

Chapter V

Discussion and Implications

This section includes a summary and discussion of the significant results of this research. Further, implications and suggestions for changing the academic climate are presented for institutions of higher education, Marriage and Family Therapy (MFT) programs, and the American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT), and Commission on Accreditation of Marriage and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE). Finally, limitations and suggestions for future research are also discussed.

Summary and Discussion of Significant Findings

Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Personal Characteristics of MFT Female Faculty Members

If one were to make a composite of the average MFT faculty for this sample, she could be described as a married, Protestant, Caucasian middle-aged female with at least one child. She was slightly more likely to work in a training institution in a non-tenure track position than in a university or college. She was also more likely to hold a doctorate than any other degree and from a marriage and family therapy program rather than any other kind of program. In many ways the average faculty member from this sample resembles the average faculty member as described in other studies (Falk, 1990; Finklestein, 1984; Lipset & Ladd, 1989), with the exception that she is female and we do not know the level of highest education for her parents.

As important as the characteristics of the average faculty member in this sample are the demographic characteristics of the marginalized groups in this sample. Only 7.3% of this sample reported their ethnic or racial affiliation to be African-American, Hispanic,

or Asian and no one reported her ethnicity or cultural heritage to Native American. In contrast, the latest U.S. Census (2000) reported that 30.9% of the population in the U.S and Puerto Rico considered themselves to be African-American, Hispanic, Asian, Native American or Pacific Islander, or a combination of races. Further, 15.3% of female faculty nationally classified themselves as one of these races (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2001). Based on these comparisons, the proportion of female faculty that is part of a minority group in this sample is smaller than should be expected (but not necessarily smaller than demographics of AAMFT as MFT students and faculty are more likely to Caucasian). It may be that I did not make the survey sensitive enough to fully explore the variables of race and ethnicity. Under other comments, one participant wrote in “please divide Latin Americans (I don’t like Hispanic) according to different races. I am Caucasian (race), Irish (ethnicity) Mexican (country of origin prior to immigration).”

Nonetheless, the low numbers of faculty that indicated they were members of minority groups deserves to be noted. Women of color face particular challenges in academia, including racism and sexism, less administrative support for research, and insufficient mentorship opportunities (Bland & Ballard, 1999; Singh, Robinson, & Williams-Green, 1995). Further, there were differences in promotions and retention rates among female members of minority groups and white males and females as women of color are less likely to be promoted and more likely to leave their institution (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Perkins, 1997; Singh, Robinson, & Williams-Green, 1995).

Similarly, although the latest U.S. Census (2000) indicated 6.2% of the population identified themselves as women living in unmarried same-sex partner households, researchers focusing on faculty relationships found only two percent or fewer

of their sample identified themselves as gay or lesbian (Miller & Skeen, 1997). Miller and Skeen (1997) speculated that gays and lesbians may be unlikely to identify themselves as such on surveys because of the insensitivity of common survey methods in classifying relationship type. This could have accounted for the low level of the response by faculty who identified themselves as lesbians in the present research. For example, under the section on marital status, one respondent who identified herself as lesbian indicated her relationship type was not present and wrote in “other.” Difficulties faced by lesbian and gay faculty include lack of access to their partner’s job benefits, difficulty finding academic positions within commuting distance, and overt and covert discrimination. It is also important to note that unmarried, cohabitating heterosexual couples often face these same challenges (Miller & Skeen, 1997).

The lack of women that identify themselves as lesbian and members of a minority group is an important issue, as this seems to indicate a lack of diversity among the faculty in MFT programs. Although I do not know the numbers of male faculty that identify themselves as members of a minority group or identify their sexual orientation as gay, based on the results of this research, there appears to be a status quo among faculty in MFT programs. This is especially disconcerting as the COAMFTE, as noted in the introduction, recently reversed its position suggesting diversity among the ranks of its faculty. As COAMFTE is no longer recommending the need for diversity, it is likely that the low numbers of faculty who are members of minority groups will not change unless MFT program leaders and departments make a concerted effort to recruit graduate students and faculty from these groups. Further implications and suggestions for recruitment are detailed below.

Tenure, Rank, Institution Type, and Highest Education Level Completed

The faculty members in this sample tended to be clustered in tenure track or non-tenure positions in the lower ranks assistant professor, visiting and adjunct professor, and instructor in tenure-track or non-tenured positions. A number of other researchers have also suggested women faculty were more likely to work in these types of positions (Benjamin, 1998; Buckley et al., 2000; Meurer et al., 1998; Robbins & Kahn, 1985; Valian, 1998). It is important to note that institution type and highest degree earned were associated with rank and tenure security in this sample. The finding that women in this sample tended to be clustered in low ranking and non-tenured positions may be because a number of these women were faculty at training institutes, which are programs that may not have tenure or rank. Further, as there are a number of programs that have become accredited in the past five years, women at these institutions may not have had the time to secure tenure or promotions. However, there is evidence that women are more likely to stay in these lower ranking and untenured roles despite availability, ability, or preferences (Benjamin, 1998; Valian, 1998). Therefore, women may be these positions due to structural and institutional barriers that keep women in these positions in addition to institution type, length of service, and educational background. Conversely, women faculty may choose to be in non-tenured and non-ranking positions because of certain factors, such as flexibility, a focus on teaching, or the need to stay in a position for the location, that these types of positions can offer.

It is also important to note the high number of faculty that worked in lower ranking and non-tenured positions as there are associations between rank, tenure, and salary. Within this sample, faculty at the highest rank of professor were more likely to

work in tenured positions, with the job security that comes with these types of positions, and at the highest salary levels. Further, women are already excluded from administrative and decision making roles within many institutions (Clark, 1978; Clark & Corcoran, 1986), thus, holding a lower rank may serve to marginalize women faculty even more. This supports the comments of two adjunct faculty who felt very isolated in their role.

Paid Work Duties and Salary

Overall, women faculty in this sample averaged nearly 13.5 hours engaged in the instruction or supervision of undergraduate and graduate students and an additional 9 hours in clinical work. Teaching and clinical work each roughly accounts for one-third of the time spent in work duties for these women, which matches the proportion of time spent in these duties among other samples (Holden & Black, 1996; NCES, 1999). As faculty in MFT programs are engaged in instructing post-baccalaureate students on clinical skills, it should be expected that many of them engage in clinical work. Indeed, COAMFTE guideline 130.02 now mandates that program faculty be engaged in direct, face-to-face clinical contact with couples, families, or groups. Although clinical work is likely paid and faculty in other disciplines also engage in paid and unpaid duties as part of their career, the fact that these faculty spend so much of their time in clinical work is important to note. Time in clinical practice may translate to less time in research or service for faculty members. Alternately, it may mean faculty may have to engage in more at-home work in order to accommodate their other duties.

As indicated, faculty reported they spent fewer hours per week engaged in their career duties than the national average (NCES, 2001). However, faculty may not have reported all of their paid work duties as these duties were outside of their normal work for

a MFT training program. As one respondent noted, “I answered the questions in this survey based only on my position as a female faculty in a MFT program. In addition to my position as a faculty member, I conduct research for a different institution. I also serve as a mental health consultant to preschools in the Denver area.”

Further, the questionnaire did not request number of hours the faculty spent each week on administrative duties. Several respondents wrote in that they spent much of their time in administration. As one participant wrote, “I am primarily an administrator now. I teach one three-hour course a semester.” Thus, the relatively low number of hours per week reported by faculty may not be reflective of their actual paid workweek. Another reason that faculty did not report as many hours per week as the national average is that a large proportion of the sample was visiting or adjunct professors or instructors. It would be expected that many of these faculty would engage in contract or part-time work and therefore would not have the time, opportunities, or expectations to engage in service and research.

Approximately 43% of this sample reported making \$50,000 or under per year while 41% reported making between \$50,000 to \$75,000. The National Center for Education Statistics (2000b) reported that for the 1998-1999 academic year (the latest year documented), female faculty members on nine-month contracts across the United States averaged \$47,421. Although it would first appear that the faculty in this sample matches the national average, by categorizing the salaries of faculty in this sample, I did not make this variable discrete enough to make valid comparisons against the national average. A number of participants wrote in they were paid by course or on contract, and

therefore received much lower salaries than would be indicated by the categorical variable of \$50,000 or under.

Nonetheless, six of the participants who wrote spontaneous, open-ended comments noted their low salary influenced the quality of their experiences. Several of these faculty noted a difference in salaries between males and females in their department. This validates the research by a number of investigators who have determined that females are paid less than males in academia for the same duties (Astin & Bayer, 1972; Benjamin, 1998; Blackburn & Holbert, 1987). While a number of variables, including age, rank, and institution type, could contribute to salary differentials both between men and women and among women faculty, there is considerable evidence that salary discrimination persists for women in academia (Astin & Bayer, 1972; Benjamin, 1998; Wyche & Graves, 1992). Further, Kite and associates (2001) suggested women faculty were at additional disadvantage, as having a lower salary often translated into “fewer financial resources to spend on their career development” (p. 1082). These resources had an impact on both a woman’s career and home life as they included having the ability to buy modern equipment, travel to conferences, hire household help to cut down on the second shift, and pay for child-care expenses. This supports the comments of one participant who noted the low salary she received made it difficult to cover her child-care.

Career Satisfaction, Relationship Satisfaction,
Friendship Intimacy, and Mentoring Relationships

Satisfaction with Teaching, Research, and Service Duties

All of the women in this sample reported engaging in teaching or supervision at some point in their career. They reported significantly higher levels of satisfaction with their teaching duties than both their research and service duties. Other researchers have also reported that faculty tended to rate teaching as the most satisfying aspect of their job (Bland & Ballard, 1999; Wissman, 1981). As these faculty members indicated they spent approximately one-third of their time in teaching duties, it is encouraging that they were satisfied with these duties.

Fewer faculty members in this sample reported engaging in research than teaching or service. For those that did engage in research, they reported the lowest career satisfaction with these duties. The discrepancy between the satisfaction levels in career duties may be reflective of the dominant view of research in the field of MFT. McWey and associates (2002) found that less than half of a sample of master's and doctoral level MFT training programs conducted clinical-based research other than theses or dissertations. As this type of clinic-based research is helpful for linking research, theory, and practice for faculty and students, this lack of focus on research is disconcerting. Crane, Wampler, Sprenkle, Sandberg, and Hovestadt (2002) suggested the MFT culture does not promote or support research and instead promotes theories based on clinical intuition and charismatic clinicians. They delineated several obstacles to the integration of research within the MFT including: "A general MFT culture that does not value research, faculty lack role models of highly effective researchers within their own

discipline, the current curriculum offered by doctoral programs is inadequate to produce high quality research directly related to MFT issues and concerns, programs often place too much responsibility for doctoral education in the hands of faculty outside of MFT” (Crane et al., 2002, p. 76). Because of the lack of focus on research in MFT training programs, it could be that faculty members do not learn the skills or have the resources necessary to conduct research. It is also likely that those faculty members who do conduct research perceived this lack of support, which contributed to their low level of satisfaction with research duties. It is encouraging, however, the research duty with which these faculty expressed the most satisfaction was opportunities to publish. Blackburn and his associates (Blackburn & Hulbert, 1987; Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995) noted the importance of publications in determining pay raises, promotions, and tenure.

Neither rank nor tenure status significantly influenced career satisfaction. A number of other researchers have found significant correlations with rank and career satisfaction in particular, with professors reporting higher career satisfaction than faculty at lower ranks (Abouserrie, 1996; Bland & Ballard, 1999; Meuer et al., 1998; Patterson, Sutton, & Schuttenberg, 1987). Meuer and associates (1998) suggested that academicians may be more dissatisfied earlier in their careers because these faculty are establishing their identities and being socialized in their career roles. Further, these faculty may feel that their contributions go unrecognized as they are not yet ready for more visible criteria for success, such as tenure or promotion (Meuer et al., 1998). As these variables did not relate to higher levels of career satisfaction, it may be that the women in this sample felt supported and comfortable in their role regardless of their rank or tenure status. In fact, several women who expressly indicated they were at lower ranks or had not yet received

tenure reported very positive experiences within their career, although two of these faculty were concerned that their experiences may change in the future due to potential life changes.

I had also hypothesized that faculty who had reached the rank of professor and faculty who were tenured would have higher career satisfaction as these faculty were at the top of the institutional hierarchy, and thus would have more power or more freedom and flexibility (Bradshaw & Wicks, 1997; Struthers, 1995). I surmised that higher ranking and tenured positions would allow these faculty members more decision making opportunities and autonomy. However, as put forth in women's developmental theory, perhaps these women have come to "an understanding of life that reflects the limits of autonomy and control" (Gilligan, 1982, p. 17). This finding could indicate that even when women do buy into the societal (i.e., male) definition of success and power, they still are not happier and thus, a different definition of power should be considered. Miller (1982) suggested there are many definitions of power, including a type of power that has often not been recognized: the power in the traditional role in fostering, rather than diminishing, the enhancement and growth of others. Women tend to achieve and use their power in the context of relationships with others. This is supported by the finding that women tended to be most satisfied with career duties that Therefore, it could be speculated for the faculty in this sample, their sense of power came from supporting and enhancing others, variables that could not be empirically measured through this survey, rather than through the external constructs of tenure and rank. Several faculty who wrote comments in endorsement of this research and in encouragement of me provides evidence that these women could have gained power through enhancing and supporting others.

Relationship Satisfaction and Friendship Intimacy

Reflecting women's developmental theory, women in this sample were involved in multiple relationships. Ninety-five participants reported being in a significant relationship and reported greater levels of satisfaction with their significant relationships than a normative sample. This is encouraging since other researchers have suggested that women view marriage negatively (Benard, 1964; Feldman, 1973; Goodrich, Rampage, Ellman, & Halstead, 1988; Simeone, 1987). Women faculty tend to face the competing demands of their career, household responsibilities, and often child care (Astin & Milem, 1997; Buckley et al., 2000; Kotkin, 1983). Barnett and his associates (Barnett, Brennan, Raudenbush, & Marshall, 1994; Barnett & Shen, 1997) suggested that career and household demands often contribute to decreased marital satisfaction levels and increased psychological distress for women. However, it is important to note that this sample included women who were in significant couple relationships who were not married, as well as married women.

The majority of women in this sample also reported having a best-friend. However, these women reported lower levels of friendship intimacy than a normative population. Two factors could have influenced the difference in intimacy levels. First, there were differences in sample sizes between the both the married and unmarried normative samples as reported by Miller and Lefcourt (1982) and this sample. Miller and Lefcourt (1982) surveyed more unmarried than married females, whereas this sample had the opposite. Contrasting to the findings of Miller and Lefcourt, it could have been that marital status influenced intimacy levels of the women in this sample, particularly as this sample was drawn from a non-clinical population. For example, one woman indicated

that her husband was her best friend, so she could not answer the part on friendship intimacy while another stated, “My husband is a ‘gift’ in my life.”

Second, the membership of the normative sample (Miller & Lefcourt, 1982) and this sample were different. Miller and Lefcourt (1982) used a student sample whereas this sample consisted of professional women. Gouldner and Strong (1987) suggested that the friendships of middle class women are affected by career factors, education levels, and location. Thus, middle class women may develop only cursory relationships with work colleagues and acquaintances with whom they have more contact. In contrast, they may have more intimate friendships with long-term friends with whom they have more infrequent contact due to geographic location. A faculty member who indicated she chose a friend in town, as her best friend lived far away, provides evidence in support of this interpretation. It could be hypothesized that this woman would perceive her friendship as having more frequent contact, but less intensity and intimacy.

Mentoring Relationships

It is encouraging to note that a majority of women in this sample reported having a mentor at some point in their career. Many other researchers have suggested that women were less likely to have a mentor than were males (Brown, 1985; Moore & Amey, 1998; Smith, Smith, & Markham, 2000; Ragins, 1982). However, because I only surveyed female faculty members, it is not possible to evaluate the percentage of women with mentoring experiences in comparison to the percentages of men who have been mentored. Further, marriage and family therapy programs tend to be more female-dominated (Kaveny, personal communication, September 2, 2002). Thus, women in these samples may have more visibility within their department and more access to women

faculty in senior positions who could act as mentors. Nonetheless, having a mentor has been associated with a number of positive career and personal outcomes for both protégés and mentors alike (Blackburn, Chapman, & Cameron, 1981; Kram, 1985; Merriam, 1983; Schlossberg, 1974; Wright & Wright, 1987).

A slight majority of female faculty in this sample reported having a female mentor. This is encouraging as other researchers have suggested that the women tend to face challenges in finding a same sex mentor, including the lack of women in senior positions and the time constraints placed on women mentors (Buckley, Sanders, Shih, Kallar, & Hampton, 2000; Moore & Amey, 1998). This is also encouraging as having a female mentor has been associated with greater levels of satisfaction in balancing family and career (Eubank, 1987). While the higher numbers of women with same-sex mentors may again be because MFT programs tend to have greater numbers of females, several women faculty in this sample indicated they mentored other women to improve the academic climate.

The protégés in this sample reported that their mentor provided psychosocial functions to a greater extent than career functions. Two theories could account for the difference in the extent of the functions provided. First, Struthers (1995) suggested female mentors are more likely to provide psychosocial functions. A slight majority of females in this sample had female mentors, although the sex of the mentor did not significantly predict the extent of the provision of psychosocial functions as it did with career functions. Second, many of the theories in MFT promote joining, or the process of making family members feel included respected (Nichols & Swartz, 1998). Thus, faculty

in MFT programs may be more likely to value and act upon psychosocial mentoring functions as these functions reflect helping the protégé feel competent and respected.

Variables Associated with Psychosocial and Career Mentoring Functions

One of the purposes of this research was to identify what characteristics of women's mentors predicted the functions he or she provided. For the provision of psychosocial mentoring functions, approximately 15% of the variance was accounted for by contact with the mentor and two ways of initiating contact with the mentor. Continued contact with the mentor was associated with the mentor providing psychosocial mentoring functions to a greater extent. Meeting the mentor through a formal mentoring program set up by her institution or through the department in which she worked was associated with the mentor providing psychosocial functions to a lesser extent. It could be that still having contact with the mentor allows the protégé to continue to experience the support and the affirmation from the mentoring relationship whereas protégés without continued contact with their mentor no longer experience, and may not remember, this support. For initiating contact with the mentor, the protégés who meet their mentor through a formal program or through the department in which they work, the mentoring relationship is initiated by an outside force or through proximity between the mentor and protégé. Therefore, these types of mentoring relationships may not be as beneficial in terms of support as a relationship initiated by other means. Mentoring functions and formal mentoring programs are discussed in more detail below.

For the provision of career mentoring functions, approximately 12% of the variance was accounted for by sex of the mentor, number of years with the mentor, and two ways of initiating contact with the mentor. Having a male mentor was associated

with the mentor providing career functions to a greater extent while a greater number of years with the mentor, meeting the mentor through a formal mentoring program, and meeting the mentor due to common interests were associated with the mentor providing career functions to a lesser extent. Other researchers have also suggested that male mentors are likely to provide career functions to their protégés (Burke & McKeen, 1996; Ragins, 1989; Struthers, 1995). As for the association among the number of years spent with the mentor and provision of career functions, it is likely that the protégés who been with their mentor longer have also been in the workforce longer and are more established in their career. Therefore, these protégés no longer need the career functions their mentor can provide to such a large extent. The relationship among career mentoring functions and meeting due to common interests is harder to explain. Perhaps as these mentors and protégés shared common interests, they simply had other things other than mentoring on which to focus.

As in this study, Ragins and Cotton (1993) found that formal mentoring programs do not provide the same career or psychosocial benefits as informal mentoring. Therefore, the usefulness of formal mentoring programs is questionable, especially for women. Males, not females, tend to have the most to gain from formal mentoring relationships as they receive psychosocial benefits, such as counseling and acceptance, which they may not receive in other areas (Ragins & Cotton, 1993). Those creating formal mentoring programs may not take into account the different developmental patterns of women and men, both in terms of their careers and in relationships (Kalbfleisch & Keyton, 1995). Further, as mentoring relationships usually revolve around an experienced professional and a relatively new professional, there are power issues

inherent in these relationships (Ault-Riche, 1987; Johnson & Nelson, 1999; Kalbfleisch & Keyton, 1995; Smith et al., 2000). These issues are of concern and need to be addressed. Suggestions for improving institutional mentoring programs are described under implications for institutions.

Associations among Career Satisfaction, Relationship Satisfaction,
Friendship Intimacy, and Mentoring Functions

Career Satisfaction

Forty-seven percent of the variance of career satisfaction was accounted for by number of hours per week in service, race, psychosocial mentoring, receiving an award for research, and career mentoring. A greater number of hours per week, being Caucasian, a greater extent of psychosocial mentoring functions, and receiving an award for research were associated with higher levels of career satisfaction. Having a mentor who provided a greater extent of career mentoring functions was associated with lower levels of career satisfaction. Each of these predictors will be discussed separately below.

It is interesting that spending more time engaged in service duties predicted greater career satisfaction as, overall, female faculty in this sample reported spending less time on service than any other duties. Kite and associates (2001) suggested service duties were especially important and satisfying for women in academia. They reported, “Women believe community service is as important as research and that such contributions will be valued” (Kite et al., p. 1083). It could be speculated that the faculty in this sample really valued their service work and therefore, more time spent in this work contributed to greater satisfaction levels. Based on this research, more emphasis and time should be devoted in service work for women as time spent on this type of work

predicted the largest amount of the variance for career satisfaction. However, service commitments can often be a “double-edged sword” (Kite et al., 2001, p. 1083) as these time consuming tasks, especially if they are viewed as women’s work, are generally devalued and under-appreciated (Blackburn & Holbert, 1987; Kite et al., 2001). Further, many institutions of higher education have cut their service and outreach due to budgetary constraints at the state and institutional level. Therefore, while I would advocate for more time on service, this work is often not supported at the institutional, state, and societal level.

It was also interesting that race entered into the regression equation as only 3 of the 37 members of the regression sample reported their race to be as part of a racial or ethnic minority, in this case Hispanic. Other researchers have also found that members of minority groups, especially when they worked in predominately white institutions, reported lower levels of career satisfaction (Bland & Ballard, 1999; Eason, 1996; Palepu, Carr, Friedman, Ash, & Moskowitz, 2000). Members of minority groups tend to face overt and covert discrimination, differential treatment by colleagues and administrators, and lack of mentorship opportunities (Bland & Ballard, 1999; Singh, Robinson, & Williams-Green, 1995). Therefore, it could be that the women of color in this sample faced the dual burdens of racism and sexism that influenced their career experiences, and thus satisfaction levels. This is somewhat supported by one faculty member who stated, “I don’t think my experiences have anything to do with my gender, but a lot to do with my ethnic background.”

Receiving an award for research was associated with greater career satisfaction. Other researchers have also found that extrinsic awards and achievements, such as

recognition, predict greater job satisfaction (Almahboob, 1987; Miller, 1980). It is interesting, however, that only receiving an award for research was associated with career satisfaction whereas receiving an award for teaching was not correlated with job satisfaction and receiving an award for service did not significantly add to the prediction. It is likely that those that have received an award for research are more likely to conduct research regularly, and therefore are more satisfied with their research duties, which would increase their overall satisfaction levels. It may also be that as institutions value research, often above teaching and service (Blackburn & Holbert, 1987), faculty who have won an award for research may feel more supported, and therefore more satisfied, than faculty who have won an award in other areas.

The only relational variables associated with career satisfaction were psychosocial and career mentoring functions. However, it is interesting that the extent the mentor provided psychosocial mentoring functions was positively associated with career satisfaction whereas the extent the mentor provided career mentoring functions was negatively associated with career satisfaction. It could be that the faculty in this sample, as did faculty in a study by Knox and McGovern (1988), preferred psychosocial mentoring functions. Knox and McGovern (1988) found that women protégés and mentors rated six mentor characteristics as most important: honesty, competency, willingness to share knowledge, willingness to let protégé grow, directness in dealings with protégé, and willingness to give constructive and positive feedback. It may be also be that protégés whose mentors provide a greater extent of psychosocial functions have a closer relationship than protégés whose mentors provide a greater extent of career functions and this relationship contributes to the difference in satisfaction levels. Kram

(1985) suggested career functions are made possible due to the mentor's experience and power in the organization while psychosocial functions depend on an interpersonal relationship that fosters trust and intimacy. Confirming women's developmental theory, it may be that for those protégés whose mentors provided a greater extent of psychosocial functions, having a relationship characterized by greater support, instead of a relationship based only on the provision of career help, contributed to the power of these faculty women.

Other variables regarding significant relationships, including marital satisfaction and friendship intimacy, were not correlated with career satisfaction, especially as other researchers have suggested that social support from others contributed to career and life satisfaction (Amatea & Fong, 1991; Hammond, 1987). While women seemed to indicate their personal relationships were important, and reported great satisfaction with their significant relationships, women reported more neutral levels of satisfaction with their overall careers. Kiecolt (2003) suggested that work has become less rewarding for women. Women "have shifted away from finding work a haven or having high work-home satisfaction toward finding home a haven" (Kiecolt, 2003, p. 33). The findings of this research suggest that women faculty in this sample also found home more of a haven than their work.

It may also be that the lack of association between significant relationships and career is in fact protective for these faculty. Research on couples that work outside the home found that women tended to experience significantly higher overall distress levels at work and home than men did (Barnett, Brennan, Raudenbush, & Marshall, 1994) and that work pressures tended to spill over to the home environment (Jones & Fletcher,

1996). If there was an association between relationship satisfaction, friendship intimacy, and career satisfaction, it could be expected that the stress that faculty experience at work would spill over to home and could contribute to lower levels of relationship satisfaction and friendship intimacy.

Friendship Intimacy

Highest degree earned and psychosocial career functions accounted for 20% in the variance for friendship intimacy. For this sample, holding a doctorate was associated with greater friendship intimacy. Hulbert (1991) also found education levels related to social networks. She suggested that networks of co-workers with higher levels of education provided more instrumental support and resources than circles of co-workers with less education. As highest degree earned was associated with institution and rank, it could be that faculty holding doctorates have more resources available, such as time and money, to visit or communicate with their friends in other ways.

Having a mentor who provided a greater extent of psychosocial support was also associated with greater friendship intimacy. This relationship may exist in part because friendships and mentoring relationships often become intertwined. A number of researchers have suggested that friendship between the mentor and protégé was often a benefit of the mentoring relationship (Busch, 1985; Kram, 1983, 1985; Krupp, 1985). There is also some evidence that the benefits of a mentoring extends to other networks as Haggis (1997) found those in mentoring relationships reported more psychosocial support from their peers than those without mentors. It could be that women whose mentors provide psychosocial support generally have relationships characterized by greater intimacy as psychosocial support is made possible by a closer relationship (Kram, 1985).

Kalbfleisch and Keyton (1995) suggested that female mentoring relationships closely approximate the model of female friendships. Both of these relationship types tend to be characterized by high levels of emotional intimacy and supportive communication. Following this theory, as the models for mentoring and friendships are similar, it may be that these faculty perceive these relationships similarly. Thus, when they receive more psychosocial support in their mentoring relationships, they also perceive their friendships to be more intimate.

Discrimination

It was interesting to note that while the questionnaire did not specifically address discrimination, a number of the responses to the open-ended questions indicated the experience of discrimination faced by MFT faculty women. Supporting the findings of other researchers (Astin & Bayer, 1972; Brooks, 1982; Caplan, 1994; Fueher & Schilling, 1985; Heckert, White, Gulinson, Schnarre, Gannon, & Schneider, 1999; Robbins & Kahn, 1985; Valian, 1998), women in this sample reported an inequality in salary and duties between men and women; differential treatment of women by students, colleagues, and administrators; and overt and covert levels of discrimination in their department and institution. Further, these women experienced power struggles with colleagues and administrators and a sense of isolation, indicating a negative climate. These types of issues can have costs to the individual and the institution, including increased levels of stress and possibly faculty turn over.

Although several women indicated they had negative experiences in academia, it was encouraging how many women indicated their experiences in academia were overwhelmingly positive. A large proportion of faculty wrote they felt they were

respected. Further, many indicated they were supported and valued by administrators and colleagues. However, it may be the positive experiences reported by female faculty could be attributed in part to the fact that the majority of students and faculty tend to be female (Kaveny, personal communication, September 2, 2002). Therefore, it could be expected that women in this field would have more visibility and possibly more support than female faculty in other fields. Confirming this idea, one participant wrote, “Compared to friends and family in other fields, I feel the MFT field is relatively ‘female friendly.’ My perspective and needs have been valued for the most part.”

Perhaps more encouraging is the changes these faculty made in response to their experiences. While a number of changes were very general, other faculty indicated they were acting as agents of social change to make the academic climate better for themselves and for future generations. Some of the changes made by these faculty including incorporating gender issues into their teaching and research and advocating for and supporting their students, particularly marginalized students. In the latest issue of *Family Therapy Magazine*, a number of authors wrote about the importance that therapists, including marriage and family therapists, can play in facilitating social change in multiple systems, although whether therapists should be agents of social change with their clients is a hotly debated topic (Bartlett, 2003; Johnson, 2003; Tomm, 2003; Tunnel, 2003). Similarly, a number of participants reported they took on more a mentoring role to improve fairness or used their strengths by collaborating more often (conversely, three faculty indicated they had become less collaborative and instrumental due to negative experiences). Changes faculty make in their teaching and research may serve to make changes in the larger systems of academia. However, it is important to note that as the

field of MFT tends to be female heavy, these faculty may have a different experience in promoting social change and collaborating with others than female faculty who hold more of a token status in their institution.

Implications and Suggestions for Change

As evidenced by this and other research on women in academia, faculty women continue to experience structural and social hurdles. Based on this research, I have a number of implications and suggestions for changing the academic climate for faculty members. Taking a systemic view of change, these changes must take place on the levels of multiple systems in order to be effective. Therefore, this section presents implications and suggestions for institutions of higher educations, MFT programs, and AAMFT and COAMFTE.

Changing the Climate of Institutions

Family Friendly Policies

Although career satisfaction in this sample did not correlate with relationship satisfaction or friendship intimacy, several faculty members in sample experienced stress in balancing their personal and work roles. This supports other research which also found faculty and students report balancing their personal and work lives as problematic (Matheson, 2002; Moyer, Salovey, & Casey-Cannon, 1999; Polson & Piercy, 1993; Reiss, 1983). Polson and Piercy (1993) noted that the spouses of the students in their sample also felt stress and isolation, indicating problems with personal and career balance is not limited to the individual. Administrators, deans, and department heads in institutions of higher education need to recognize these stresses and implement policies designed to reduce stresses. Polson and Piercy (1993) found students and their spouses

reported taking time-off from work as an effective coping mechanism to deal with career stress. One faculty member in this sample reported taking sabbatical leave in order to focus on her personal life, although she seemed to indicate continued distress. While taking time off may also be an effective coping mechanism for faculty members, it is likely that faculty will not interrupt their work pattern if they are establishing their careers or trying to secure tenure. Therefore, administrators need to restructure the tenure process so that faculty will feel able to take vacations or request sabbaticals without this adversely affecting faculty performance evaluations.

Creating and instituting family benefits would also be important for improving the academic climate. The National Center for Education Statistics (2000a) reported 58% of institutions offered paid maternity leave and 39% of institutions offered paid paternity leave for full-time faculty. For part-time faculty, the large proportion of this sample, only 12% of institutions offered paid maternity leave and 9% offered paid paternity leave. Furthermore, only a small percentage of institutions offered subsidized or unsubsidized childcare or eldercare to either full-time or part-time faculty. Although the Family Medical Leave Act of 1993 requires any employer with over 50 employees to grant up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave (U.S. Department of Labor, 2003), many workers cannot afford to take unpaid leave (IRS Employment Review, 2002). Further, faculty in tenure track positions may not be able to take time off because of the teaching, research, and service work they still need to complete in order to secure tenure or promotions. This is reflected in the comments of a faculty member who stated she could not take an official maternity leave as no one else in her department wanted to teach a certain class. Institutions across the board need to institute paid maternity and paternity leave and administrators again

need to restructure the tenure process so faculty can take this kind of leave without this adversely influencing their ability to get tenure.

Creative Collaboration

Most colleges and universities promote competition instead of collaboration. This is especially evident in the tenure system, where criteria such as single-authorship and the securing of funded grants have a significant impact on the determination of tenure. However, it has been speculated that women often do not have the resources necessary for grant-writing and conducting research (Blackburn & Holbert, 1987). Therefore, women are already starting out at a disadvantage. Further, direct competition is often counter to many women's developmental style and serves to subvert their strengths.

Instead of competition, leaders within institutions of higher education need to promote "creative collaboration" (Covey, 1989, p. 262). Within creative collaboration individuals collectively pool their resources and unique strengths to develop a synergistic relationship, or a relationship where

The whole is greater than the sum of its parts. It means that the relationship which the parts have with each other is a part in and of itself. It is not only a part, but the most catalytic, the most empowering, the most unifying, and the most exciting part. (Covey, 1989, p. 263)

In the spirit of fostering more creative collaboration, institutions need to reward collaborative efforts between faculty. This would include joint authorship on publications and grants, research teams of faculty, team mentoring, and collaboration between disciplines. Further, as shown in this research, women who engage in community and institutional service work tend to be more satisfied with their careers. Service work often

includes opportunities to work in collaboration with students and faculty, such as on committees and at conferences. While many institutions of higher education have faced financial cuts to at the institutional and state level for their outreach and service budgets, service is important to both institutions and to individual faculty and as such, should be valued.

Creative collaboration efforts should also be recognized for tenure and promotions. As creative collaboration draws on women's strengths of working in relationships, it can be expected that these types of programs would contribute to a greater sense of satisfaction in these faculty. This may also help to reverse the negative attitudes female faculty in MFT programs have regarding research. As one faculty member highlighted, research teams have "encouraged more women to become involved."

Mentoring Programs

Institutions need to overhaul their formal mentoring programs. As reviewed in the literature, women and members of minority groups face particular challenges in initiating and retaining mentoring relationships (Blake, 1999; Moore & Amey, 1988; Ragins, 1989; Smith et al., 2000). Yet, as indicated in this as in other research (Alleman, Newman, Huggins, & Carr, 1986; Dreher & Ash, 1990; Merriam, 1983) mentoring relationships can influence career satisfaction levels. Further, there is evidence that having a mentor is associated with reduced levels of faculty turnover (Smith et al., 2000). In this sample, faculty expressed the importance of mentoring on their own career outcomes and thus made attempts to mentor others to improve the academic climate. Yet, the comments of

one faculty member indicated that mentoring, especially of people in marginalized groups, is still needed. She wrote, “There is a great need for mentoring women of color!”

Institutions have attempted to create mentoring relationships by matching new faculty to more established faculty through formal mentoring programs. Yet in this research, formal mentoring programs were associated with the mentor providing psychosocial and career functions to a lesser extent. This is important as psychosocial mentoring functions in this research were associated with greater career satisfaction and greater friendship intimacy whereas career mentoring functions were associated with reduced career satisfaction. Further, as psychosocial mentoring functions are made possible by a closer relationship, it may be that for protégés that do not choose their mentors, they would perceive this relationship differently. It could be that women in academia need a different model for mentoring. Kalbfleisch and Keyton (1995) suggested women may seek a mentoring model “that includes women’s unique developmental paths, their affinity for relationships, and their minority status in a predominately male work environment” (p. 193). O’Neill, Horton, and Crosby (1999) reported that some institutions are instituting mentoring circles instead of formal mentoring programs. Within these mentoring circles, several senior faculty take responsibility for mentoring several junior faculty. This model not only takes into account the developmental pattern of females, it also promotes creative collaboration as the mentors and protégés are pooling these resources. More institutions should institute these types of alternative mentoring programs. Further, to encourage mentoring relationships, institutions should consider granting release leave from certain duties to faculty who participate in these types of programs.

Including Gender Issues in MFT Training

It is clear that MFT programs need to continue to incorporate gender issues and gender sensitivity. Gender needs to be viewed as a primary organizing principle in family theory, rather than an issue at the periphery (Hare-Mustin, 1986; Storm, 1991). Male and female family therapy trainees need to be educated on the differential experiences of males and females in the academic arena, at home, and in the therapy room. These issues need to include discrimination and harassment of women and minorities and the unpaid second shift experienced by women who also work outside the home. Further, trainees need to be educated on the concept of relationships from a female developmental perspective. Not only will this help to support the relationships of both males and females, it can help these future therapists uncover alternative definitions of power within families.

The latest standards of the COAMFTE (2002) specified, “Programs are expected to infuse their curriculum with content that addresses issues related to diversity and power and privilege as they relate to age, culture, environment, ethnicity, gender, health/ability, nationality, race, religion, sexual orientation, spirituality, and socioeconomic status.” However, “infuse” is not defined and there are no suggestions for how to implement this curriculum. Thus, this infusion is left to the discretion of individual programs. Brown-Filkowski, Storm, York, and Brandon (2001) suggested that students who were part of a program that purposely integrated gender into all aspects of the curriculum, instead of a program that devoted time in one class on gender, tended to incorporate gender ideas into their therapy. Therefore, MFT programs need to develop ways to create a “genderist” philosophy (Storm, York, & Keller, 1997).

Suggestions for AAMFT and COAMFTE

Implications for Supervision

AAMFT has recently changed the approved supervisor designation to make the relationship between approved supervisors and those training to be supervisors resemble a mentoring relationship. As part of the approved supervisor process supervisor candidates are encouraged to select an approved supervisor mentor. This mentor is then responsible critiquing supervision, ensuring ethical and legal standards for practice, and reviewing the supervisor candidate's theory of supervision paper. These supervisor mentors, therefore, take a much more active role in the training and development of supervisor candidates than previously detailed by AAMFT (AAMFT, 2002).

While the change to the supervisor process can be positive, this relationship can have the same problems as traditional mentor relationships. First, as in the case of mental health or managed care agencies, supervisor candidates may not be able to choose their mentor and instead be assigned a mentor due to liability reasons or agency policy. This can adversely affect the career satisfaction and progress of the supervisor candidate as, detailed above, formal mentoring programs may be less effective than informal mentoring (Ragins & Cotton, 1993). Second, even in cases where supervisor candidates choose their mentors, they may be forced to into cross-sex or cross-cultural mentoring opportunities due to location or availability of mentor supervisors. As with cross-sex and cross cultural mentoring relationships, these supervisory relationships could have costs, especially to women and members of minority groups. These costs include sexual harassment and dual relationships (Hardesty & Jacobs, 1986; Ragins, 1989) or ignorance of societal and institutional factors that can adversely affect women and members of

minority groups (Gilbert & Rossman, 1992). Thus, it is unclear how the change to the approved supervisor designation will affect supervisor candidates and mentors or how grievances will be addressed.

Implications for Clinical Practice

As indicated in this study, faculty members spent nearly one-third of their time during the week engaged in clinical practice. Although faculty are required to engage in direct, face-to-face clinical contact as specified under the new COAMFTE guidelines (2002), institutions may consider other duties to have precedence over clinical work. It is likely that training institutions would be more supportive of clinical work and actively encourage their faculty to engage in clinical work given that training institutions are often tied into mental health centers or other clinical settings. However, research and liberal arts institutions may value other duties over clinical practice. As indicated in the review of the literature, many institutions place the most value and emphasis on research (Blackburn & Holbert, 1987). Therefore, time spent on clinical work may mean less time for the duties considered crucial to the tenure and promotion reviews. The AAMFT and COAMFTE need to work in tandem with institutions and MFT programs to create policies designed to promote clinical work, such as release time for clinical duties. Alternately, AAMFT and COAMFTE may need to make allowances for faculty, especially in tenure track positions, who are not able to spend time in clinical work.

Facilitating Diversity: Suggestions for Institutions,

MFT Programs, COAMFTE, and AAMFT

It is clear that academia continues to lack diversity in sex, members of minority groups, and men and women who identify their sexual orientation as gay or lesbian.

Although there have been some changes in the last few decades, these faculty continue to be underrepresented in academia, especially in higher ranking and administrative positions (Bickel, Croft, Johnson, & Marshall, 1998; Moyer et al., 1999; Wyche & Graves, 1992, Valian, 1998). Changing the status quo will take a concerted effort from institutions, individual programs, and governing bodies such as AAMFT. Further, it will require those in a position of privilege to recognize their power. Bailey, Price, and Walsh (2002) stated, “To become more inclusive, those in the mainstream, especially those who are privileged by societal standards, should be equally accountable to address issues of diversity in clinical thinking, research, and training” (p. 484).

Some institutions have attempted to recruit or retain faculty by giving preference in hiring to by the spouse of the faculty member (Shoben, 1997). While this is a noble effort, especially in small communities with limited professional opportunities, there may be ethical and legal ramifications (Shoben, 1997). Further, a recent controversy here at Virginia Tech suggests that these policies may not be justly implemented. An academic offer made to the same-sex partner of an incoming dean was rescinded by the Board of Visitors. Although the Board of Visitors cited budget cuts, the married spouse of another faculty member was offered a faculty position at the same time. This issue continues to be a controversy at this university.

Instead of individual efforts, more effective recruitment programs need to be developed. Oliver and Brown (1988) suggested several principles for encouraging student recruitment of members of minority groups. To be effective, recruitment programs: (a) must involve members of those groups that would be considered to be in the ethnic majority in institutions (i.e., Caucasian males), (b) should be designed to develop and

facilitate social networks, (c) should include diverse activities aimed at engaging groups inside and outside of the institution, (d) should include active service duties, and (e) should be integrated as an institutional plan. As these strategies were suggested for student recruitment, I would propose that additional efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty must take place at the graduate and undergraduate level. This would entail increasing the numbers of students from diverse groups and putting into place strategies to help retain these students and female students. Further, this would entail socializing undergraduate and graduate students to the academic lifestyle and helping male and female students to understand the often differential experiences of faculty.

Although it would seem that these are institutional issues, COAMFTE, AAMFT, and MFT programs need to do their share. Killian and Hardy (1998) stated there is a sense that MFT as a profession and AAMFT as an organization are not culturally or gender friendly nor are the majority of members and officers interested in making the profession more equitable. Therefore, in order to achieve parity, these groups will also need to make changes.

First, COAMFTE needs to set up procedures to account for the numbers of faculty of different genders, minority groups, and sexual orientation. In researching the status of faculty, I wrote to Don Kaveny (personal communication, September 2, 2002) at COAMFTE requesting the numbers of male and female faculty members. While he sent me information gathered from students and faculty in COMAFTE programs, he stated COAMFTE did not have the resources to gather this information or follow up with institutions when they are negligent in submitting this information. While I understand these limitations, I believe that the status quo will not be changed until we know more

about the numbers, rank, and tenure status of both male and female faculty in MFT programs.

Second, while the AAMFT has established awards to encourage participation of members of minority groups, they need to be proactive about integrating women and members of minority groups into all aspects of governance. Killian and Hardy (1998) stated as AAMFT “moves towards empowered minority participation, the culture of the organization will need to be modified to ensure that minority members, like their majority member counterparts are major ‘stockholders and brokers’ in the policy and decision-making arenas of the AAMFT” (p. 208). AAMFT and COAMFTE can also do much to improve the climate of academia for women through forums or new communication strategies. One faculty member in this study suggested, “A listserv for women in academia through AAMFT might be helpful as a forum to discuss ideas, mentorship, and to receive academic support (and personal support, too).” Wright and Wright (1987) suggested that organizations can be instrumental in setting up forums designed to promote collaborative efforts, and thus community, between faculty members.

Finally, those in positions of power in MFT programs need to ensure that women and minority groups are not only in positions of the faculty, but are in positions of administration and leadership. While most MFT programs can claim to have female faculty, the results of this research indicate a large number of these faculty were at the rank of assistant professor, visiting or adjunct professor, or instructor and in tenure-track or non-tenured positions. While these variables were not associated with career satisfaction, they are generally positions that offer less security and fewer decision making opportunities. Further, there were very few faculty who were members of

minority groups or who identified themselves as lesbian. Therefore, MFT programs need to continue the suggestions recently dropped by COAMFTE (2002) encouraging diversity among faculty and among students, our future faculty.

Limitations

As with most social science research, there are a number of limitations to the present study. First, this research is limited to those participants that chose to participate in this study. It may be that the participants that choose to complete and return the survey were invested in this type of research. Indeed, a few of the participants wrote in that this type of research was needed and thanked me for undertaking this study. The demographics and career characteristics of the non-respondents, therefore, could have been different than those of the respondents. It may have been that those that were more satisfied with research did not complete this survey as they were spending a lot of their time in research. Perhaps members of minority groups may have been overburdened by service and committee responsibilities, as suggested by some researchers (Bland & Ballard, 1999; Kite et al., 2001; Wyche & Graves, 1992), and therefore were unable to complete the survey.

Second, this sample is limited by the sample size. Although 111 faculty members completed the questionnaire, only 37 faculty members completed all of the variables under study. As I asked about relationship influences, it could be expected that some faculty could not complete certain portions of the questionnaire, as they did not have that type of relationship (i.e., significant romantic relationship, best friendship, and mentor relationship). However, the fact that so few respondents had all of these relationship types limited the analyses that could be conducted. Further, the number of variables to be

entered into the regression equations had to be reduced because of the small valid sample size. Therefore, it may be better to consider the results descriptive rather than predictive.

From a feminist standpoint, the research may have been limited by the chosen methodology. Feminists often criticize the use of surveys, as this method does not allow enough richness for inquiry into the lived experience of women. Interviews and other qualitative forms of inquiry encourage participants to reflect on and recover information and knowledge about themselves (Taylor, Gilligan, & Sullivan, 1995). For this reason, feminist research is often classified under qualitative methods (Sprenkle & Moon, 1996). Another feminist critique could be the choice to use standardized scales in order to collect data. As Avis and Tuner (1996) noted, “Research instruments embody specific race, class, gender, and cultural biases which will in turn be reflected in results and in their interpretation” (p. 155). For example, the Kansas Marital Satisfaction scale views marriage from a heterosexual stance and may reflect middle-class values about marriage while the Miller Social Intimacy Scale classifies close friendships as being characterized by affection, disclosure, and intimacy. Indeed, one respondent to this survey stated, “Your friendship part seemed ambiguous at best and working from implied assumptions” while another respondent noted, “I thought it was interesting that you separated the spouse/romantic partner and friend and included affection only under friendship.” However, although quantitative methodology may have flaws from a feminist standpoint, I believed it was the best method at this point in time due to the sample size and the fact that there is very little research on MFT faculty women. I also tried to offset these limitations by adding open-ended questions designed to explore the experiences of faculty women in MFT programs.

Suggestions for Future Research

This research represents a new and needed addition to Marriage and Family Therapy literature. To continue this work and to explore the lives of faculty in MFT programs and across academia further, I would like to suggest the following areas of inquiry. First, if this project were to be duplicated, the researcher should inquire about the satisfaction with and time spent on administrative tasks of female faculty in COAMFTE programs. One respondent requested, “Your next study should include attention to women as administrators. Most of us end up doing administration for very little reward.” It would be especially important to focus on the academic tasks due to the hierarchical nature of academia. As many researchers, including myself, suggest that women should be promoted to more administrative and higher ranking positions (Benjamin, 1998; Valian, 1998), it would be important to know if these administrators feel supported and satisfied.

Second, the next step beyond this project would be to conduct qualitative interviews with these women to further explore satisfaction. This would allow more of a focus on the different variables which affect the work and personal lives of these women. The responses to the open-ended questions regarding the experiences of these women and changes based on these experiences were fascinating and often explained more about the lives of these women than the quantitative responses. Therefore, this type of inquiry should be pursued. As an addendum, it would also be important to understand what success means to these women. Developing a conceptualization of success for female faculty is important as much of the research on success in academia suggests that external variables, such as salary, publications, and status, define success (Buckley et al., 2000;

Hamovitch & Morgenstern , 1977). Researchers tend to ignore the inclusion of variables following a female developmental pattern, such as relationships and mutual cooperation, when focusing on success.

Third, it would be important to compare satisfaction of those primarily in academia versus those in clinical work. Boice and Myers (1988) discovered satisfaction differs for doctorates in academia versus private practice as clinical psychologists in private practice, particularly women, reported more overall happiness with their careers than psychologists in academia. Those in faculty positions reported higher job-related stresses, health concerns, and marital or family problems. Academicians were also less likely than clinicians to seek therapy for themselves regarding career, personal, or family stresses. Overall, this study indicates that place of employment can influence career satisfaction levels. AAMFT should undertake or fund research designed to understand differences in career satisfaction between MFT graduates in academia and in private practice as AAMFT designs policy for these two groups. Finally, research is needed on the satisfaction levels of males in MFT program, including information on relationships. Rather than use as a comparison to females, this research should be used to understand male experiences and broaden the conception of satisfaction and success to include relationship factors.

Overall Summary

The purpose of this research was to explore career satisfaction, satisfaction with significant relationships, friendship intimacy, and mentoring functions among a cohort of MFT faculty women. These women reported neutral levels of career satisfaction, with higher satisfaction with teaching duties than service or research duties. In terms of

relationships, this sample reported high levels of satisfaction with their significant relationships and moderate levels of friendship intimacy with their best friend. For those who had mentoring relationships, protégés reported their mentors provided psychosocial mentoring functions to a greater extent than career mentoring functions. Having continued contact with the mentor was associated with a greater provision of psychosocial functions while meeting the mentor in the department where she worked or through a formal mentoring program was associated with the mentor providing psychosocial functions to a lesser extent. Having a male mentor was associated with a greater provision of career mentoring functions. Number of years in the mentoring relationship, meeting the mentor through a formal mentoring program, and meeting the mentor because of common interests were associated with the mentor providing career functions to a lesser extent.

I also looked at the associations among career satisfaction, relationship satisfaction, friendship intimacy, mentoring functions, and personal characteristics of the faculty members. Spending more time in service duties, having a mentor who provided more psychosocial mentoring functions, being Caucasian, and having received an award for research were associated with greater levels of career satisfaction. Having a mentor who provided a greater extent of career mentoring functions was associated with reduced levels of career satisfaction. Other variables regarding relationships were not associated with career satisfaction. In this case, it may be that “no news is good news” as this could indicate that work did not spill over to the home. In terms of friendship intimacy, holding a doctorate and having a mentor who provided a greater extent of psychosocial mentoring functions were associated with greater levels of intimacy in close friendships.

Based on this research and the literature of women in academia, it is clear that changes are needed in the academic system. To improve the climate, institutions need to create family friendly policies, promote collaboration among faculty members, and develop mentoring programs that fit with women's needs. MFT programs need to continue to include gender issues in training. The AAMFT and COAMFTE need to assess their policies regarding approved supervisor status and clinical practice for faculty members. Finally, institutions, MFT programs, AAMFT, and COAMFTE need to work in tandem to recruit and retain a more diverse faculty, including women, persons of color, and persons who identify their sexual orientation as gay or lesbian.