Chapter I

Introduction

Overview

Women have a long and varied history in academia. Historical data, as reported by Stephan and Kassis (1997), showed that women accounted for up to 20% of part-time or full time faculty members in the late 19th century and in fact, constituted a larger proportion of the labor force in colleges and universities than their proportion in the general labor force during this time. Women mainly worked as faculty in women's colleges, although they quickly joined the ranks of faculty at primarily male institutions, especially land grant institutions. Females were even elected to the upper levels of administration, including deans and presidents. In fact, women in the United States were relatively prominent in higher education until societal attitudes about women engaging in paid employment began to change during the Depression when jobs became scarce. After the Depression, the numbers of women faculty fell, a trend that has only recently begun to change (Stephan & Kassis, 1997).

While women have been a part of academia in various positions since many institutions were in their infancy, it was not until the late 20th century that researchers even began to conduct research on women in academia, particularly the experience of discrimination faced by these women (Benard, 1964; Astin, 1969; Astin & Bayer, 1972; Rossi & Calderwood, 1973). This focus on women in academia coincided with the civil rights and women's movements of the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s as these movements helped to demonstrate that institutions of learning subjugated women and minorities.

1

Due to the focus on women's rights, discriminatory practices and sex bias became a major policy issue within higher education in the United States. Public pressure to change these practices helped to ensure the passage of Title IX of the Educational Amendment of 1972, which prohibited sex discrimination in educational activities or programs that receive federal aid. Affirmative action programs and educational regulations and laws designed to reduce sex discrimination have helped draw to women into the previously male dominated world of academe (Weg, 1991). With Title IX and policy changes, the academic climate substantially improved for women. The Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2000a) reported that in 1998, Caucasian females accounted for 36% of all college faculty; in contrast, they only made up 28% of faculty in 1992 (it is clear from these numbers, however, that although this is an increase, women have not yet achieved parity). Women have joined the ranks of faculty in traditionally male dominated fields, such as engineering and business. Further, women have increasingly been hired into leadership and administrative positions and have been included on committees and special councils (Blackburn & Holbert, 1987; Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Fuehrer & Schilling, 1985; Lattin, 1983). Blackburn and Holbert (1987) stated, "When one compares the inroads made by women into various male-dominated professions, their progress in the professorate may appear to be the success story of the past twenty years" (p. 296).

Nevertheless, women in academia continue to experience notable social and structural hurdles inside the workplace. Women have often had to surpass men in terms of publications, grants, and student ratings to receive raises, tenure, or promotions. Further, when women succeed or excel many males assumed they did so only due to

affirmative action (Lattin, 1983, Sandler, 1991; Wyche & Graves, 1992). The double standard for women holds true at home as well as in paid work, as professional women experience an unpaid second shift of household and childcare tasks to be completed once they are finished with their paid duties (Hochschild, 1997). The double standards faced by women have the potential to influence well-being and both career and life satisfaction (Moyer, Salovey, & Casey-Cannon, 1999; Reiss, 1983)

Significance of the Study

Although there are more women in faculty positions than in previous decades, they continue to be overlooked in research. The typical faculty member in the United States has been described as a middle aged, Protestant, Caucasian male of European decent from a middle to upper class background with a college educated, professional father (Falk, 1990; Finkelstein, 1984; Lipset & Ladd, 1989). While this description was a reflection of the sex and social composition in academe, it was also a consequence of sampling. Historically, when researchers began to focus on the family background and life of faculty members in the 1960s, they sampled those in academic positions – other Caucasian males. Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) succinctly stated:

> In more ways than one, then, the possibility for understanding female academics ended the day it began. The researchers looked in the mirror and found variables that accounted for their own superior position: Ph.D. as their highest degree, national ranking of their graduate school, quality rating of their place at work, religion in which raised (not Catholic or Southern Baptist), parents' education and social class, politically liberal orientation – in short the features of male WASPs and Jews. They apparently did not entertain hypotheses that there could be

different factors related to female success. From their vantage point, academe was a pure meritocracy, and could not possibly discriminate against women (p. 47).

Thus, although women have long worked in educational institutions in both faculty and support positions, researchers have tended to overlook their experiences and, in turn, administrators have created policies that could lead to discrimination, harassment, and decreased satisfaction. It is clear that focused research needs to be completed with women faculty in order to understand the experiences of women. With an understanding of the satisfaction levels and relationships of women faculty members, institutions can begin to create policy designed to recruit and retain these faculty members.

Women Faculty in MFT Programs

Women faculty in marriage and family therapy (MFT) programs have also been ignored in research, despite the inclusion of women's issues in MFT training and practice. Beginning in the 1970s and 1980s, feminist family therapists began to question and challenge sexist and gender stereotyped concepts that dominated traditional systems theory (Goodrich, Rampage, Ellman & Halsead, 1988; Hare-Mustin, 1978; Libow, Raskin, & Caust, 1982; Walter, Carter, Papp, & Silverstein, 1988). Early systems theories, in particular, tended to subvert and pathologize relationships through classifications such as enmeshment or the schizophrenic mother. Conversely, independence and autonomy, traits generally associated with men, were celebrated through a focus on individuation and emotional detachment (Gilligan, 1982; Miller, 1976).

As a result of the feminist critique, in 1988 the Commission on Accreditation of Marriage and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE) began to require training on gender and cultural issues in accredited programs. Coinciding with this mandate, COAMFTE also started encouraging the diversification of faculty members in MFT programs. From 1988 to 2002, the COAMFTE specified cultural and gender diversity among faculty members with the following standard.

> 130.08 The program will have a faculty diverse in age, culture, ethnicity, gender and race. Compliance will be judged in the context of program size and location. The program will be excepted from the diversity requirements of one or more of the items listed, if it can demonstrate that while the faculty itself is not diverse, it contributes by its lack of diversity to the diversity of the marriage and family therapy field as a whole (COAMFTE, 1997).

In addition to this standard, the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT) has helped to encourage the cultural diversity of students and faculty members through award programs such as the minority fellowship award, minority internship, and the minority supervision stipend award (AAMFT, 2002). Further, during the last two decades, cultural and family diversity issues have been featured much more prominently in workshops at AAMFT national conferences (Killian & Hardy, 1998) and in articles published in the *Journal of Marriage and Family Therapy,* one of the top tier journals in MFT (Bailey, Pryce, & Walsh, 2002). This suggested responsiveness, at least in theory, to the changing demographics in AAMFT and Western society in general.

However, while AAMFT and COAMFTE have promoted cultural and ethnic diversity, these organizations have been slower to promote gender concerns in MFT

training. There is considerable evidence that those in Marriage and Family Therapy clinical practice and training institutions continue to discriminate against and subordinate women (Haddock, MacPhee, & Zimmerman, 2001; Haddock, Zimmerman, & MacPhee, 2000; Werner-Wilson, Price, Zimmerman, & Murphy, 1997). McGoldrick, Anderson, and Walsh (1989) made the criticism that gender issues have been largely and unjustly ignored in MFT due to the following reasons: (a) focusing on needs of women is unscientific, (b) gender is unimportant as it is a content rather than process issue, (c) prominent therapists promote the idea of gender neutrality and therefore view concerns regarding incorporating gender as unnecessary, (d) families and children will suffer if women assert their needs, and (e) those who pay attention to male and female issues do so out of anger at men. The lack of focus on women's issues may well have kept MFT as a profession subordinate to psychology, social work, and counseling. Hare-Mustin (1989) stated, "The fact that family therapy has had little impact on other disciplines and theories may well be due to its inability to deal with the basic issue of gender" (p. 61). This has occurred because family therapists tend to place gender issues at the periphery and do not recognize that gender was a central organizing category.

Recently, COAMFTE reversed its position on recommending diversity within programs. As a preamble to the latest Standards of Accreditation, the Commission specified the following.

> The Commission believes that a great area of concern for our profession and accredited programs is the inclusion of racial diversity in our training contexts and in the student body of our programs. However, we have removed all diversity standards pertaining to numbers of individuals. Programs will be able to decide

for themselves whether they want to enhance diversity in their training contexts or maintain the status quo. The Commission also seeks to enhance the diversity of our programs in terms of age, culture, ethnicity, gender, physical ability, religion, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status, without disregarding the rights of religiously affiliated institutions and institutions outside of the United States. Religiously affiliated institutions that have core beliefs directed toward conduct within their communities are entitled to protect those beliefs. All institutions are exempt from those standards that would require them to violate the laws of their states or provinces (COAMFTE, 2002).

Although this reversal was likely due to the pragmatics of enforcing gender and racial diversity, this reversal effectively marginalizes cultural and gender issues and could serve to promote discrimination in training institutions.

COAMFTE as an organization has not placed the appropriate emphasis on gender and the experiences of women. This is particularly problematic as the profession is primarily female. Based on available data from program reports, it was estimated that in 1999, approximately 74% of graduate students and slightly over half (53%) of MFT faculty in COAMFTE accredited programs were female (Kaveny, personal communication, September 2, 2002). As women make up such a large percentage of the faculty and students in MFT, they deserve to have their experiences be recognized and supported to the same extent as male faculty. Based on available literature on women in academia, it is clear that women face notable institutional and societal hurdles. This can create a hostile environment where not only are women's experiences ignored, they are subverted. Only by knowing about the experiences of women faculty members can

AAMFT go beyond a band-aid approach of encouraging diversity to creating programs and incentives necessary to keep female faculty members successful and satisfied.

Theoretical Influences

This study is guided in part by the theoretical frame of General System Theory, the basis of Marriage and Family Therapy. Within General System Theory, the interaction of organisms is considered a system, and thus these multiple systems must also be the focus of study (Bertalanffy, 1968). Bertalanffy stated, "It is necessary to study not only parts and processes in isolation, but also solve the decisive problems found in the organization and order unifying them, resulting from dynamic interaction of parts, and making the behavior of parts different when studied in isolation or within the whole" (p. 31). Thus, the behavior of organisms cannot be reduced to individual processes. General System Theory represented a change from more linear views of thinking in therapeutic interventions which only focused on the individual. Family therapy founders expanded on the ideas of General System Theory by classifying human beings and families as systems, and thus changing their area of focus to the interaction of family members. Within this framework, multiple systems may have an influence on and in turn be influenced by problems or joys within one aspect of the system (Bateson, 1979; Efrans, Lukens, & Lukens, 1990).

While family systems theory represented a new and exciting way to look at families, traditional systemic family therapy has been characterized by patriarchy and male hierarchy (Goodrich et al., 1988; Libow et al., 1982; Walter, Carter, Papp, & Silverstein, 1988). As a result, some of these theories have promoted and reinforced sexist and gender stereotyped concepts within families (Libow et al., 1982). Therefore,

8

while this research takes the frame of General System Theory by addressing multiple systems, the theoretical framework is also guided by a feminist perspective on women's developmental theory, which is often associated with psychology or human development. The theoretical model of women's development is summarized below.

Theoretical Model of Women's Development

Researchers have long recognized that women and men encounter different developmental patterns, particularly in the area of relationships (Gilligan, 1982; Miller, 1976). This research indicates gender is an organizing theme of families. Therefore, when focusing on the needs of women, it is important to understand and address female developmental theory.

Perhaps one of the greatest achievements in 20th century psychology is the pioneering work by Carol Gilligan, Dorothy Dinnerstein, Jean Baker Miller, and others, who recognized that women experience a different developmental pattern than do men. This realization contrasted with developmental theorists dating back to Freud who viewed healthy development from a masculine image that has negated, demoralized, and frightened women (Gilligan, 1982). A central difference in Westernized female and male developmental patterns is the experience of relationships in the formation of identity. Due to early sex differences in the experiences of individuation, men and women tend to view connection differently. Stereotypically, intimacy and attachment have defined femininity whereas separation has defined masculinity. Thus, researchers focused on adult development, as defined by male developmental patterns only, have traditionally placed more value on individuation than on intimate relationships (Gilligan, 1982). Although this may seem constraining and simplistic to modern ideals of masculinity and

femininity, as used in the past, these concepts delineated the divergent paths of female and male development. Basing criteria for normal development on typical male patterns, while ignoring female patterns, has served to classify women's unique strengths as deviant and weak.

In female-centered development, work has been redefined to encompass many different meanings and activities rather than being limited to paid employment outside the home. Traditionally, work conducted by women was often not recognized as such because the activities involved in this work aided in the development and advancement of others without necessarily contributing to or emphasizing self-enhancement. Further, as women's labor has often been unpaid, it has not been counted in the male definition of meaningful work. However, the important work of managing the household, providing care for children, and aiding in the emotional development of others is necessary for the development of multiple systems. Although not accepted as worthwhile endeavors in traditional Western society, women have been able to build a sense of self-worth through these caring activities (Dinnerstein, 1976; Gilligan, 1982; Miller, 1976). Women have the ability to recognize and respond to others' needs without detracting from their own identity, which could lead to more advanced development of the self than might otherwise be possible (Miller, 1976).

Social relationships with others make up part of a woman's sense of self and identity. Women, more so than men, have discovered that many actions are more fulfilling when they are conducted within relationships and particularly when these relationships lead to the enhancement of others (Dinnerstein, 1976; Miller, 1976). By building relationships, women can achieve a sense of power. Work outside the home

contributes to male identity and sense of power, but paradoxically alienates males from others. Conversely, women hold and exert power in the traditional roles of fostering the development of and empowering others (Miller, 1982). This type of support has been essential to allow and enable men to work outside of the home and thus achieve their sense of identity.

Nonetheless, while women define themselves through their relationships and caregiving activities, this same care has tended to be devalued by the men they care for and by Western society in general (Dinnerstein, 1976; Gilligan, 1982; Miller, 1976). Beginning in adolescence, girls become socialized to subvert their needs and relational strengths because these resiliencies were seen as threatening to those with whom they want to build relationships (Taylor, Gilligan, & Sullivan, 1995). Women come to understand that social relationships viewed as healthy are defined through the male experience and are characterized by distant romantic partnerships and casual relationships with friends. Gilligan (1982) stated, "When the focus on individuation and individual achievement extends into adulthood and maturity is equated with personal autonomy, concern with relationships appears as a weakness of women rather than as a human strength" (p. 17).

Although there is little research on the relationships of women in academia, the research that has been conducted has indicated that relationships are important to the development of faculty women. Professional networks and work friends are thought to provide faculty women with career and personal benefits, including increased visibility and information dissemination (Rose, 1985), group solidarity and community (Astin & Leland, 1991; Rose), and unconditional positive regard (Sack, 2001). Female faculty

have reported having a mentor, or an established colleague who could provide career and psychosocial assistance, positively correlated with enhanced career and individual outcomes and increased satisfaction (Brown, 1985). Finally, faculty women with greater levels of support from their friends, family, and significant others reported better physiological health and well being (Amatea & Fong, 1991) and improved work and life satisfaction (Hammond, 1987). Based on the results of these studies, it is clear that relationships can influence the career and life experiences of women faculty and thus, deserve further scrutiny.

<div align="center">Purpose of the Study</div>

Despite the fact that academe may be one of the most frequently and methodically studied occupations (Locke, Fitzpatrick, & White, 1983), there has been very little research on the personal and professional relationships of academic faculty. Further, there has been very little published research on female MFT faculty. As Avis and Turner (1996) noted:

> We are struck with how little research exists in family therapy on women, their experience and their perspectives – as therapists, as clients, in supervisory and training relationships, as employees in agencies and institutions, as authors and researchers, and as members of professional organizations. The need to create space for women's voices remains important and overdue (p. 165).

Understanding the satisfaction levels of women faculty is necessary for creating a climate hospitable to faculty and trainees and for creating incentives helpful for recruitment and retention of future faculty.

To meet this need, this dissertation addressed three main foci. First, I examined the overall experiences and satisfaction of women faculty in Marriage and Family Therapy programs. These women had the opportunity to identify their experiences and levels of satisfaction through objective means. Second, I assessed how demographic and institutional variables predict career satisfaction, satisfaction with significant relationships, intimacy in friendships, and mentoring functions. Finally, I examined associations among career satisfaction, relationship satisfaction, interpersonal intimacy, and mentoring functions in accordance with women's developmental theory.

Research Questions

As there is very little research on women faculty in MFT programs, this study was exploratory in nature. I examined the career satisfaction level of female faculty in MFT programs and explored how social support, significant romantic relationships, and mentor relationships predict career satisfaction. I addressed the following questions.

1. How satisfied are MFT women with their careers overall?

2. How satisfied are these women with their marriages or committed relationships?

3. How intimate are the friendships of the women in this sample?

4. Does interpersonal intimacy differ across friends of different genders in these women's networks?

5. What personal and professional characteristics of a woman's mentor predict the functions he or she provides?

6. To what extent do friendship, satisfaction with significant romantic relationships, mentor functions, and demographic variables predict career satisfaction in this sample?

7. To what extent do friendship intimacy, mentor functions, career satisfaction, and demographic variables predict satisfaction with significant romantic relationships in this sample?

8. To what extent do satisfaction with significant romantic relationships, mentor functions, career satisfaction and demographic variables predict friendship intimacy in this sample?

Hypotheses

As the relationships of women in academia have largely been ignored in research, this research represented an attempt to explore the associations among these variables. However, there is some evidence to suggest that the rank and tenure status influence career satisfaction (Abouserrie, 1996; Bland & Ballard, 1999; Meuer et al., 1998; Patterson, Sutton, & Schuttenberg, 1987). Therefore, based on this research, the following hypotheses were proposed.

1. Faculty who are tenured will be more satisfied with their career.

2. Faculty who have reached the rank of professor will be more satisfied with their career.

Self of the Researcher

Phenomological family therapy researchers recognize that researchers are not separate from the subjects they study (Boss, Dahl, & Kaplan, 1996). The researcher herself influences the choice of topic, methods, instruments and data analysis in any study. This section highlights the theoretical influences that guide my work as well as my social and cultural background.

<u>Feminist Informed Family Therapy and Research</u>

Goodrich and associates (1988) described feminist family therapy as "a political and philosophical viewpoint which produces a therapeutic modality by informing the questions the therapist asks and understanding the therapist develops" (p. 21). Thus, feminist family therapy is less of theory and more of a worldview. My viewpoint as a researcher and clinician comes from this feminist stance. Feminist family therapists view gender and power as organizing factors in Western society (Avis, 1996; Hare-Mustin, 1989). This stance reflects the social context and cultural stereotypes reinforced in families that disempower women and members of minority groups and force them into inferior positions (Hare-Mustin, 1978; Goldner, 1985; Wheeler, Avis, Miller, & Chaney, 1986). Feminists seek to make individuals aware of the oppressiveness of traditional roles while gaining experiences promoting self-definition and ideally choosing behaviors to fit the situation regardless of stereotyped roles or expectations (Hare-Mustin, 1978).

As a feminist informed researcher, I have paid special attention to the following approaches. First, feminist researchers focus on the interface between power and gender (Avis & Turner, 1996). As female faculty live and work in a hierarchical climate, this research will highlight how status issues affect academic women's experiences. Second, feminist research recognizes and represents human diversity and particularly the uniqueness of women. As this research uses only a female sample, it allows the study of the similarities and differences among a cohort of women. Finally, in the interest of promoting social change, feminist researchers look to contribute to greater gender equality as well as the general expansion of knowledge. They recognize and emphasize the need to report research results to participants, the academic audience, and the general

public (Avis & Tuner, 1996). As part of the dissemination of this research, I will prepare a summary of the results and interpretation to send to research participants upon request. In addition, I will prepare a list of recommendations for recruiting and retaining female faculty in MFT programs and will send these recommendations to COAMFTE and to COMAFTE accredited MFT programs. Finally, every effort will be made to publish the results of this research in scholarly journals related to MFT, women's issues, and faculty issues.

Social History

From my theoretical stance as a feminist, I recognize that my "research will always be influenced by [my] own gendered and social experience" (Avis & Turner, 1996, p. 161). Therefore, it is important to identify and reflect on my own privileged experience as a Westernized, Caucasian female. As my parents' upbringing directly relates my own social history and the impetus for this study, I begin with my understanding of their history. Both my mother and father were from poor, rural, coal mining towns in the Appalachian Mountains with little opportunity for education or jobs. My mother and father saw higher education as a way to escape from their environment. They earned bachelor degrees from Berea College, making my mother the first four-year college graduate in her family and my father the first in his family to even graduate high school. My father went on to get his M.S. and Ph.D. and obtained a faculty teaching position at a large university.

Due to the importance of higher education in shaping my parents' lives, I grew up valuing the importance of education and respect for the academic lifestyle. During my childhood, my parents did not ask, "Are you going to college?" but instead, "What

college?" While in college, my parents encouraged me to further my education. I chose to pursue a Ph.D. with the ultimate goal of becoming a faculty member in an MFT program. Thus, when deciding on a topic of research, I decided to more fully explore the intricacies of the academic lifestyle, partly as a self-serving way to find out what was in store. As a MFT researcher, I wanted to find out about the relationships of MFT women faculty and how their relationships influenced their careers. As a feminist, I wanted to highlight and celebrate the private and public lives of these women and to promote change within MFT programs for future generations of women.

Although I have roots in rural Appalachia, I must acknowledge the privileges of growing up as an upper middle class, Caucasian, Protestant female with college educated parents. In many ways, I fit the prototype of the typical academic faculty member, although I am not male. These factors have awarded me certain advantages, including the opportunity to attend college and graduate school. My social background and history influence my research, including, and perhaps even especially, my choice of topics for this research.

Anticipated Benefits of the Study

There are a number of anticipated benefits of this study. This research will add empirical findings to the literature on women faculty members in general and female MFT faculty in particular. This is important as women faculty members are often overlooked in research studies. This research will also highlight factors that predict career satisfaction for MFT female faculty members. This information can be used to inform policy at the COAMFTE and institutional level to recruit and retain a diverse

faculty. Further, this research will contribute to women's developmental theory as it focuses on the importance of relationships on career satisfaction.

In addition to the contributions to the general knowledge of women, this research will add to feminist family therapy theory and research. It focuses on both the public paid work role and private relational role of women MFT faculty. This is important as women have historically been relegated to the role of family provider while their role as paid worker has been ignored. Further, research has documented continued discrimination in status, hiring, and salary among faculty women. Using a feminist framework allows more of an examination on gender and power differentials in the academic climate. Finally, feminist family therapy researchers are active in identifying and working with gender and power in family therapy and MFT training (Avis, 1996). As this is one of the first studies on MFT faculty in general and female MFT faculty in particular, it has the potential to change the training practices of those that are training future marriage and family therapists.

Chapter II

Review of Relevant Literature

In addressing the career satisfaction of women in academia, it is important to review historical and current literature and research pertaining to these women. More specifically, this chapter will examine: (a) the paid work duties of faculty women, (b) issues faced by academic women in the workplace, (c) relationships of faculty women, and (d) sources of career and personal stress and satisfaction.

Duties of Women in Academia

As indicated by the work duties of an average faculty member, those in higher education have been engaged in many roles. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (1999) found faculty members averaged 53 hours a week at work, with the vast majority of time spent on paid activities (46 hours), with some portion of the week (3 hours) spent on unpaid activities at their institution. Faculty spent 57% of their time engaged in teaching, 15% on research, 13% on administrative tasks, and 11% on service and professional growth activities. Although male and female faculty members performed the same duties, there were differences in the amount of time afforded to and interest in these activities. A summary of work duties and related sex differences is described below.

Teaching

Teaching undergraduate and graduate classes is both the main duty and expressed preference of many faculty members in the United States. Across institutions, 61% of faculty reported spending at least 8 hours per week in formal classroom instruction and 67.7% reported teaching 3 or more undergraduate or graduate classes per week (NCES,

1993). Faculty in teaching colleges tend to have heavier teaching loads while faculty at primarily research institutions tend to have lighter teaching loads (NCES, 2001; Ladd & Lipset, 1977). As teaching requires extra time for preparation and grading, it is easy to see why faculty spend so much of their time with teaching duties.

Although both males and female academicians engage in classroom instruction, there is great variability in teaching loads between the sexes as women have been given larger teaching loads than men. The National Center for Education Statistics (1999) reported that female faculty spent approximately 61% of their time engaged in teaching duties, whereas male faculty spent 54% of their time teaching. Women also tended to teach more undergraduate level classes then did men (Astin & Bayer, 1972). It is unclear from the literature if women are given more teaching responsibilities due to an interest in teaching, because of administrative beliefs that women are better able to handle the social interaction involved in educating students, or because, on average, women hold lower ranks and taught more courses due to rank. Nevertheless, higher teaching loads could lead to many outcomes, including more energy spent in preparation and grading, reduced time for research and publishing, and a greater likelihood to be asked to join committees and engage in service work due to the increased visibility of these faculty. Heavier teaching and service loads could also adversely affect tenure and promotions, especially at research institutions, as this would likely translate to less time for research and scholarship. Alternately, this could force women to spend more time "on the job" in order to balance the competing duties of teaching, research, service, and administration.

Students often treat male and female teachers differently for the same tasks and behaviors. Male students have tended to act more aggressively in female taught

classrooms by speaking more often than female students and interrupting both female students and professors (Brooks, 1982). Further, students often challenge the credentials and the authority of female professors more often than those of male professors, in covert ways, such as failing to address a female faculty member as "Doctor", as well as overt ways, including openly questioning the degree awarded to these faculty members (Brooks, 1982; Heckert et al., 1999). Students tend to see women academicians as less available even though female faculty on average spend more time with students than do male faculty (Bennett, 1982).

Further, female professors often face a double bind with students, administrators, and male faculty. They are expected to be more motherly and nurturing than male teachers and are often pressured for special treatment, yet this behavior is simultaneously viewed as weak. Unlike a male counterpart, when a female professor acts assertively or demanding, she has been seen as rigid and over controlling, (Basow & Silberg, 1987; Sandler, 1991). Students, administrators and other faculty also tend to be more critical of the dress, grading policies, and manner of speech of female faculty and hold women to higher standards than men. If a female professor introduces women's issues or interjects non-sexist language such as "he and/or she," students, faculty, and administrators have often viewed the teacher negatively or as pushing a political agenda (Sandler, 1991). Thus, female faculty tend to be overburdened not only by heavier teaching loads, but also with double standards and a negative work environment.

Research and Publications

Faculty members build visibility and respectability with funded research projects and publications of scholarly work. Research and publishing have fast become "the

activities most valued in academia and most conducive to rewards in terms of salary, promotions, and access to the more prestigious universities" (Blackburn & Holbert, 1987, p. 305). On average, faculty spent 15.2% of their work week conducting research and writing publications, with faculty at research institutions spending more time on research than faculty at other colleges and universities (NCES, 2001). Although research and scholarship are highly valued across higher education institutions, it is clear that faculty have not been able to spend as much time as they wished on these activities. The National Center for Education Statistics (2001) reported that while faculty spent 15.2% of their actual work time distribution engaged in research or scholarship, their preferred work time distribution for these activities would have accounted for 21.9% of their work week. This indicates that faculty would have liked to spend more time on research and publications, but were unable to carve the time in their work week to engage in these necessary tasks. Faculty often found they had to juggle the multiple demands of teaching, research, publishing, and committee work in order to be competitive (Rhone, 1995).

As with teaching, there is great variability in time spent in grant writing and research between males and females. Women spent a lower percentage of their time conducting research than male peers (12% versus 18%) (NCES, 1993). Women have also been less likely to have grants, especially federal grants with larger awards (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). However, it is unlikely that the reduced time spent on research and grant writing was a reflection on a woman's ability to conduct research. Instead, it is likely due to an inequity in support offered to female academicians to obtain external funding. Blackburn and Holbert (1987, p. 305) stated "women do not have equal access

to the ways and means for research productivity — collegial networks, funding opportunities, research assistants, and collaborative arrangements."

Dissemination of research findings through scholarly publications often determines pay raises, tenure, and promotions. Many researchers have addressed sex differences in productivity of faculty, with early literature suggesting that men had more publications than women (Astin, 1978; Astin & Davis, 1985; Bayer, 1973; Centra, 1974; Clemente, 1973; Hamovitch & Morgenstern, 1977). However, many of these studies were either sample specific or failed to control for variables such as institution and discipline. As females have been overrepresented in less prestigious schools and disciplines with reduced opportunity for research, they have had fewer resources available for writing articles and grants (Blackburn & Holbert, 1987). Further, in female dominated fields such as the humanities and education, faculty have tended to publish more books than research articles, which depresses the publication rates of refereed articles (Wanner, Lewis, & Gregorio, 1981). Other theories on the differences in publication rates between men and women fall under two categories: social factors, such as sex discrimination, and psychological factors, including experience with or interest in research and family role commitments. These theories also have limitations, including the failure to address socialization, environment, and personal differences (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995).

More recent research has shown negligible differences in publication rates between men and women (Allen, 1990; Bently & Blackburn, 1991; Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; MacKie, 1985; Reiger, 1990). This is especially true in disciplines with a greater number of female faculty, such as sociology (McNamee, Willis, & Rotchford, 1990), education (Reiger, 1990), and library science (Garkland, 1990). McNamee and

associates (1990) found that women in sociology tended to co-author books and articles, suggesting that women tend to be more productive in collaborative work relationships, a finding that reinforces the relational nature of female development. However, co-authorship is generally not regarded as highly as single or first authorship in most scholarly circles. This could adversely affect women since consideration for tenure and promotions almost often rest primarily on research and publications.

<u>Service</u>

Professional service to one's profession, institution, and community comprises a third aspect of the faculty lifestyle. Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) defined service as "the catchall name for everything that is neither teaching, research, nor scholarship" (p. 222). Faculty performed service functions both as a requisite for their position and to further their own career. These service duties take place both inside and outside of institutions of higher education. Certain duties, such as holding office in national associations, reviewing grant proposals, and editing journals, are esteemed within the academic community. Other services, such as advising and committee assignments, are not (Blackburn & Holbert, 1987).

As there are fewer women faculty members, those in academic positions are unduly encumbered with committee work and advising commitments. This type of work, while taking up much time and energy, has often been unrecognized and undervalued for tenure and promotions (Blackburn & Holbert, 1987; Kite et al., 2001). Men and women of color are often particularly overburdened by committee work, where the presence of a woman or a member of a minority group has become almost a necessity (Bland & Ballard, 1999; Kite et al., 2001; Wyche & Graves, 1992).

Summary on Academic Duties of Women in Academia

While the duties that male and female academics have engaged in are the same, there are sex differences regarding the amount of time spent in these duties and level of respect afforded to men and women in academia. As summarized above, females are likely to spend more time engaged in teaching and service duties, resulting in less time for research and publishing. However, although institutions of higher education are thought of as arenas of teaching, most colleges and universities value research over teaching. Thus, research, which historically tended to be the domain of males, was rewarded at a greater level than teaching, the domain of females. This, in turn, influences the compensation and status awarded to faculty for these tasks. These factors could also transform the satisfaction and stress levels of these faculty members and, thus, deserve further scrutiny.

Issues Facing Women in Academia

As evidenced by the vast quantity of literature on the subject, women faculty face unique and pervasive challenges in the workplace, including sexual and occupational discrimination and harassment. Practices considered discriminatory in academia include the underrepresentation of females and members of minority groups, unequal pay, sexual harassment of students and faculty, and inequitable funding for male and female athletic programs (Fueher & Shilling, 1985). Many researchers have proposed that women have been victims of discrimination in academia based upon documented differences in status, salaries, and expectations for men and women (Alperson, 1975; Astin & Bayer, 1972; Caplan, 1994; Fueher & Schilling, 1985; Robbins & Kahn, 1985; Valian, 1998). These behaviors help contribute to the devaluation of women's perceived sense of competence

in the classroom and within the academic system (Fueher & Schilling, 1985). The next four sections summarize sex differences in discipline, rank and tenure, salary, and harassment.

Sex and Discipline

Women tend to be clustered in certain fields, such as social sciences, nursing, education, and humanities (Blackburn & Holbert, 1987; Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Robbins & Kahn, 1985; Stephan & Kassis, 1997). These fields are apt to have fewer outside resources, more competition for grants and fellowships, and lower mean salaries than disciplines such as engineering, business, and physical sciences. This creates a disadvantage for women within these fields for launching their career and obtaining the necessary grants and publications to move up the academic ladder (Blackburn & Holbert, 1987). In addition to the underrepresentation of women in certain fields, women are more often excluded from research-oriented universities and assigned to low power positions with little autonomy and decision making ability in other colleges and universities (Blackburn & Holbert, 1987; Freeman, 1977). Women are more likely to teach in two-year and community colleges, institutions which often have fewer resources, such as research assistants and access to educational and research oriented materials. Community colleges are also considered by many in the academic community to be less prestigious (Astin & Bayer, 1972; Blackburn & Holbert; Blackburn & Lawrence; Hill, 1984; Joesting, 1974).

Sex, Rank, and Tenure

In general, women tend to have less esteemed careers, often being assistants rather than directors or administrators. In academia, women are concentrated in lower

ranking and untenured positions, such as assistant professor, lecturer, or adjunct (Benjamin, 1998; Buckley et al., 2000; Joesting, 1974; Meurer et al., 1998; Robbins & Kahn, 1985; Valian, 1998). Women are likely to be involuntarily unemployed or underemployed even when they have high credentials and experience (Solomon, 1978; Valian). The underrepresentation of female faculty persists despite the increase of women entering college, earning their Ph.D., and obtaining academic positions (Bickel, Croft, Johnson, & Marshall, 1998; Valian, 1998). Women are even scarcer at more elite institutions. In a national survey of faculty, Szafran (1984) found that the higher the rating of the department or institution, the fewer the number of female faculty hired.

Women hired into academic positions are less likely than men to reach the rank of professor, the upper echelon in academia. In 1997, although women comprised 36% of faculty at all ranks at higher education institutions in the United States, only 20% held the rank of professor (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000a). Further, whereas the percentage of female faculty at the ranks of assistant and associate professor rose steadily during the 20th century, the percentage of women professors did not rise until the 1980s (Stephan & Kassis, 1997). This discrepancy persisted despite the availability of women at the lower ranks who could have moved to the rank of professor (Benjamin, 1998; Valian, 1998). Thus, although women have served their time as assistant and associate professors, they are less likely than men to be promoted to professor.

Members of minority groups, especially women, are disproportionally underrepresented in all ranks of faculty and administration (Moyer, Salovey, & Casey-Cannon, 1999; Wyche & Graves, 1992). The National Center for Education Statistics (2000a) reported that African-American, Hispanic, and Native American men and women

made up only 13.7% of full-time instructional faculty in degree-granting institutions in 1997. Although most institutions denounce overt forms of discrimination, minorities continue to face "symbolic racism" as informal sources of support and resources, such as research assistants, library time, and research leave are often denied to them (Moyer et al., 1999). Thus, even though many institutions state a commitment to diversity in hiring with the blanket statement "women and minorities are particularly encouraged to apply", these same institutions create an atmosphere where women and minorities are a risk to fail.

The academic tenure and reward system is biased towards males as duties traditionally conducted by men (e.g., publishing, research, and administration) are recognized and valued at a greater level than duties completed by women (e.g., teaching and service) (Astin & Bayer, 1972). Female faculty members often take twice as long to move up the academic career ladder (Astin & Bayer, 1972) and are less likely to receive tenure than their male counterparts (Valian, 1998). When women achieve tenure, they generally do so at a later age. There remains "a widely held attitude in many institutions that women are not really serious or even legitimate contenders in the academic enterprise" (Hill, 1984, p. 180). Even after entering the academic system, male networks keep women from significant participation in the administrative and decision-making affairs of the institution, which effectively push women into marginalized roles (Clark & Corcoran, 1986). Further, institutions often deny or delay tenure for women due to interruptions in employment from child rearing or other family responsibilities (McElrath, 1992; Moyer et al., 1999; Robbins & Kahn, 1985). McElrath (1992) found women with career interruptions were less likely to achieve tenure than males with

similar career interruptions or females without interruptions but matched in productivity. Women with families, therefore, appeared to be penalized for taking time for childbearing and child rearing.

African-American female educators face the dual burdens of sexual discrimination and racism. Singh, Robinson, and Williams-Green (1995) discovered that African-American women were not granted tenure at the same rate as African-American men. These women also perceived less administrative support for funding and research and reported fewer chances to work in collaboration with colleagues, contributing to fewer publications and grants awarded. Women of color were less likely to be promoted and were more likely to leave their institutions than were white males (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Perkins, 1997; Singh et al., 1995). Administrators and colleagues may relate to female members of a minority group through stereotypes or view them as affirmative action tokens. These women also face the risk of having their research be undervalued and under funded, especially if their research focuses on gender or ethnic issues (Wyche & Graves, 1992). Historically, Caucasian women tended to show insensitivity to the discrimination faced by female members of minority groups while male members of minority groups viewed them as a threat to their own economic and social advancement (Alperson, 1975). As a result of these behaviors, women of color may have been even more invisible or oppressed in the academic system than their Caucasian counterparts.

Sex and Salary

It is clear from the research that women in academia have traditionally earned less than men for the same duties, credentials, and achievements (Astin & Bayer, 1972;

29

Benjamin, 1998; Blackburn & Holbert, 1987; Robbins & Kahn, 1975). There has been less of a consensus, however, whether the discrepancy in pay between men and women is deserved. One reason for the confusion is that the criteria for awarding tenure and promotions are not standardized across or even within institutions and instead depend on individual variables, such as productivity, ability to secure grants, teaching effectiveness, rank, and years of service. Institutions use these criteria to justify different pay rates for faculty. Some researchers indicated that differences in institution type, discipline, experience, and rank justified differences in salary. As summarized above, women tend to enter fields with fewer resources and opportunities for grants (Blackburn & Holbert, 1987; Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Robbins & Kahn, 1985) and tend to teach at smaller colleges or community colleges, institutions that generally offer lower salaries to faculty members (Astin & Bayer, 1972; Blackburn & Holbert; Blackburn & Lawrence; Hill, 1984; Joesting, 1974). Women are also more likely to teach part-time (Benjamin, 1998). On the surface, this indicates that it is only appropriate to generalize research on salaries within disciplines and institution type instead of across faculty men and women in general. Nevertheless, while these variables could account for salary differentials, researchers often fail to consider discrimination, socialization factors in choosing a discipline, or hiring practices within institutions and thus may not be accounting all of the variables that contribute to these differences.

Another reason for the disagreement regarding pay between male and female faculty has been poor research design. Researchers have often focused on differences in salaries for males and females according to rank or institutions; however, they often failed to control for variables that could confound salary discrepancies. Males at the level

30

of professor tend to be older and more experienced than females at this level and thus, earn a higher salary. This tends to inflate pay inequality between men and women (Valian, 1998). On the other hand, as males were promoted faster than females, faculty at lower ranks and pay levels included both young males and females and older females who should have been promoted out of this rank. Therefore, comparing salaries at lower ranks is likely to underestimate income discrepancies (Benjamin, 1998; Valian, 1998). Comparing salaries across institutional type also indicate different pay rates for men and women. At colleges with a higher percentage of male instructors, men were apt to be paid more than women, likely as a result of pay differentials among disciplines. Institutions with higher numbers of women, such as community colleges, tend to have more parity between the sexes (Hill, 1984).

Supporting the argument of gender discrimination in salary, researchers discovered women with comparable or better credentials and publication records then men still received lower salaries and less recognition (Benjamin, 1998; Black & Holden, 1998; Robbins & Kahn, 1985; Solomon, 1978). Women faculty members have also tend to receive lower salaries even when differences in rank, degree, and years of employment are taken into account (Astin & Bayer, 1972; Benjamin, 1998; Wyche & Graves, 1992). As part of an update to the 1988 report from the American Association for University Professors, Benjamin (1998) suggested salary discrepancies between men and women had more to do with societal and institutional factors that limited women to part-time, untenured positions than differences in abilities or preferences. Astin and Bayer (1972) stated, "Women clearly hold a lower status not only by virtue of some of their choices based on their interests, but also because of limitations imposed upon them by the system.

When women make the same choices and enter the system as men do, they still do not make as much money" (p. 110).

Harassment

Women faculty often face occupational and sexual harassment from male students and other faculty. Grauerholz (1989) found that nearly half of a sample of faculty women reported harassment from students, peers, and supervisors, ranging from undue attention and comments to obscene phone calls and implicit sexual propositions. Similarly, McCain, O'Reilly, and Pfeffer (1983) reported that 49% of untenured women faculty and 32% of tenured women faculty experienced harassment from a superior, including verbal harassment, gestures, and pressure for sexual favors. In addition, Nevels (1980) found that women faculty indicated that male colleagues patronized and made hostile comments to them. These types of behaviors can create a hostile work environment.

Sexual and occupational harassment can lead to early career termination as up to 10% of women have quit a job due to harassment (Gutek, 1989). Sexual and occupational harassment has also been associated with a number of adverse personal outcomes, such as psychosocial and physical symptomology, stress and anxiety, decreased autonomy, and increased risk for suicide. Approximately 25% to 75% of women who have been harassed at work experienced emotional or physical symptoms (Roosmale & McDaniel, 1998).

Summary on Issues Facing Women in Academia

Based on the research documenting gender disparities in academia, it is evident that women are at a disadvantage. Research has clearly shown that "in almost every field and subfield, in almost every cohort and at almost every point in their teaching and research careers, women advance more slowly and earn less money than men" (Valian, 1998, p.

217). Additionally, women have faced sexual and occupational harassment from students, administrators, and other faculty. Although administrators and faculty at institutions of higher education would likely deny that they have engaged in discrimination, it is apparent from research that these behaviors have not disappeared nor are they confined to certain institutions. Instead, discrimination, harassment, and bias, can "be found everywhere, from the most prestigious universities to little known community colleges" (Robbins & Kahn, 1985, p. 7) and creates far-reaching emotional and professional costs to the individual and institution.

<div align="center">Relationships of Women in Academia</div>

<u>Couple and Family Relationships</u>

Historical data on the marital relationships of faculty women is relatively scarce. Prior to the 1970s, a large percentage of women with advanced degrees or in faculty positions were single (Centra, 1974; Eckert & Stecklein, 1959; Miller-Loessi & Henderson, 1997). Although women, and particularly women of color, have long been part of the paid work force, primarily due to economic need (Goldin, 1990; Miller-Loessi & Henderson, 1997; Perkins, 1997), combining a well paid and satisfying career with marriage and a family in the United States was until only recently limited to men and generally only Caucasian men from privileged backgrounds (Stephan & Kassis, 1997). Institutional factors, such as a preference for single females and restrictions against hiring family members (Ferber & Loeb, 1997; Stephan & Kassis, 1997), and the societal separation of home as the domain of females and paid work as the domain of males (Goldner, 1985) kept women with families from careers in academia. As Miller-Lossi and Henderson (1997) stated, "only a few women could hope for a fulfilling and well-paid

career, many women could expect a committed relationship and a family, but almost no women–of any race or class–could have it all" (p. 28).

Anti-nepotism codes, which forbade the hiring of spouses and relatives at the same institution, served to keep married women out of academe until the 1970s (Ferber & Loeb, 1997; Shoben, 1997). Even into the 1980s, a married professional woman was unlikely to hold a faculty position if her husband was employed at the same university. Anti-nepotism codes were particularly problematic for women in small communities with limited opportunity for skilled work outside of college or university settings. More recently, there has been a rapid rise of married women in academia, resulting from the reversal of anti-nepotism codes and from the general increase of women entering the labor force and getting advanced degrees (Ferber & Loeb, 1997). Since the 1960s, societal constraints regarding women and paid work have lessened so that women can more readily get advanced degrees and combine their career with a family (Goldin, 1990). Although the rise of married women faculty could have been due to a difference in sampling in research studies as much of the past research focused on males, the change in the number of married women in research samples may also indicate that married women faculty are becoming more visible.

Although there are more married women faculty than in previous decades, these faculty members tend to face different internal and external pressures than single female or married male faculty. Supporting the results of other historical research on the well-being of married men and women, married academic men were likely to describe their marital status as an asset, whereas faculty women viewed marriage as a hindrance (Benard, 1964; Feldman, 1973). Fueher and Shilling (1985) suggested having a wife

freed academic men from household responsibilities and allowed more time for scholarly activities, whereas, because women were traditionally responsible for household work, these family responsibilities have impeded women's progress and productivity.

Married, professional women have been more likely to change their career plans or relocate for their partners' career than married men (Astin & Milem, 1997; Bukley, Sanders, Shih, Kallar, & Hampton, 2000; Kotkin, 1983). Although traditionally, Western society has dictated that women should relocate for their partners' job, this paradoxically created the image that women faculty were not as serious about their own careers and contributed to negativity about these women (Buckley et al., 2000). Academic women are unlikely to take time off from their career for childbearing or rearing and therefore often have had to work with the competing demands of childcare, home care, and their career (Astin & Milem, 1997; Blackburn & Holbert, 1987; Reiss, 1983). Faculty members who are also mothers have tended to engage in part-time graduate study and employment due to family responsibilities (Reiss, 1983). This creates the disadvantage that women enter the work force later, which results in lower lifetime salaries and decreased retirement benefits.

While married faculty women tend to be have many at-home pressures, several researchers have suggested that faculty women married to faculty men tend to fare better than single women in their career in terms of rank, employment patterns, and productivity (Astin & Davis, 1985; Astin & Milem, 1997; Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Davis & Astin, 1987). Astin and Davis (1985) argued that as faculty women tended to marry faculty men, they were at an advantage as their husbands could put them in contact with collegial networks with which they may not have otherwise had contact. They stated, "Women

without a male partner may be more likely to be excluded from the 'boys' network, important connections and critical information. Academic women who are married have fewer obstacles to the social networking and collegiality that plays an important role in facilitating productivity in academe" (Astin & Davis, 1985, p. 99).

Collegial Relationships and Friendships

There has been surprisingly little information on the social networks and friendships of academics, and female faculty in particular. Among the general population, many women consider friendships to be important to their well-being and enjoyment of life. Females tend to report that friends provide them with considerable emotional and social involvement and affective support (Blieszner & Adams, 1992; Roberto, 1996). Davidson and Packard (1981) found that women perceived their friendships as therapeutic and concluded that friendship contributed to positive psychological adjustment. Female friendships provide security, ego-support, and self-affirmation and are important components to well-being (Wright & Scanlon, 1991).

Much of the research on social networks has focused on collegial and professional networks as researchers have suggested that faculty members, particularly males, tended to socialize with other faculty (Bayer, 1973; Finklestein, 1984). In a review of the literature on professional networks, Rose (1985) theorized that collegial and professional networks provided the following functions for faculty: (a) socialization, (b) group development of social and moral solidarity, (c) enhanced visibility, (d) career benefits, including professional contacts and career opportunity information, and (e) information dissemination. Women faculty, in particular, reported that having work friendships helped them create a cohesive community within the academic system (Astin & Leland,

36

1991; Sack, 2001). Sack found work-based friendship groups often offered feelings of sisterhood, comfort, and unconditional positive regard and were important to the professional and personal growth of women faculty. Based on these functions, it is clear that professional and friendship networks are very beneficial to female faculty in feeling supported in the often hostile academic climate. This, in turn, could help predict greater career satisfaction.

Kaufman (1978) found that academic women tended to have larger and more integrated social networks than did male faculty. Unmarried female faculty reported more friends than single males or married males or females; however, they were likely to surround themselves with other unmarried female friends and colleagues. Married men and women tended to have more cross-sex relationships and were more likely to include males in their social networks. Kaufman suggested that single female professors were perceived as "triple deviants" due to their gender, profession, and unmarried state. As such, they were likely to have larger, more homogeneous networks of friends and colleagues in order to reduce perceived negative pressures about their career and marital choices. Further, unmarried women may have had social constraints that prohibited them from creating or maintaining cross-sex friendships. Hence, as unmarried female faculty were excluded from certain networks, particularly male networks that tended to hold power, they were "not only 'marginal' but 'invisible' when such important professional decisions as selection for promotion, tenure, research grants, co-editorships, summer teaching, and departmental privileges are under consideration" (Kaufman, 1978, p. 20). This research supported the contentions of Astin and other researchers (Astin & Davis, 1985; Astin & Milem, 1997; Davis & Astin, 1987) who speculated that married faculty

women were at an advantage as they gained access to professional collegial networks, and thus power, through their husbands.

Mentor Relationships

Since Greek mythology, when Odysseus entrusted the development of his son, Telemachus, to his trusted servant, Mentor (Homer, 1960), many have recognized that mentoring relationships have the ability to provide personal and professional development and advancement to both mentors and protégés (Merriam, 1983; Struthers, 1995). Although there have been many differing definitions of mentoring, it has broadly been defined as a professional relationship between a young adult and an older, more experienced adult who provides assistance navigating a professional career (Kram, 1985; Wright & Wright, 1987). The mentor relationship is characterized as providing to the protégé two important developmental functions: career functions and psychosocial functions (Kram, 1985; Levinson et al., 1978; Noe, 1988). Career functions are aspects of the relationship that could create and enhance career advancement and generally provide five benefits to the protégé: sponsorship, visibility and exposure, career related coaching, protection, and the provision of challenging work assignments. Psychosocial functions, on the other hand, help to enhance the protégé and mentor's sense of professional identity, competence, and effectiveness. Benefits include role modeling of appropriate behaviors, acceptance, confirmation, and support of each member in the relationship, expression and exploration of personal concerns, and friendship (Kram, 1985).

Although mentoring has been associated with a number of positive career and personal outcomes for both male and female protégés (Kram, 1983; 1985; Merriam, 1983), women and members of minority groups in the United States have been less likely

than white males to have a mentor for a number of reasons. First, as there are fewer women and members of minority groups in academia, these groups were forced to seek cross-sex or cross-cultural mentoring relationships. This has led to a variety of problems, such as rumors of or actual sexual involvement, harassment, or an ignorance of the discrimination faced by women and members of minority groups (Moore & Amey, 1988; Smith, Smith, & Markham, 2000; Ragins, 1989). Second, women and members of minority groups often lack visibility within organizations or access to informal settings to create mentorship opportunities, which allows mentors to overlook these faculty members (Brown, 1985; Hall & Sandler, 1983; Ragins, 1989). Hall and Sandler (1983) called educational institutions "old boys' networks" as white male administrators and senior faculty foster the development of other males as their successors, often to detriment of women and members of minority groups (p. 2). Finally, men may not have chosen females or minorities as protégés due to sex-role socialization, negative attitudes towards women and people of color, comfort level, or the idea that sponsoring a female or a person of color was a greater risk (Moore & Amey, 1988; Ragins, 1989; O'Neil, Horton, & Crosby, 1999; Smith et al., 2000). Moore and Amey (1998) stated that male mentors were more likely to choose other white males as protégés due to the "assumptions that males are more determined or more natural leaders and that women are less serious, less dedicated, and less likely to last over the long haul" (p. 47).

Further, senior women have been less likely to serve as mentors than senior men. Women seeking mentors are often challenged by the low numbers of female faculty mentors and the time constraints placed on these mentors due to personal work-load and the large demand for same sex mentors (Buckley et al., 2000; Moore & Amey, 1998).

This could pose problems for female protégés as many preferred having a female role model (Moore & Amey, 1998). The lack of senior female mentors was likely a result of small numbers of women in senior positions, rather than their willingness or preference to be a mentor (O'Neil et al., 1999).

Recent research indicates that some of the statistics on mentoring are changing, at least in business organizations. Several researchers have found that females are as likely as or more likely than males to have mentors (Dreher & Cox, 1996; Smith et al., 2000). Other researchers have suggested women have been working harder to establish mentoring relationships and have been utilizing alternative ways of finding mentors, such as on-line mentoring hotlines (Ibarra, 1995; Russell & Adams, 1997). Members of minority groups, on the other hand, continue to be less likely to have a mentor, particularly a same-race mentor, likely as a result of the low numbers of faculty that are also members of minority groups (Smith et al., 2000). While the increase of female faculty members in mentoring relationships is encouraging, the length women must go to in order to find a mentor shows that this continues to be problematic for women faculty.

Male mentors have been perceived to be more powerful than female mentors, likely as a function of the position of authority men held in organizations and academic settings (Ragins, 1989). Historically, male faculty and administrators controlled more financial resources and training opportunities. Even when female mentors had these resources, they have been discouraged from using them, as the direct use of power did not fit into the stereotypical female role (Johnson, 1976). In terms of differences in provision of resources, males have been associated with providing instrumental functions, such as career development, whereas females have been associated with providing

40

expressive functions, such as psychosocial support (Struthers, 1995). Instrumental

support has long been promoted within our culture while expressive and affective

expressions have been devalued (Hare-Mustin, 1989; O'Neill et al., 1999). Finally,

women have been less likely to believe that they have the resources and power necessary

to mentor as effectively as men (Ragins & Cotton, 1993). When choosing mentors,

protégés have been swayed by the actual and perceived power differentials between male

and female mentors. Ault-Riche (1987) reported that female students avoided females for

mentors or supervisors because they did not believe that they had to power to protect

students or to provide career opportunities. In the same vein, Struthers (1995) suggested

that male students avoided female mentors because they believed that males had more

status and power to facilitate career prospects.

Summary on Relationships

In summarizing the research of the relationships of academic women, it is clear

that couple, collegial, and mentor relationships have influenced the personal and career

lives of female faculty members in both positive and negative ways. Regarding marital

status, it appeared that being married or in a significant relationship has contributed to

more home stress, with women taking on a disproportionate share of household

responsibilities. However, martial status has also been related to better career outcomes

for at least for women faculty married to academic men, partly because of the

opportunities for networking provided by their husbands. In terms of social relationships,

professional networks and friendships have provided many benefits for faculty men and

women, including comfort, visibility, and cohesion. Again, marital status influenced the

careers of unmarried and married faculty women as unmarried female faculty did not

have the same access to networks, including cross-sex friendships, as their married

counterparts. This, in turn, could have hindered the career outcomes for certain faculty.

Finally, while the benefits of mentoring have long been recognized, women and

members of minority groups have been less likely to be mentored due to personal,

institutional, and societal factors. Further, there appears to be actual and supposed power

differentials between male and female mentors that have influenced how protégés view

the mentor relationship. Gender differences are likely more problematic for female

protégés as even if they want to be mentored, they may not have access to a mentor or,

alternately, may believe certain mentors were more beneficial than others. The gender

differences in mentoring opportunities could limit the potential career, relational, and

personal satisfaction levels of faculty women.

<center>Correlates of Career Satisfaction</center>

Evidence seems to indicate that faculty members express high overall satisfaction

with their careers, although satisfaction levels have declined since the 1960s and 1970s

(Rhone, 1995; Willie & Stecklein, 1982). Newell and Morgan (1983) found 91% of a

sample of faculty reported that they would still choose academia if they could pick their

career again. Other researchers have also found the majority were satisfied with their

careers, with faculty noting the overall academic climate, opportunities for autonomy,

and teaching duties were factors contributing to their satisfaction (Rozier, Gilkeson, &

Hamilton, 1991).

Although many faculty members report high satisfaction with their career, the

academic lifestyle could also be a source of distress. In a study of 5,000 academicians,

the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1989) found that 40% were

<center>42</center>

less enthusiastic about their career than when they began teaching and 44% were considering leaving academe within a five year span. Further, 57% felt trapped in their profession and expressed little hope for advancement. Likewise, Robins (1983) found the morale of 532 faculty members and administrators to be extremely low. Two-thirds of this sample felt the status of the academic profession had declined and expressed dissatisfaction with their remuneration. Although these studies did not specifically discuss the sex of the faculty member, it would be interesting to note whether women were more dissatisfied than men due to the discrimination and harassment factors described in previous sections.

Faculty members have also experienced moderate to high levels of stress, emotional exhaustion, and burnout (Abouserie, 1996; Boice & Myers, 1987; Edelstein, 2000). In one study, academic faculty and staff rated work as the most significant cause of stress in their lives, with work overload, adverse relationships with colleagues, students, and administrators, and family work role conflicts rated as the top stressors (Abouserie, 1996). Boice and Myers (1987) reported psychologists in private practice were more satisfied than psychologists in academia. Job-related stresses, such as increased paperwork, service, committee responsibilities, and low professional recognition contributed to the lower satisfaction levels of faculty members. Women faculty in this sample reported even greater levels of distress. Faculty may have experienced such high levels of distress as they, similar to other men and women who work outside the home, take on multiple career, professional, marital, and family roles (Fisher, 1994).

In measuring career satisfaction, researchers have often focused on the individual and demographic characteristics of the faculty member, such as sex, race or ethnic affiliation, rank and salary, and discipline. Less often, researchers have focused on the influence of relationships on the career satisfaction of faculty. The following summarizes research on selected personal and relational variables associated with career satisfaction of faculty members.

Interpersonal Variables Related to Career and Personal Satisfaction

Sex

Researchers have been unable to conclude whether the sex of the respondent correlates with career satisfaction in academic samples. Several authors (Black & Holden, 1998; Hammond, 1987; Hemmasi, Graf, & Lust, 1992; Meuer et al., 1998; Solomon, 1974; Stadtman, 1980; Winkler, 1982) suggested male faculty were more satisfied than female faculty. This was especially true in institutions such as medical schools, where males reported more happiness with work duties, administration, professional relationships, salary, autonomy, and opportunities for advancement (Black & Holden, 1998; Coyle, Aday, Battles, & Hynan, 1999). However, these studies did not take into account the sex-segregated nature of certain disciplines, across institutions, or academia in general. Women in institutions with a balanced ratio of male and females tended to report greater satisfaction than women in male dominated institutions (Farley, 1974; Hill, 1984).

Other researchers have found differences between male and female faculty in factors that influenced satisfaction. Kuhne and Pew (1989) found for males, having a higher salary best predicted satisfaction levels, accounting for 9% of the variance in job

satisfaction. In contrast, for females, spending less time with undergraduate students correlated with higher satisfaction levels, predicting 17% of the variance. It is interesting that for women, satisfaction was related to time spent with undergraduate students as other researchers found females generally teach more undergraduate classes and thus spend more time with undergraduate students (Astin & Bayer, 1972). In another study, Hammond (1987) also found differences in satisfaction predictors between males and females. The use of individual coping strategies and greater hardiness levels (defined by having an internal locus of control, involvement and commitment in life activities, and perceiving change as a means of development) predicted sources of satisfaction for men. Conversely, for women, but not men, social support from friends and family predicted higher satisfaction. In both of these studies, individual or interpersonal variables predicted satisfaction for men whereas relational and social support variables influenced the perception of satisfaction for females. These findings seem to support women's developmental theory.

Women in academia face a number of stressors. Akin to other women who work outside the home, female faculty have been burdened with balancing work and family life, personal and professional time constraints, financial concerns, a lack of supportive work environment, and managing household work. These pressures are often internal or situational and appear to be influenced by other's expectations and socialization factors (Moyer et al., 1999; Reiss, 1983). Stress, particularly for women, has been linked to a number of adverse outcomes, including chronic illness and disease (Arber, Gilbert, & Dale, 1985; Cooke, 1986; Powers, 1984) and increased psychological distress (Barnett & Brennan, 1997; Barnett, Brennan, Raudenbush, and Marshall, 1994; Sekran, 1985). It

could be expected, then, that women face situations, such as work and family pressures, which influence their career satisfaction levels.

Among MFT faculty, Matheson (2002) found that males reported greater satisfaction than females the balance of their work and personal life. Female MFT faculty generally felt they had a poor balance or mixed good and poor balance between their career and home life. This was related to chronic pressures at home and work that hindered these women from balancing these two spheres. Both male and female faculty felt that males had an easier time balancing home and family due to the inequitable division of household labor between men and women. This research confirms the work by Hochschild (1997) and others who suggested professional women experience an unpaid second shift of housework and childcare.

Ethnic Differences

In general members of minority groups have reported lower career satisfaction than Caucasian faculty. In a study of faculty at medical colleges, African-American, Mexican American, and Puerto Rican faculty reported lower levels of job satisfaction and a greater likelihood to leave academia within five years than Caucasian faculty. Further, faculty persons of color reported the need for additional income and felt that financial constraints negatively influenced their career choice (Palepu, Carr, Friedman, Ash, & Moskowitz, 2000). While faculty members from minority groups experienced the same successes and strains as those in the majority, they additionally faced racism and discrimination, factors that negatively affected career satisfaction. African-American faculty noted feeling overburdened with multiple duties and responsibilities, which led to increased stress levels. Race appeared to correlate with sex as a factor in academic

satisfaction as female African-American faculty were more likely than their male counterparts to rate themselves as unsatisfied or very unsatisfied with their academic careers (Bland & Ballard, 1999). These findings suggest faculty from racial or ethnic minority groups face particular hardships due to the added strain of discrimination.

African-American professors who taught in historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) reported greater career and relationship satisfaction than their peers in predominantly white colleges and universities. Male and female faculty in HBCUs reported greater satisfaction with their personal relationships and job security and felt their accomplishments and efforts were more recognized than faculty in other institutions (Eason, 1996). Similarly, Okolo and Eddy (1994) found faculty in HBCUs were largely satisfied with their relationships with co-workers, the supervision provided, and opportunities for promotion, but were dissatisfied with their pay. Married faculty and those at a higher academic rank were more satisfied with their career; however, sex, race, and length of service did not correlate with job satisfaction in this sample. As with the research above indicating satisfaction levels differ according to the sex composition of the institution, this research indicated that faculty tended to be more satisfied when they held less of a minority or token status.

Discipline and Rank

Satisfaction levels seem to be associated with discipline as faculty in the physical sciences (i.e., engineering, chemistry, and math) have reported greater career satisfaction than faculty in the social and behavioral sciences (i.e., education, social sciences, nursing) (Gmelch, Lovrich, & Wilke, 1984; Jennings, Barlar, and Bartling, 1991; Locke, Fitzpartick, & White, 1983; Zenger & Lawrence, 1989). Gmelch et al. (1984) speculated

that faculty in the physical sciences were more satisfied because they had better defined research programs and greater resources than those in the social and behavioral sciences and humanities. These resources enabled faculty to obtain more research grants and publish more prolifically, which translated to greater opportunities for tenure and promotion. However, this assumption may have been overly simplistic as having resources and grants does not necessarily equate with greater publishing rates. Instead, differences in satisfaction could have been due to the academic climate, which rewarded faculty, primarily men, in the physical sciences with more support and respect.

Several researchers have suggested that those in higher ranks were more satisfied with their careers, with professors having the highest satisfaction levels (Abouserie, 1996; Bland & Ballard, 1999; Holden & Black, 1996). In addition to lower satisfaction levels, faculty at lower ranks reported more life stress (Abouserie, 1996). Further, those in tenured or tenure track positions, which are often considered positions with greater career stability and security, rated themselves as more satisfied than faculty in non-tenure track positions (Bland & Ballard, 1999; Holden & Black, 1996). As professors are at the top of the academic ladder, these findings seemed to equate promotions with satisfaction and thus, success. However, in contrast to these findings, Richard and Krieshok (1989) found that faculty members experience similar role stressors regardless of sex and rank. This indicates that more variables may influence career satisfaction and stress levels than rank.

Social Support Factors and Career Satisfaction

Satisfaction with Significant Relationships, Co-Workers, and Career

Although marital status was a common variable in demographic questionnaires, only a handful of studies compared satisfaction to marital status in academic populations and with varying results. While research on primarily male samples has indicated that married male faculty report better career satisfaction (Kurt & Mills, 1968) or that there is no relationship between marital status and career satisfaction (Wood, 1973), research focused on female faculty samples has found a negative correlation between marital status and career satisfaction. Simeone (1987) found that while male faculty viewed their marriage as an asset to their life as an academician and reported greater career satisfaction, women in academia expressed the opposite. Married faculty women had less stable marriages, reported reduced career satisfaction, and tended to feel less successful in their paid work than married male faculty. This finding was likely a reflection of the discrimination and more prominent second shift of housework and childcare faced by faculty women. These family responsibilities influenced occupational well-being, with academic women with children reporting lower career satisfaction than men with children.

Much of the research on dyadic relationships in academic samples is one-dimensional as researchers compared relationships with co-workers to satisfaction. Near and Sorcinelli (1986) suggested collegial relationships were often influential on career satisfaction levels as work and play were so intertwined for faculty. Indeed, two researchers (White, 1998; Winkler, 1982) found stronger relationships with co-workers positively correlated with increased job satisfaction for faculty members. Conversely,

Almahboob (1987) found relationships with co-workers and administration contributed to dissatisfaction. Both White (1998) and Winkler (1982) included male and female faculty from institutions across the United States whereas Almahboob (1987) focused mostly on male faculty from Saudi Arabia. Therefore, sex and cultural differences may have contributed to some of the differences in the results.

Overall, social support derived from relationships with others generally provides a buffer against stress and strain and has been thought to be beneficial to one's health and well-being. Social support helps to ameliorate symptoms of stress and illness and provides resistance against an early death (Berkman & Syme, 1979; Crohan and Antonucci, 1989). Berkman (1985; Berkman & Syme, 1979) found those with few social contacts had higher mortality rates than those with more social contacts, independent of individual or lifestyle factors. Having a close social network is also thought to protect against psychological disorders and distress (Lin & Ensel, 1989; Mueller, 1980) and has been associated with higher levels of self-esteem and lower levels of depression (McCarthy, 1989).

Within academic samples, social support also seems to contribute to better health and satisfaction. Amatea and Fong (1991) found women who reported higher levels of marital and familial support had better psychological and physical health and less strain than women with less support. Similarly, female faculty who indicated more social support from friends and family reported greater career, leisure, parental, and life satisfaction. Male faculty, on the other hand, did not report that social support influenced their satisfaction levels (Hammond, 1987). These findings point to the importance of social support and relationships for women in general and academic women in particular.

Satisfaction with Mentor Relationships and Career

Mentoring has been generally associated with positive career and personal outcomes for male and female mentors and protégés. For the mentor, having a protégé has been associated with increased job satisfaction (Blackburn, Chapman, & Cameron, 1981; Reich, 1985; 1986), job performance and productivity (Burke, 1984; Reich, 1985, 1986), and visibility of the mentor due to the productivity of the protégé (Merriam, 1983; Wright & Wright, 1987). Personally and developmentally, mentors reported receiving satisfaction in helping the protégé develop and succeed (Kram, 1983; Krupp, 1985), often worked through the stage of generativity (Levinson et al., 1978; Merriam, 1983), experienced personal growth (Krupp, 1985), and received support and friendship from the protégé (Busch, 1985; Kram, 1983; Krupp, 1985). It should be noted that as many mentors in business and academia are male, these researchers focused on mostly male samples. Thus rewards, such as productivity and generativity, fit within stereotypically male developmental patterns. The rewards received by female mentors have not been as well researched.

Protégés also experienced career and personal benefits from the mentor-protégé relationship. Researchers have found that those who had mentors earned more money (Merriam, 1983), were happier with and experienced greater success with their careers (Alleman, Newman, Huggins, & Carr, 1986; Merriam, 1993) received faster promotions (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Fox, Waldron, Borhner, Hishinuma, & Nordquist, 1998), and were more likely to mentor themselves (Smith et al., 2000). As with mentors, protégés had greater career satisfaction (Alleman et al., 1986; Kram, 1983; Krupp, 1985). As for psychosocial and personal benefits, protégé's tended to have more self-confidence

(Dreher & Ash, 1983; Kram, 1983) and reduced career related stress (Fox et al., 1998). Protégés also rated friendship as a benefit of the mentor-protégé relationship (Busch, 1985).

While having a mentor was important to the professional development of both male and female protégés, it was thought to be crucial for women (Merriam, 1983; Schlossberg, 1974; Wright & Wright, 1987). Scandura and Ragins (1993) suggested "mentorship is particularly important for women entering male-dominated occupations, since these women are isolated as tokens and face gender-related barriers to advancement" (p. 251). Women who have succeeded or advanced in an organization have been more likely to have mentors (Merriam, 1983; Ragins, 1989). Based on the development and collegiality of faculty in women's colleges, Tidball (1973) proposed that a woman's success was directly related to having positive female role models such as mentors. Mentors provide women legitimacy through their backing of the protégé's work, career guidance and direction, and help in building self-confidence. Further, mentors provide information and assistance in negotiating the politics of an organization or academic setting (Merriam, 1989; Ragins, 1989). Finally, mentoring helps women overcome gender-related obstacles to their career (Ragins, 1989). Having a mentor would be especially helpful for family therapy faculty and students who are struggling to create their own identity (Vasquez & Eldridge, 1994; Prouty & Helmeke, in progress). Prouty, and Helmeke (in progress) noted the importance of mentoring in clinical supervision for supporting, socializing, and developing a sense of professionalism among therapists.

Although the mentor-protégé relationship is generally considered by mentors and protégés as productive, there are also costs associated with this relationship. Risks for the

mentor have included time associated with the relationship (Busch, 1985; Moore &

Amey, 1988), emotional strain (Kram, 1983, Reich, 1985), protégé dependency (Hardesty

& Jocobs, 1986), and political issues (Dirsmith & Covaleski, 1985). Risks for the protégé

have included relationship stress (Kram, 1983; Reich, 1985), jealousy of peers (Dirsmith

& Covaleski; Reich, 1985), a forced or accidental over identification with mentor

(Dirsmith & Covaleski, 1985) and suspected or actual sexual improprieties (Hardesty &

Jacobs, 1986; Moore & Amey, 1988; Ragins, 1989). Several of these risks, including

dependency on the mentor, political issues, and suggested sexual innuendos, are often

considered to be more risky and detrimental to female protégés (Hardesty & Jacobs,

1986). Further, mentors may not take into account organizational and structural practices,

such as harassment, that affect women, and thus, provide a constricted range of benefits

to women protégés (Gilbert & Rossman, 1992).

<u>Summary on Satisfaction</u>

While in general, faculty seem to be satisfied with their careers, a number of

personal and interpersonal variables appear to correlate with satisfaction. Personal

variables include sex of respondent, race and ethnicity, and discipline and rank. Women,

members of minority groups, faculty in the social sciences, faculty holding lower ranks

and faculty in non-tenure track positions report lower career satisfaction than others.

These factors, however, appear to correlate with social support as women and members

of a minority group who hold less of a token position in their department or institution

tend to be more satisfied with their jobs than women faculty and members of minority

groups at other institutions. Interpersonal and social support variables included marital

status and satisfaction, collegial relationships and friendships, and mentor relationships.

Having a collegial network and a mentor seems to predict higher career satisfaction levels for both male and female faculty. Conversely, marital status, at least for women, seems to predict lower levels of career satisfaction. As noted above, research on the relationships of women in academia indicates women married to faculty men have greater career outcomes. This seems to indicate that married faculty women fare better in terms of employment, rank, and productivity, but were less satisfied with their careers. This indicates that the interceding effects of social support and career satisfaction need to be more fully explored.

<p style="text-align:center">Gaps in the Research and Overall Summary</p>

In examining the research on faculty women, there appears to be a number of omissions and methodological problems. This segment provides an overall summary of the research and describes gaps in research and theory. The sections on the relationships of academic women and career and personal satisfaction are combined in order to explain the contradictions in these paragraphs and because of the difficulty in separating relationships and satisfaction.

<u>Duties of Women in Academia</u>

As confirmed by the statistics on work duties of academic faculty, professionals in academic positions have a long paid work week. This was especially true of women faculty as they spent more time in teaching and service, both time consuming tasks. While the duties of faculty women in general have been well documented, there is less of a consensus on how these paid work duties influence career and, particularly, personal satisfaction. What influence these paid work domains have on the relationships and career satisfaction of faculty women, therefore, deserves further scrutiny.

Although time allocation of faculty women in general was well researched, there was a definite lack of research on the typical work week of women in marriage and family therapy programs. As part of the ethical codes of American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT) and Commission on Accreditation of Marriage and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE), faculty in MFT programs are expected to engage in certain duties, including direct client contact hours and community participation. Therefore, it is important to identify the duties of women faculty in MFT programs to assess if time spent on these duties influences career and relationship satisfaction.

Issues Facing Female Faculty

The academic climate can be particularly hostile to women, as evidenced by discrimination in salary, rank, and tenure and increased harassment faced by female faculty members. Yet, even though a vast majority of the research has focused on discrimination and harassment of women faculty, there were a number of methodological problems with this research. First, as higher education was often so noxious for faculty women, researchers overwhelmingly focused on problems these women face. Although it is important to understand problems in the academic climate, addressing women's experiences only within the context of the discrimination does not allow researchers to focus on strengths or resiliencies exhibited by female faculty. Second, although many researchers specified gender as a variable of study, they failed to address the societal factors that influenced the social construction of gender. Instead, researchers only focused on biological sex as a variable by addressing differences between males and females. Third, researchers often neglected a focused examination of power variables.

This is important as the experience of sex or gender is not unidimensional. Focusing on power is also important when addressing the experiences of women as academe continues to be a male-dominated profession. Fourth, even when females have been included in research, there is a notable lack of information on relationships and particularly how relationships influence satisfaction. Women develop within the context of relationships and therefore relationships with others should have a noticeable impact on the experiences of these women. Finally, much of the research on female faculty compares faculty men and women. This serves to judge women's experiences on a male developmental model that may not be salient for women.

<u>Relationships and Satisfaction</u>

It appears that a number of personal and interpersonal factors influence the well-being and career satisfaction of academic women. Although there is scant research on the impact of relationships on academic women, and the available research is often contradictory, this research seems to indicate relationships are influential to career and personal satisfaction. However, there are a number of omissions in this research. First, much of the research on collegial networks and mentoring has been conducted with male samples. Thus, the impact of relationships on the career and personal lives of academic women is less well known. Second, while marital status has often been included as a variable assessing career and personal satisfaction, the level of satisfaction with the marriage or significant relationship has not been addressed or compared with career satisfaction. Third, friendship has been poorly defined as the terms collegial networks, professional networks, and friendships were often used interchangeably, although people in these different categories likely serve different functions. Similarly, mentorship and

56

associated functions often meant one thing in the business world and another in the academic arena (Merriam, 1983; Noe, 1988). Fourth, although the formation of a friendship between the mentor and protégé has been considered to be a perquisite of the mentor-protégé relationship (Busch, 1985), there is very little research comparing these divergent relationship types. Finally, researchers often only assessed the influence of one relationship (marital status) or at most two relationships (marital status and collegial networks). Researchers have rarely examined the influence of academic women's multiple relationships on personal and life satisfaction and well-being.

Overall Summary

It is clear that the experiences and needs of women faculty have traditionally been ignored and devalued. This is evidenced not only by the difference in work duties between males and females and the overt and covert discrimination faced by females, but by a failure to include information on women's relationships in research. This is important as women tend to gain and exert power through their relationships (Miller, 1982). Examining the relationships of faculty women, in addition to individual and institutional variables, will be beneficial to designing policies to create a less hostile climate for faculty women. Thus, using the theoretical framework of female developmental theory, through this research I attempted to identify and highlight the career and relationship experiences of women faculty from MFT program. Based on these experiences, I formulated implications and suggestions for changing the climate in institutions, MFT programs, and AAMFT and COAMFTE.

Chapter III

Methodology

Procedure

The sample for this study consisted of women who identified themselves as marriage and family therapists affiliated with a college, university, or training institute. Respondents were chosen by three means. First, I searched the websites of the Commission on Accreditation of Marriage and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE) for accredited marriage and family therapy (MFT) programs. This search indicated 79 masters, doctoral, or post-graduate training institutes accredited by COMAFTE or in candidacy status. Second, I explored the websites of each of these programs for names, work addresses, and email addresses of female faculty members. For programs that did not have a website or did not include faculty information on their website, I called or sent email to program coordinators and asked them to provide names and addresses of female faculty members. Finally, a convenience sample of faculty members in MFT programs were asked to provide contact information for MFT women in academia who were not included on the list. The above methods yielded a sample size of 246 contacts for possible inclusion into the study.

Surveys (see Appendix A) were formatted as a booklet and sent by mail to prospective research participants. Included was a detailed cover letter explaining the project and a self-addressed stamped return envelope. Surveys were coded to keep track of responses for follow up purposes. This code consisted of a number linked to the respondent and was kept in a database separate from the statistical database in order to ensure confidentiality.

The Dillman (2000) tailored design method was followed to boost response rate. At the initial contact, participants were sent a pre-notice email message regarding the questionnaire. For those that did not have an email address, I sent a pre-notice post card. One week after initial contact, participants were sent a survey with a detailed covered letter explaining the project. Next, respondents were sent a brief thank you postcard approximately two weeks after the mailing of the survey. This contact expressed appreciation for responding to the survey and asked non-respondents to respond as soon as possible. Finally, non-respondents were sent another copy of the survey one month after the initial survey (see Appendix B).

<div align="center">Instrumentation</div>

The variables measured in this study included career satisfaction, satisfaction with intimate relationships, perception of intimacy among friends, and extent of mentoring functions. These were measured through the Faculty Satisfaction Questionnaire (Serafin, 1991), Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (Schumm et al., 1983), Miller Social Intimacy Scale (Miller & Lefcourt, 1982) and Mentoring Functions Scale (Tepper, Schaffer, & Tepper, 1996). Self-report and open ended questions measured demographic information and the participant's experiences of being in academia.

Faculty Satisfaction Questionnaire

The Faculty Satisfaction Questionnaire (FSQ), created by Serafin (1991), assesses the career satisfaction levels of college faculty. The FSQ contains 29 items grouped into three dimensions of teaching, research, and service. Each section evaluates feelings about institutional, administrative, and daily activity variables. The FSQ uses a five point Likert scale ranging from very dissatisfied to very satisfied. The scale yields a satisfaction score

for each dimension, with higher mean scores reflecting greater satisfaction. In addition to the 29 content items, the questionnaire contains nine optional demographic questions.

The FSQ was tested on two faculty samples. The first field test, conducted with 22 faculty members, yielded alpha coefficients of .85 for teaching, .80 for research, and .85 for service with no negative inter-correlations among items. Further evidence for the reliability of the test was established with 207 faculty members. Coefficient alphas from this sample were .76 for teaching, .86 for research, and .83 for service. To establish content validity, a team of experts reviewed the table of specifications and assessed both the English and Spanish versions of the instrument (Serafin, 1991).

Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale

The Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (KMS), developed by Schumm, Nichols Schectman, and Grigsby (1983), provides a brief but comprehensive way to assess satisfaction in marital or couple relationships. The KMS was based on Spanier and Cole's (1976) theoretical work that conceptualized satisfaction with spouse, marriage, and the marital relationship as different dimensions. Although there are other valid inventories testing marital satisfaction, such as the Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (RDAS) (Busby, Crane, Larsen, & Christensen, 1995), the Marital Satisfaction Scale (Roach, Frazier, & Bowden, 1981), and the Marital Satisfaction Inventory (Synder, 1979), these tests contain 14, 50, and 280 items respectfully. In contrast, the KMS addresses the "need for a conceptually unidemensional, brief measure of marital satisfaction for basic family research" (Schumm et al., 1985, p. 719).

The KMS consists of three items that measures satisfaction with marriage, spouse, and the marital relationship. Participants rate each question on a seven point Likert scale

from extremely dissatisfied to extremely satisfied. Scale scores are then summed and range from 3 to 21, with higher scores indicating greater relationship satisfaction (Schumm et al., 1985; Schumm et al., 1986). The KMS has been used with different samples, including Caucasian couples (Crane, Middleton, & Bean, 2000; Schumm et al., 1983), African American couples (Green, Woody, Maxwell, Mercer, & Williams, 1998), conservative church couples (Calahan, 1997), and Chinese couples (Shek, Lam, Tsoi, & Lam, 1993), confirming the reliability of this instrument among diverse populations. For the present research, I asked about satisfaction with respondents' significant intimate relationship and partner to make these questions more relevant to faculty women who are in committed relationships but are not married.

The KMS demonstrated high levels of internal reliability with coefficient alphas ranging from .84 to .98 across samples (Mitchell, Newell, & Schumm, 1983; Schumm et al., 1983; Schumm et al., 1985; Schumm et al., 1986). In a study evaluating reliability of the scale for couples, Schumm and his associates (1983) determined Chronbach alphas were .89 for wives and .93 for husbands. Additionally, the KMS has shown internal consistency with test-retest correlations of .71 in a sample of mothers over a 10-week interval (Mitchell et al., 1983).

The KMS also demonstrated strong criterion related validity. The KMS correlated with the Quality Marital Index (QMI), with Pearson product moment correlations of .93 for the total sample, .95 for wives, and .90 for husbands (Callahan, 1996). Further, research has found strong correlations between the KMS and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS), particularly the Satisfaction subscale of the DAS (Grover, Paff-Bergen, Russell, & Schumm, 1985; Schumm et al., 1986). The QMI and the DAS have been

widely used in assessing marital satisfaction and have good reliability and validity statistics. The scale supported criterion validity of the scale with separated couples, suggesting the scale could help researchers differentiate between distressed and non-distressed couples (Schumm et al., 1986). The KMS also demonstrated construct-related validity as a factor analysis demonstrated that each item was clearly associated with its own and not other factors (Schumm, Bollman, Jurich, & Hatch, 2001).

Miller Social Intimacy Scale

The Miller Social Intimacy Scale (MSIS), developed by Miller and Lefcourt (1982), assesses perceived intimacy in various interpersonal relationships. The scale was structured to test intimacy across a variety of types of interpersonal relationships, including friendship and marriage. In most research and for psychometric properties, subjects have rated their relationship with their closest friend (Downs & Hillje, 1991; Krahn, 1996; Miller & Lefcourt, 1982; Weinstein, 1998). For the purpose of this research, the scale was used to measure intimacy among female faculty and their friends.

The scale consists of 17 items, with 6 of the items measuring frequency of interaction and 11 items measuring intensity of the relationship. All items are rated on a 10-point Likert scale, with responses from "very rarely" to "almost always" describing frequency and "not much" to "a great deal" describing intensity. Two items (#2 and #14) are reversed scored. Higher scores indicate higher trust, closeness, and intimacy among friends (Miller & Lefcourt, 1982). Downs and Hillje (1991) suggested having respondents indicate the sex of the friend, as same-sex and cross-sex dyads revealed different relationships dynamics and indicated a multidimensionality of the scale.

The MSIS was field tested with an unmarried student sample, a married student sample, and a married clinical sample. Chronbach alpha coefficients were high, ranging from .86 to .91 across samples. Further, test-retest reliability coefficients from two subsets of the unmarried student sample were .84 and .96 over a one-month interval (Miller & Lefcourt, 1982).

Validity of the MSIS was tested several ways. In support of the construct validity of the scale, the mean MSIS score for married students was higher than the mean scores for both unmarried students and the distressed married clinical sample. Further, the mean score for unmarried students was higher than the score for the distressed married clinical sample, indicating the MSIS allowed a more precise measure of intimacy than marital status alone. Finally, mean MSIS scores for respondents' closest friends were higher than for casual friends. Confirming predictive validity, the scale has been compared to other instruments. Respondents who characterized their closest relationship as having a high degree of trust and intimacy on the Interpersonal Relationship Scale (Guerney, 1977) scored high on the MSIS, while respondents who described themselves as lonely on the UCLA loneliness scale (Russell, Peplau, & Ferguson, 1978) also scored low on the MSIS.

Mentor Relationships

Information on mentor relationships was gathered by having respondents provide demographic characteristics of their mentors and complete a scale indicating mentoring functions. Questions on mentoring demographic characteristics include current status and length of the relationship, gender and rank of the mentor, and how the protégé initiated

contact with the mentor. These questions were based on relevant literature on mentoring relationships (e.g., Kram, 1985; Levinson et al., 1978).

The Mentoring Functions Scale was developed by Noe (1988) and revised by Tepper, Schaffer, and Tepper (1996). The scale consists of 16 items, which measures the job related and personal functions of the mentoring relationship. The psychosocial mentoring functions subscale addresses the extent the mentor provides counseling, coaching, acceptance and confirmation, and acts as a role model while the career mentoring functions subscale measures the extent the mentor provides career protection, exposure and visibility, sponsorship, and challenging assignments. Participants rate each function provided by their mentor on a five item response scale from "to a very slight extent" to "to a very large extent." High internal reliability was found for these factors, with Chronbach alpha reliability coefficients of .88 for psychosocial functions subscale and .90 for the career functions subscale (Tepper et al., 1996).

Demographic Questionnaire

The demographic questionnaire contained 13 questions asking about the personal and professional characteristics of the respondent. Several items, including the number of years in higher education and recognition for teaching, research, and service, were modified from the demographic questions developed by Serafin (1991). Other questions, such as tenure and number of hours engaged per week in teaching, research, service, and clinical work, were included to get a picture of the status and duties of these women. Finally, the survey included open-ended questions asking respondents to reflect on their experiences of being a female in academia and changes to their research and teaching based on their experiences.

Methods of Analyses

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 11.5 was used for analyses of numerical data. Prior to analysis, the data were examined for errors by inspecting frequency distributions and descriptive statistics to determine means, standard deviations, and to check for missing responses. For participants that had less than 10% of missing items per scale, their mean for that scale was inserted. For participants that had more than 10% of missing variables per scale, their responses were not entered for that scale, but their data were used in other scales when sufficiently complete. Bivariate correlations were analyzed to examine the relationships among the independent and dependent variables. Chronbach alpha coefficients were also run to determine reliability of the scales. The reliability estimates for this sample were as follows for the Faculty Satisfaction Questionnaire: teaching scale, alpha = .78; research scale, alpha = .85, service scale, alpha = .79; total career scale, alpha = .86. For the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale assessing relationship satisfaction, the alpha estimate was .98, while for the Miller Social Intimacy Scale assessing friendship intimacy, the alpha estimate was .92. Finally, for the Mentoring Functions Scale, alpha estimates were .88 for the career mentoring functions subscale and .87 for the psychosocial mentoring functions subscale. Since alpha coefficients ranged from .78 to .98, these scales were considered to be internally consistent for this sample of MFT female faculty.

Data Management

For the purposes of the chi-square and regression analyses, I collapsed the variables in the following ways. In general, categories were collapsed if there were fewer than 10 responses in the category. For highest level of education, Master's and post-graduate certificate were combined. For discipline of highest degree, counselor

education, social work, and family studies were collapsed into the category of *other*. For participants that wrote in *not applicable* or *other* for rank, institution type, and how their position was currently funded, these responses were recoded as system missing as they could not be collapsed into any of the categories. The collapsing of other variables is described under the regression results.

<u>Analysis of the Open Ended Questions</u>

In order to analyze the two open ended questions, responses were first categorized according to major themes then subthemes were then created based on repeated words or issues. For example, under the experiences of faculty members, I categorized all comments under the main themes of positive experiences, negative experiences, or experiences not based on gender. I then created subthemes, such as respect, as many of the participants expressly noted feeling respected by others, or isolation, as participants wrote about feeling lonely and isolated. Some of the responses that participants made under "other comments" were grouped with the themes. Two researchers then checked the codes, providing verification of the data. I attempted to punctuate as many different themes and subthemes as possible by using direct quotes.