring dual-career couples at your institution in the past five years: (please check the box which most closely matches your opinion):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>STRONGLY ENCOURAGE</th>
<th>ENCOURAGE</th>
<th>NO EFFECT</th>
<th>DISCOURAGE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISCOURAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money/Salary not sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor/Supervisee situation (one partner would report to the other)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference or imposition in the autonomy of another academic unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of institution/no opportunities for candidate’s partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic unit considered candidate’s partner unqualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only appointment was in same department and that’s not done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s partner perceived an unfriendly welcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough resources to invest time on the issue of dual-career couple accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (please indicate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. For each of the following, please indicate which are available at your institution. Also, if available, please indicate the extent to which you believe each affects the hiring of dual-career couples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available at your institution? (Indicate Yes or No)</th>
<th>Please indicate if there has been a marked change in each area in the past five years. Then indicate your opinion today in the columns to the right.</th>
<th>STRONGLY ENCOURAGE</th>
<th>ENCOURAGE</th>
<th>NO EFFECT</th>
<th>DISCOURAGE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISCOURAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction between departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of career service office for use by employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular position hiring for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for fellowships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of other programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (please indicate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please share any other thoughts you may have regarding dual-career faculty couples or dual-career couples in general:

Thank you for your participation in my dissertation research. Please return your completed survey in the enclosed envelope. If you are interested in receiving a copy of the results from this study, please check here: _____
APPENDIX B: ELECTRONIC MAIL QUESTIONNAIRE
Recently you should have received a survey from me via the U.S. mail about hiring dual-career academic couples at XYZ College. I know that the end of the academic year is a busy one for many of us in academe. I am sending this e-mail to you now with the hope that your workload has slowed enough to allow you a few minutes to respond to my survey questions. You are only one of 118 chief academic officers to whom I am sending this e-mail. As you are well aware, strong response rates for survey research are crucial and so I am making another request for your assistance.

My survey is at the bottom of this e-mail. Would you please complete it? Or, if you prefer, I would welcome an opportunity to have a telephone survey/interview with you. I will contact you again in a few days to follow-up on this request for your assistance. Completed surveys can be returned via e-mail, or if you prefer, printed out and faxed back to me at (740) 362-3135. My contact information can be found at the bottom of this e-mail.

Thank you for your consideration. I will be happy to answer any questions you may have, or you may contact my dissertation advisor, Dr. Mary Ann Danowitz Sagaria at The Ohio State University, (614) 292-7702 or sagaria.1@osu.edu.

SURVEY TITLE: THE FREQUENCY OF HIRING DUAL-CAREER COUPLES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Section I: Please provide some general background information about yourself and your institution for descriptive purposes only. Your answers will be completely confidential.

Gender:  
_____ Female  
_____ Male

Your Age:  

Your Race:  
_____ African American  
_____ Asian American  
_____ Caucasian, Non-Hispanic  
_____ Foreign National  
_____ Hispanic  
_____ Native American
Years in Current Position: 

Years at this institution: 

Check the one response that best describes the location of your institution:

- Very Large City (Over 500,000)
- Large City (250,000-499,999)
- Small City (50,000-249,999)
- Large Town (10,000-49,999)
- Small Town (2,500-9,999)
- Rural Community (under 2,500)

Definition of Dual-Career Couple: For the purposes of this study, a dual-career couple includes any two persons in a committed relationship, regardless of their marital status. This research study is looking at dual-career faculty couples, although it is understood that both partners may not be working in faculty positions.

Section II: Please respond to the following questions:

In academic year 1993-1994:

1. How many full-time faculty positions were filled at your institution during this academic year? 

2. Did you hire any members of dual-career couples to fill these positions? (Yes/No; How many?) 

3. Of the candidate pool from which you hired, were you aware of any dual-career candidates as applicants? Please indicate the number (or estimate) if you recall. 

4. If you did hire a dual-career candidate(s) for a faculty position, please indicate what their partner is doing (ie: hired by institution in what capacity, accepted position in community, not employed, don’t know, etc.)

In academic year 1994-1995:

1. How many full-time faculty positions were filled at your institution during this academic year? 

2. Did you hire any members of dual-career couples to fill these positions? (Yes/No; How many?) 

3. Of the candidate pool from which you hired, were you aware of any dual-career candidates as applicants? Please indicate the number (or estimate) if you recall. 

4. If you did hire a dual-career candidate(s) for a faculty position, please indicate what their partner is doing (ie: hired by institution in what capacity, accepted position in community, not employed, don’t know, etc.)

In academic year 1995-1996:
1. How many full-time faculty positions were filled at your institution during this academic year? _____
2. Did you hire any members of dual-career couples to fill these positions? (Yes/No; How many?) _____
3. Of the candidate pool from which you hired, were you aware of any dual-career candidates as applicants? Please indicate the number (or estimate) if you recall. _____
4. If you did hire a dual-career candidate(s) for a faculty position, please indicate what their partner is doing (ie: hired by institution in what capacity, accepted position in community, not employed, don’t know, etc.)

In academic year 1996-1997:

1. How many full-time faculty positions were filled at your institution during this academic year? _____
2. Did you hire any members of dual-career couples to fill these positions? (Yes/No; How many?) _____
3. Of the candidate pool from which you hired, were you aware of any dual-career candidates as applicants? Please indicate the number (or estimate) if you recall. _____
4. If you did hire a dual-career candidate(s) for a faculty position, please indicate what their partner is doing (ie: hired by institution in what capacity, accepted position in community, not employed, don’t know, etc.)

In academic year 1997-1998:

1. How many full-time faculty positions were filled at your institution during this academic year? _____
2. Did you hire any members of dual-career couples to fill these positions? (Yes/No; How many?) _____
3. Of the candidate pool from which you hired, were you aware of any dual-career candidates as applicants? Please indicate the number (or estimate) if you recall. _____
4. If you did hire a dual-career candidate(s) for a faculty position, please indicate what their partner is doing (ie: hired by institution in what capacity, accepted position in community, not employed, don’t know, etc.)

Section III: Please respond to the following questions:

To your knowledge, between the years 1993 and 1997 ...

1. Did your institution have a formal program or plan to respond to the needs or desires of dual-career couples seeking employment at your institution? (Yes/No/Don’t Know/NA)
2. Did your institution have an informal program or plan to respond to the needs or desires of dual-career couples seeking employment at your institution? (Yes/No/Don’t Know/NA)
3. If you answered "yes" to either question 1 or 2, was your program designed specifically or in part to recruit women and minorities? (Yes/No/Don't Know/NA)

4. Did your institution hire any dual-career couples in cooperation with another organization or institution? (Yes/No/Don't Know/NA)

5. Please indicate the extent to which the following have served as a factor for hiring dual-career couples at your institution in the past five years (please indicate your opinion):

   a. Money/Salary not sufficient
      _____ Strongly Encourage
      _____ Encourage
      _____ No Effect
      _____ Discourage
      _____ Strongly Discourage
      Have you had a marked change in this area in the past five years? (Yes/No)

   b. Supervisor/Supervisee Situation (one partner would report to the other)
      _____ Strongly Encourage
      _____ Encourage
      _____ No Effect
      _____ Discourage
      _____ Strongly Discourage
      Have you had a marked change in this area in the past five years? (Yes/No)

   c. Interference or imposition in the autonomy of another academic unit
      _____ Strongly Encourage
      _____ Encourage
      _____ No Effect
      _____ Discourage
      _____ Strongly Discourage
      Have you had a marked change in this area in the past five years? (Yes/No)

   d. Location of institution/No opportunities for candidate’s partner
      _____ Strongly Encourage
      _____ Encourage
      _____ No Effect
      _____ Discourage
      _____ Strongly Discourage
      Have you had a marked change in this area in the past five years? (Yes/No)

   e. Academic unit considered candidate’s partner unqualified
      _____ Strongly Encourage
      _____ Encourage
      _____ No Effect
      _____ Discourage
f. Only appointment was in the same department and that's not done
   _____ Strongly Encourage
   _____ Encourage
   _____ No Effect
   _____ Discourage
   _____ Strongly Discourage
   Have you had a marked change in this area in the past five years? (Yes/No)

   g. Candidate's partner perceived an unfriendly welcome
      _____ Strongly Encourage
      _____ Encourage
      _____ No Effect
      _____ Discourage
      _____ Strongly Discourage
      Have you had a marked change in this area in the past five years? (Yes/No)

   h. Not enough resources to invest time on the issue of dual-career couple accommodation
      _____ Strongly Encourage
      _____ Encourage
      _____ No Effect
      _____ Discourage
      _____ Strongly Discourage
      Have you had a marked change in this area in the past five years? (Yes/No)

   i. Other? (Please indicate)

6. For each of the following, please indicate which are available at your institution. Also, if available, please indicate the extent to which you believe each affects the hiring of dual-career couples:

   a. Affirmative Action Policies
      Available? Yes/No
      _____ Strongly Encourage
      _____ Encourage
      _____ No Effect
      _____ Discourage
      _____ Strongly Discourage
      Have you had a marked change in this area in the past five years? (Yes/No)

   b. Personnel Policies
      Available? Yes/No
      _____ Strongly Encourage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Encourage</th>
<th>Encourage</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
<th>Discourage</th>
<th>Strongly Discourage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. Interaction between departments</td>
<td>Available? Yes/No</td>
<td>[Responses]</td>
<td>Have you had a marked change in this area in the past five years? (Yes/No)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Search Committee</td>
<td>Available? Yes/No</td>
<td>[Responses]</td>
<td>Have you had a marked change in this area in the past five years? (Yes/No)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Presence of career service office for use by employees</td>
<td>Available? Yes/No</td>
<td>[Responses]</td>
<td>Have you had a marked change in this area in the past five years? (Yes/No)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Particular position hiring for</td>
<td>Available? Yes/No</td>
<td>[Responses]</td>
<td>Have you had a marked change in this area in the past five years? (Yes/No)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Opportunities for fellowships</td>
<td>Available? Yes/No</td>
<td>[Responses]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
______ No Effect
______ Discourage
______ Strongly Discourage
Have you had a marked change in this area in the past five years? (Yes/No)

h. Presence of other programs
   Available? Yes/No
   ______ Strongly Encourage
   ______ Encourage
   ______ No Effect
   ______ Discourage
   ______ Strongly Discourage
   Have you had a marked change in this area in the past five years? (Yes/No)

i. Other? (Please indicate)

7. Please share any other thoughts you may have regarding dual-career faculty couples or dual-career couples in general.
APPENDIX C: RESULTS OF T-TEST
To be able to apply the findings of this study to all Baccalaureate I colleges, it was necessary to demonstrate that the sample of respondent colleges and the sample of non-respondent colleges were equivalent. A random sample of 40 non-respondent colleges was drawn for the purpose of comparison with the 49 respondent colleges. From these samples, 31 representations from each data set were used to obtain critical values from the t distribution for the needed degrees of freedom ($df = 60$). The sample of 31 non-respondent colleges had a mean of 1443.84 (SD = 747.8); while the sample of 31 respondent colleges had a mean of 1185.84 (SD = 526.7). The researcher assumed that the sampled distributions were both normal, and used the .05 confidence level to decide whether the data from the two samples differed from one another.

The null hypothesis states that the means of the two samples are not different from one another ($H_0: \mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$). The alternative hypothesis holds that the means of the two samples are different from one another ($H_a: \mu_1 - \mu_2 \neq 0$). The test statistic value is $t = \frac{X_1 - X_2}{S_p \times \sqrt{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{n}}} = \frac{258}{164.2849} = 1.5704$. $H_0$ is rejected if either $t \geq t_{\text{alpha}/2 \cdot m+n-2}$ or $t \leq -t_{\text{alpha}/2 \cdot m+n-2}$. The critical value for the t distribution, at the .05 level of significance, is $t = 2.0$. Because $t$ is not in the rejection region, the means of the respondent colleges and non-respondent colleges are similar on the variable of full-time
student headcount and thus it is reasonable to apply findings from this study to all Baccalaureate I colleges.