

Iowa State University

From the Selected Works of Linda Serra Hagedorn

2004

Marriage, Children, and Aging Parents: the Role of Family-Related Factors in Faculty Job Satisfaction

Linda Serra Hagedorn, *University of Southern California*
Linda J. Sax



Available at: https://works.bepress.com/linda_hagedorn/28/

Marriage, Children, and Aging Parents: The Role of Family-Related Factors in Faculty Job Satisfaction

Linda Serra Hagedorn

University of Southern California

Linda J. Sax

University of California at Los Angeles

Due to changes in the academic market, faculty job satisfaction is especially critical. Using a multi-step framework, this study explores the role of family and stress related “pull factors” on a measure of overall job satisfaction for a large nationally representative sample of college and university faculty members. These “pull factors” include, but are not limited to, care for a child, spouse or elder, as well as other responsibilities and duties not directly related to one’s academic career.

Attracting and retaining good faculty is critical in maintaining institutional quality and strength (Howard, Snyder, & McLaughlin, 1992)

Within both the business organization and higher education literature, job satisfaction is a highly studied concept (Agho, 1993). There is little doubt that job satisfaction is linked with many important outcomes for postsecondary faculty including recruitment, turnover, morale, scholarly productivity, promotion, and tenure (Barnes, Agago, & Coombs, 1998; Caldwell & O’Reilly, 1990; Hagedorn, 1996; Olsen, 1993; Olsen, Maple, & Stage, 1995; Rausch, Ortiz, Douthitt, & Reed, 1989). In light of its outcomes as well as recent predictions of future faculty shortages, the importance of job satisfaction of college faculty is especially critical (WICHE, 1992; Barnes, Agago, & Coombs, 1998). Moreover, as the American work

force continues to include more women and people of color, postsecondary institutions should strive to create faculties that will better relate to and reflect the gender and ethnic distribution of students (Olsen et al., 1995). Along with this directive comes the responsibility of maintaining appropriate satisfaction levels among the new ranks of students and faculty. However, the comparably slim financial rewards, high stress environment, and the extensive involvement of academic careers complicate the task of producing and maintaining adequate levels of job satisfaction for faculty as well as attracting qualified, young prospective academics (Clague, 1992; Morgan, 1996; Strober & Others, 1993; Teevan & Others, 1992).

Despite its importance there remains an aspect of job satisfaction that has not been sufficiently studied — namely the role, extent, and influence of external and family-related “pull factors” such as mar-

riage, children, and aging parents. The term “pull factors” has previously been used in the literature to describe group activities, responsibilities, and situations that detract students from an academic focus. With respect to faculty, we apply the term “pull factors” to those activities that may interfere or be in direct conflict with an academic career.

It is interesting that older, previous research framed family-related variables as positive or enhancers of job satisfaction. For example, in a review of the literature prior to 1972, Astin and Bayer (1972) reported that marriage and a large family were positively related to higher salaries despite controls for degree, field, productivity, and work activities. Of course, studies at that time were conducted with samples that reflected the high majority of males in academe. But in light of the changing gender and ethnic distributions, the increases of women with young children in the workforce, and increases in life-expectancy coupled with turmoil in the health-care industry, it appears that workers (including faculty) may face increasing levels of family-related stress that may create more than trivial obstacles to success and job satisfaction.

We explore the role of family and stress related “pull factors” on a measure of overall job satisfaction for a large nationally representative sample of college and university faculty members. The model is useful in the design of appropriate faculty development specifically for female faculty. The research design is such that the sample is observed, tested, and partitioned in an effort to better understand female faculty members. We chose to concentrate (but not limit) our efforts on women because we know that despite many positive changes in societal norms, on average, women continue to carry a larger portion of daily family responsibilities (Hensel, 1991; Hunter, 1999; Rausch, Ortiz, Douthitt, & Reed, 1989). We hypothesize that the disproportionate weight of “pull factors” create a person-environment-fit problem that creates higher levels of stress which in turn create obstacles to women’s overall job satisfaction.

Number and Role of Women

Despite past affirmative action efforts as well as sincere institutional concerns for equity, the num-

ber of female faculty remains low (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Rausch, et. al., 1989). According to the latest data from the National Center of Educational Statistics, only thirty-five percent of the nation’s tenured/tenure-track faculty are female (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002). However, since trends charted for the last fifty years indicate that the number of female doctoral degree recipients and subsequently women entering academe has steadily and consistently increased, it appears likely that the proportion of academic women will increase (Gunderson, 1989; National Center for Educational Statistics, 1997; Dwyer, Flynn, & Inman, 1991). Reflective of patterns of general female employment, it follows that the number of female faculty with family responsibilities including dependent children will also rise.

Although women continue to perform the lion’s share of the domestic household duties including care of children and/or elders, it is important to acknowledge that men are also impacted by family-related responsibilities. Hughes and Galinsky (1988) reported working fathers experienced higher levels of stress than did men without children. Regardless of gender approximately one-half of the U. S. labor force reports responsibilities for dependent children or elderly adults (Galinsky, Bond, & Friedman, 1993) and forty percent of employees cite problems in balancing work and family (Raabe, 1996). Thus, a large proportion of workers regardless of gender or job position may experience the effects of family-related “pull factors”.

The family-related “pull factor” that has received the least amount of attention is the care of elderly parents or other relatives. National statistics on how many faculty are responsible for the care of elderly family members is not routinely collected or available but we do know that the need for elder care is growing rapidly (Herndon, 1995). It is estimated that twenty-five million Americans provide care for family members who are unable to care for themselves (About Women and Marketing, 1998). Moreover, the growth of the proportion of the population over the age of sixty-five years has greatly exceeded that of the country in general (Hobbs, 1999; U. S. Census Bureau, 2003). Further, since the likelihood of chronic illness, disability, and dependency increases with age, it is likely that increasing numbers

of workers, including proportional numbers of college faculty, will experience stress from the care and/or concern for elderly parents and relatives.

The Role of Stress

Most researchers have included measures of stress in their models of job satisfaction as a detractor or negative predictor (Brooke, Russell, & Price, 1988; Hagedorn, 1996; House, 1981; Tack & Patitu, 1992). Faculty lead stress-filled lives. Contrary to popular opinion, faculty work long hours (Gappa & McDermid, 1997). Bailyn (1993) reported that faculty work on average 60 hours per week while a significant minority (ten percent) work much longer. The balancing of teaching, nurturing students, committee and other service work, as well as an active research agenda for many faculty add up to long workdays and work-filled weekends. In addition, junior faculty must struggle with the stressful journey to tenure, often concurrent with the most intense years of child-care.

There is little doubt that the tenure process brings about stress. And, according to the research, the road to tenure may be even more stressful for women (Gmelch, 1993). The additional stresses on women may account for their higher levels of attrition among faculty. For example, one study of tenure track faculty between 1977 and 1980 found that forty-seven percent of the women and thirty-eight percent of the men left the institution prior to the tenure decision date (Rausch et. al., 1989). Blackburn and Wylie (1985) similarly found tenure-track women leaving academe at a higher rate than their male counterparts. Further, women may experience the tenure track stress for longer periods of time because they tend to be tenured more slowly than men.

Further complicating the nature of stress is its ambiguity and generality in form and definition. Broad descriptions of stress are consistent with accepted definitions, including what Bebbington (1973) describes as “a general response of a system undergoing strain which is source-specific” (p. 9). Most studies of job satisfaction of college faculty operationalize stress as a composite measure including perceptions of time crunches, personal upheaval, and job-related issues. But sweeping generalities may

mask important distinctions such as the effect of daily life conflicts (i. e., family, marital, financial, etc.) which have been found to be more stressful than major life events (DeLongis, et. al., 1982; Gmelch, Lovrich, & Wilke, 1984; Gmelch, 1993). Thus, to add to our understanding of faculty stress and subsequently job satisfaction, it may be necessary to study the effects of family-related stressors apart from those that are strictly job-related.

When the literature focuses specifically on stress experienced by college faculty; there is little agreement on the types of stress that interacts with faculty job satisfaction. As a result of their study of more than one thousand faculty from eighty Ph.D. granting institutions, Gmelch, Wilke, and Lovrich (1986) posit a five-factor stress model. They suggest the dimensions of faculty stress are 1) reward and recognition (e.g., disparity between faculty and administration over the activities and accomplishments of value), 2) time constraints, 3) departmental pressure and demands, 4) professional identity, and 5) student interaction. In their monograph on faculty job satisfaction specifically among women and minorities, Tack and Patitu (1992) cite seven internal stressors threatening job satisfaction; 1) pressures resulting from teaching and research, 2) colleague and institutional reputation, 3) student quality, 4) student interaction, 5) autonomy and responsibility, 6) perceived disparity between achievement and recognition, and 7) issues related to promotion and professional growth. Although these models do not specifically include family-related stress, we suspect that it may be reflected in the role of time constraints and other pressures.

Conceptual Framework

We derived our theory from Blackburn and Bentley (1993) who identified two types of moderating variables in determining fit – personal and environmental. Blackburn and Bentley hypothesized that stress results “from a poor fit between a person’s motivations, abilities, or values and the corresponding opportunities, demands, or constraints of the workplace” (Blackburn & Bentley, 1993, p. 726). We posit that the combination of home-related and work-related stresses may be especially debilitating for col-

Table 1. Description of Variables

<i>Block</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Description</i>
Dependent Variable	Overall satisfaction	10 itemscale; alpha coefficient of.8931; measuring overall faculty satisfaction including satisfaction with teaching load, working conditions, opportunities, quality of students, course assignments, benefits, autonomy, and relationships with administration.
Block 1. Demographics	Race	Three dummy variables indicating race of faculty member (African American, Asian, and Hispanic); coded 2= yes; 1=no. Note: the exclusion of a specific variable indicating non-minority or Caucasian indicates all comparisons are made to this group.
	Age	Faculty age at the time of the survey
	Gender	1= male; 2=female
Block 2. Institutional/ Professional	Control	Equals 2 if the institution is public; else equals 1.
	University or college	Equals 2 if the institution is a university; if a college equals 1
	Academic rank	Rank of faculty member 1=professor 2- Associate Professor; 3=assistant professor; 4=instructor or lecturer.
	Faculty Salary	Natural log of annual faculty salary. The natural log of salary was used because raw salary was highly skewed.
	Tenure	Tenure status of faculty member coded 1= untenured; 2=tenured
	Hard/soft	Discipline classification of faculty member coded 2 if discipline fits Biglan's definition of hard; else=1.
	Pure/applied	Discipline classification of faculty member coded 2 if discipline fits Biglan's definition of pure; else=1.
	Research orientation	7-itemscale, alpha coefficient of.8152, indicating the faculty member's research productivity, time spent in research, and preference for research-related activities.
	Desire for recognition	Desire to become an authority in the field and to earn recognition from colleagues
	Block 2. Institutional/ Professional (Continued)	Institutional emphasis on resources and reputation
Student personal development		8 itemscale, alpha=.8830, measuring faculty commitment to developing students on both a personal and emotional levels.
Block 3 Gender related	Women's study	2 if ever taught a women's study class; else=1.
	Research on women	2 if ever performed research/writing on women; else=1.
	Sexually harassed	2 if ever sexually harassed at institution; else=1.
	Female faculty treatment	Women faculty treated fairly (1= strongly disagree to 4= strongly agree)
Block 4 "Pull factors" and Stressors	Dependent child	2 if faculty member reported one or more dependent children; else equals 1.
	Academic spouse/partner	2 if spouse or partner is also an academic; else equals 1
	Spouse/partner work location	2 if spouse or partner works in the same city; else equals 1
	Career interruption	2 if ever interrupted career for reasons of health or family; else equals 1.
	Home related Stress	3 item scale, alpha =.7358, (stress resulting from childcare, children's problems, and managing household responsibilities).
	Stress- care of elderly parent	Extent of stress from the care of elderly parent (1=not at all to 3= extensive)
	Stress – personal finances	Extent of stress from personal finances (1=not at all to 3= extensive)
	Stress – marital friction	Extent of stress from marital friction (1=not at all to 3= extensive)
	Job related stress	10 item scale, alpha=.7347, indicating the extent of stress related to professorial job components.
	Marital status	2 if faculty member reported being married, else equals 1.

lege faculty because of the intense nature, intellectual depth, and clear focus required by the academic career. This hypothesis is supported by McMillen (1987) who characterized universities as “stress factories”.

Further, female faculty may be less likely to experience adequate person-environment-fit because the history and roots of the academic profession are strongly influenced by the male image. In the words of Hensel:

The structure of university professorships reflects the male dominance of not only the university but also society at large. Professorships were originally designed for men who had wives at home not only to care for home and children but also to provide support for the man’s career. Professors work more hours than nearly every other profession, take the most work home, and in the past were the least likely to spend time with their children or assist their wives with housework. This is the legacy inherited by women professors (Hensel, 1991, p. 69).

The research questions driving our inquiries were:

1. Do marriage, children, aging parents, and other family-related “pull-factors” detract from faculty job satisfaction? and
2. Is the nature of “pull factors” dependent on gender or tenure status? We posit that suggestions for faculty development may be derived from the results of these analyses.

Methodology

Sample. The data used in this study are drawn from the 1995-1996 Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey, a national survey of college and university faculty. A four-page survey instrument was distributed to 143,816 faculty at 446 higher education institutions in the fall of 1995. After a second wave follow-up to non-respondents, responses were received from 59,933 faculty, constituting a forty-two percent response rate. The analytical sample used in this study consists of the responses of 31,080 full-time college and university teaching faculty at 330 four-year colleges and universities across the country (10,687 women and 20,393 men).

Variables. The dependent variable is a scale

measuring overall job satisfaction derived from 10 items (Alpha coefficient of .8931) consistent with Astin’s faculty morale factor (Astin, 1993). The model is composed of four blocks of variables: demographics, institutional/professional, gender related and “pull-factors”. To control for disciplinary differences, two dichotomous variables (hard/soft and pure/applied), were constructed based on the Biglan classification system (Biglan, 1973a, 1973b; Malaney, 1986. See Table 1 for a complete list and description of the items and scales (including reliability coefficients) composing each block.

Initial analyses. We first checked for homogeneity of proportions by gender in two ways. For dichotomous variables we used a contingency table analysis (χ^2) to evaluate whether men and women were statistically different across the variables of interest (see Green, Salkind, & Akey, 1997). We used the chi-square test as the test for significance and computed the phi statistic (ϕ) for a measurement of the effect size. For continuous variables, the test of significant differences between males and females was the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Analyses. After the reliability of each of the constructs was verified (check of Cronbach’s Alpha), and the regression equation defined, we regressed our measure of overall job satisfaction on the four blocks of variables. Initially, we included the full usable sample ($n=26,340$) of faculty. After finding a significant interaction by gender ($F_{change}=6.637$; $p<.0001$) we divided the sample into men ($n=17,371$) and women ($n=8,968$) and obtained separate outputs. Finding a significant interaction in the female sample by tenure/non-tenure status ($F_{change}=1.702$; $p<.05$) we divided the female sample into tenured ($n=3,840$) and nontenured ($n=5,157$) faculty. We proceeded to test both the tenured and untenured female samples for interactions by age (under and over 45 years of age), marital status (single and married), and having a dependent child. Since these tests for interactions with both the tenured and the untenured samples were not significant, we did not subdivide the sample further. The process of dissecting the sample into men, women, nontenured women and tenured women provided a clearer picture of the constituents of overall job satisfaction for postsecondary faculty.

Final analyses consisted of comparing the standardized regression weights (Beta weights) within

each equation to ascertain the most important components for job satisfaction within each sample. For example, a ranking of the Beta weights within the equation for men reveals the relative importance of each of the independent variables for the male sample. Secondly, to look at relative differences between samples, we compared the unstandardized regression weights (b-weights). In this case, the analysis consisted of comparing the b-weights of a specific independent variable for men, untenured, and tenured women.

Results and Conclusions

Male/female differences

The results of the contingency table analyses revealed that women were statistically more likely to; be African-American or Hispanic, have taught a

women's studies course, report sexual harassment, in soft disciplines, or have interrupted their careers for health or family reasons. On the other hand, men were more likely to be; Asian, employed in a university (rather than a college), tenured, a parent of a dependent child, married, and employed in the same city as a spouse or partner. The most salient difference was that whereas only four percent of the men reported interrupting their career for health or family reasons, about one-fourth of the women reported such interruptions.

The one-way ANOVA indicated that on average men reported significantly higher levels of overall satisfaction, were older, higher in rank, earned higher salaries, had stronger research orientations, were more likely to report positive treatment of female faculty, and reported higher levels of marital stress. Women reported higher levels of both job-related and home-related stress, as well as higher lev-

Table 2. Tests of Significance Between Male and Female Faculty
2a. Results of Contingency Table Analysis (χ^2)—Dichotomous Variables^a

Variable	% within Males	% within females	Pearson Chi Square	Phi	Approx. Sig.
White	91%	92%	0.302	.003	.583ns
African-American	2%	3%	37.333	.034	.000
Asian	4%	3%	8.615	.017	.003
Hispanic	2%	3%	17.932	.024	.000
Control (Public)	54%	54%	0.136	.002	.712
University	35%	31%	65.228	.048	.000
Tenured	72%	28%	953.841	.174	.000
Hard	35%	19%	776.945	.163	.000
Pure	50%	42%	129.964	.067	.000
Dependent child	41%	35%	143.567	.067	.000
Married	86%	69%	1295.404	.203	.000
Taught women's studies course	2%	17%	2094.935	.257	.000
Research/writing on women	17%	41%	2215.910	.265	.000
Sexually harassed	3%	11%	1007.605	.179	.000
Spouse/partner an academic	29%	30%	1.511	.007	.219
Spouse/partner works in same city	53%	41%	405.689	.113	.000
Interrupted career for health/family	4%	25%	2951.588	.306	.000

^a All percentages refer to those responding in the affirmative. For example in the variable, public, 53.9% of the men reported employment in a public (rather than a private) university.

els of stress from the care of elderly parents and personal finances. On average, women were also more concerned with personal development of students.

Job Satisfaction Equations

Table 3 provides the block-by-block incremental R2 change for each of the tested samples. Every block in each of the samples explained a significant proportion of the variance of job satisfaction ($p < .001$). Although the block of variables termed “gender-related” was significant for the male sample, it explained more than three times the amount of variance in job satisfaction for women. Also noteworthy is the significant proportion of variance explained by the “pull factors” for all groups. For the five samples tested the collective sum of independent variables explained between twenty-eight percent and thirty-

two percent of the variance in overall faculty job satisfaction.

Table 4 provides both the standardized (i) and unstandardized (b) regression weights for all independent variables for each tested sample. In the demographics block, age is a relatively strong negative predictor for all groups indicating that younger faculty tend to be more satisfied. Being Asian was also a negative predictor of job satisfaction for all groups while being African American was negative only for nontenured women.

Within the institutional/professional block, strong significant predictors of satisfaction for all include higher salary, institutional emphasis on resources and reputation, and commitment to students’ personal development. Although employment at a university (rather than a college) was significant for

2b. Results of One-Way Anova (f-test)—Continuous Variables

Variable	Male mean (S. D.)	Female Mean (S. D.)	F
Overall satisfaction	3.754 (.5586)	3.7157 (.5461)	33.851***
Age	49.870 (9.978)	46.695 (9.324)	765.750***
Academic rank	1.93 (.97)	2.53 (.97)	2788.669***
Salary (natural log)	3.874 (.3295)	3.678 (.2967)	2677.879***
Research orientation	.07366 (.7044)	.1323 (.6270)	660.177***
Job-related stress	1.755 (.3696)	1.914 (.3602)	1336.178***
Institutional emphasis on resources and reputation	2.322 (.7996)	2.344 (.8250)	5.088*
Student personal development	2.397 (.6265)	2.590 (.6197)	674.061***
Female faculty treatment	3.36 (.70)	2.91 (.86)	2418.504***
Home related stress	1.519 (.4829)	1.6102 (.5375)	233.539***
Stress- care of elderly parent	1.31 (.58)	1.41 (.67)	200.722***
Stress- personal finances	1.71 (.69)	1.78 (.73)	57.656***
Stress- marital friction	1.30 (.57)	1.28 (.56)	15.246***

*** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$

all faculty, the standardized regression weight indicated that it was a much weaker predictor than the other variables previously mentioned. Significant only for men was employment in a private institution, soft and pure disciplines, higher rank, and lower scores on the research orientation scale. Finally, the desire for recognition was negative only for tenured women.

In the gender-related block, the perception that women are treated fairly at the institution was significant and positive for all samples. This variable had a very high standardized regression weight indicating its extreme importance in the satisfaction equation. Also significant for all groups is the negative effect of being sexually harassed at the institution. For men, having research focused on women was a positive predictor while teaching classes in women's studies was significant only for nontenured women.

In the last block, the "pull-factors", having dependent children was a significant negative predictor of satisfaction for all faculty. Financial and job-related stresses also were significant negative predictors of satisfaction for all groups. Evidenced by the values of the Beta-weights, the most important variable appears to be job-related stress. Interestingly, experiencing home-related stress was related to greater levels of job satisfaction for all groups. For men only, having a spouse in the same city was positive, while care of elderly parent or other relative was negative for nontenured women. Not-significant vari-

ables include marital status, an academic spouse, career interruptions for family or health purposes, and marital friction.

Conclusions and Policy Implications

Despite the high levels of satisfaction reported by many faculty, family-related variables and stressors do make a difference, although not always as expected. While we generally found a consistent and negative relationship between stress producers and job satisfaction for both men and women, home-related stress emerged as a surprising positive predictor of satisfaction for all groups. This finding suggests that faculty are more satisfied with their jobs when they experience greater stress resulting from child care, children's problems, and managing household responsibilities. Although somewhat counter-intuitive, this finding could actually reflect a greater appreciation of the merits of academic life among those faculty who have extensive responsibilities in the home.

The results from both the contingency tables and one-way analysis clearly present a picture of female faculty as more stressed, less satisfied, and more likely to interrupt their career for health or family reasons than male faculty. It is interesting to note that women reported higher levels of stress in all of our

Table 3. R² Change by Block for Each Sample

Block	R ² _{change} and test of F _{change}				
	Total Sample	Divided by Gender		Women divided by tenure status	
		Men	Women	Non-Tenured	tenured
1. Demographics	.013***	.016***	.004***	.003**	.005***
2. Institutional/ Professional	.080***	.091***	.063***	.057***	.077***
3. Gender-related	.070***	.042***	.141***	.137***	.140***
4. "Pull factors"	.125***	.133***	.102***	.107***	.098***
Total Model R ²	.287 ***	.282***	.309***	.305***	.320***

*** p<.001 ** p<.01

studied areas except marital friction. However, since the proportion of married males exceeded the proportion of married females, we felt the necessity to reevaluate the variable restricting the sample to only married faculty. We found that married women reported statistically higher levels of marital stress than

did married men ($f=7.453$; $p< .01$) thus confirming the overall higher stress levels for women.

The standardized regression weights indicate that the strongest predictor of job satisfaction for all faculty is low levels of job-related stress. For women, tenured or not, the perception that women are treated

Table 4: Regression Weights of Independent Variables for All Samples

Variables	Regression Weights – Unstandardized b-weights (standardized Beta weights)				
	Total Sample	Divided by Gender		Women divided by tenure status	
		Men	Women	Non-Tenured	Tenured
Constant	2.818***	3.087***	2.909***	2.982***	2.828***
Block 1. Demographics					
Race (Black)	-.069 (-.018)**	-.041 (-.010)ns	-.093 (-.028)**	-.123 (-.040)**	-.028 (-.007)ns
Race (Asian)	-.209 (-.068)***	-.213 (-.071)***	-.200 (-.063)**	-.191 (-.066)***	-.206 (-.056)***
Hispanic	.013 (.003)ns	.017 (.004)ns	.010 (.003)ns	.013 (.004)ns	.007 (.002)ns
Age	-.058 (-.105)***	-.006 (-.109)***	-.0057 (-.096)***	-.005 (-.075)***	-.007 (-.105)***
Gender Men(1) women (2)	.124 (.107)***	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Block 2. Institutional/Professional					
Control Private (0) Public (1)	-.054 (-.049)***	-.068 (-.061)***	-.025 (-.023)*	-.021 (-.0189)ns	-.031 (-.028)ns
Institutional Type 4 year (0) University (1)	.078 (.068)***	.079 (.068)***	.084 (.071)***	.092 (.078)***	.080 (.068)***
Rank 1= full prof to 4=instructor	.023 (.041)***	.029 (.048)***	.014 (.024)ns	.005 (.007)ns	.024 (.028)ns
Salary (natural log)	.373 (.224)***	.387 (.228)***	.332 (.180)***	.307 (.148)***	.363 (.175)***
Tenure status	-.010 (-.009)ns	-.015 (-.013)ns	.004 (.003)ns	N/A	N/A
Research orientation	-.016 (-.021)**	-.025 (-.031)**	-.002 (-.002)ns	.0154 (.016)ns	-.018 (-.020)ns
Desire for Recognition	-.006 (-.009)ns	-.000 (-.001)ns	-.013 (-.020)*	-.005 (-.007)ns	-.023 (-.037)*
Institutional emphasis on resources and reputation	.079 (.114)***	.085 (.122)***	.068 (.102)***	.069 (.103)***	.068 (.104)***
Commitment to student personal development	.118 (.135)***	.116 (.131)***	.119 (.136)***	.113 (.127)***	.127 (.146)***
Discipline (Soft=0; Hard=1)	-.020 (-.016)**	-.025 (-.021)**	.005 (-.003)ns	.024 (.017)ns	-.041 (-.027)ns
Discipline (Applied=0; Pure=1)	.035 (.031)***	.046 (.041)***	.012 (.011)ns	.003 (.003)ns	.027 (.025)ns
Block 3 – Gender Related					
Taught a women’s study course	.036 (.018)**	.053 (.015)ns	.039 (.028)**	.057 (.038)**	.022 (.017)ns
Research focused on women	.031 (.025)***	.037 (.026)***	.023 (.021)ns	.023 (.021)ns	.019 (.017)ns
Ever been sexually harassed at this institution	-.149 (-.063)***	-.250 (-.072)***	-.072 (-.042)***	-.051 (-.026)*	-.085 (-.056)***
Women are treated fairly at institution	.144 (.207)***	.115 (.146)***	.195 (.307)***	.198 (.311)***	.192 (.303)***

Table 4 continues on page 20

fairly was about as important as job-related stress. Other variables looming important for all included salary and an institutional emphasis on resources and reputation. Thus, an environment perceived as positive and an appropriate reward structure are important to maintaining job satisfaction for all.

The analyses involving the “pull-factors” revealed some interesting differences among the tested samples. When comparing the significant unstandardized regression weights (b), of the “pull factors” we found the tenured women and men to be quite similar. However, the nontenured women were very different from either the male or tenured women sample. Among nontenured women, having a dependent child was a comparably larger detractor to job satisfaction than for either of the other two samples. Also, care of an elderly parent was a significant detractor for only this group. Coupled with the strong importance of job-related stress, our study provides additional evidence that nontenured women have multiple stresses, responsibilities, and situations that make job-satisfaction more complex and less likely.

Many policies can emanate from the present research. Primarily, administrators should appreciate the interaction of “pull-factors” and job satisfaction for all faculty. Men as well as women may have significant responsibilities or situations that make job

satisfaction tenuous. Therefore, liberal policies with respect to family-leave, provisions for on-campus child care or emotional or other support for elder care would be a positive step for many faculty regardless of gender. Finally, it appears that the stressful journey to tenure may be especially rocky for women. Juggling multiple responsibilities at home and on the job may be especially taxing for this group. Provisions to allow a break in the ticking of the tenure clock during early childbearing years may be a way for some untenured faculty to find relief and successfully achieve tenure. Support groups, assistance with finding appropriate child or elder care may also encourage positive outcomes during difficult times. Workers, including postsecondary faculty, do not abandon their family-related or other stressors when arriving on campus. It follows that acknowledgment and assistance with “pull factors” may be a very positive and important step in the maintenance of faculty job satisfaction that in turn may promote faculty retention, development, recruitment, scholarly productivity, promotion, tenure, and institutional quality.

This study identified stressors and other factors detracting from job satisfaction. Since job satisfaction leads to job retention, the importance of this topic is obvious (Hagedorn, 1996). Typically faculty development has been aimed at the improvement of

Table 4 (continued)

Block 4: “Pull Factors” and other stressors					
Dependent children	-.051 (-.046)***	-.046 (-.041)***	-.060 (-.053)***	-.072 (-.064)***	-.047 (-.040)*
Married (spouse or partner)	.004 (.003)ns	.019 (.012)ns	-.008 (-.007)ns	-.015 (-.013) ns	-.001 (-.001)ns
Spouse or partner is an academic	.003 (.002)ns	.007 (.006)ns	-.006 (-.005)ns	-.027 (-.023)ns	.002 (.015)ns
Spouse/partner works in same city	.035 (.031)***	.037 (.033)***	.028 (.025)*	.034 (.031)*	.016 (.015)ns
Career interrupted for family purposes	-.012 (-.007)ns	-.032 (-.013)ns	-.0006 (-.000)ns	.001 (.001)ns	.001 (.001)ns
Home related stress	.065 (.059)***	.062 (.054)***	.074 (.073)***	.082 (.083)***	.066 (.063)**
Stress from care of elderly parent	-.013 (-.015)**	-.011 (-.012)ns	-.016 (-.019)*	-.021 (-.025)*	-.012 (-.015)ns
Family financial stress	-.067 (-.086)***	-.079 (-.098)***	-.048 (-.065)***	-.030 (-.040)**	-.076 (-.098)***
Marital friction stress	-.001 (-.002) ns	.000 (.000)ns	.0000 (0000)ns	.006 (.006)ns	-.010 (-.010)ns
Job related stress	-.534 (-.364)***	-.547 (-.365)***	-.495 (-.327)***	-.518 (-.348)***	-.474 (-.306)***

scholarship or updating within the discipline. It should be acknowledged that faculty with significant family responsibilities are not able to participate in development efforts such as professional travel or tuition remission. The need for development initiatives to help faculty balance and blend personal and professional lives seems especially warranted.

Note

This study was sponsored by the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California at Los Angeles

This study was also funded in part by a grant from the James Irvine Foundation. Grant No. 98-106. The findings and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of the James Irvine Foundation.

References

- Agho, A. O., Mueller, C. W., & Price, J. L. (1993). Determinants of employee job satisfaction: An empirical test of a causal model. *Human Relations, 46*(8), 1007-1026.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, H. S., & Bayer, A. E. (1972). *Sex discrimination in academe*. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Bailyn, L. (1993). *Breaking the mold: Women, men and time in the new corporate world*. New York: Macmillan, The Free Press.
- Barnes, L. L. B., Agago, M. O., & Coombs, W. T. (1998). Effects of job-related stress on faculty intention to leave academia. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(4), 457-469.
- Bebbington, A. C. (1973). The function of stress in the establishment of the dual-career family. *Journal of Marriage and the Family 35*, 530-537.
- Biglan, A. (1973a). The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 57*(3), 195-203.
- Biglan, A. (1973b). Relationships between subject matter characteristics and the structure and output of university departments. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 57*(3), 204-213.
- Blackburn, R. T., & Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Blackburn, R. T., & Bentley, R. J. (1993). Faculty research productivity: Some moderators of associated stressors. *Research in Higher Education, 34*, 725-745.
- Blackburn, R. T., & Wylie, N. (1985). Current appointment and tenure practices: Their impact on new faculty careers : Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Brooke, P. P. J., Russell, D. W., & Price, J. L. (1988). Discriminant validation of measures of job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*(2), 139-145.
- Caldwell, D. F., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1990). Measuring person-job fit with a profile-comparison process. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 648-657.
- Clague, M. W. (1992). *Hiring, promoting and retaining African American faculty: A case study of an aspiring multi-cultural research university* (ED352896). Minneapolis, MN: Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- DeLongis, A., Coyne, J. C., Dakof, G., Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1982). Relationships of hassles, uplifts and major life events to health status. *Health Psychology, 1*, 25-39.
- Dwyer, M. M., Flynn, A. A., & Inman, P. S. (1991). Differential progress of women faculty Status 1980-1990. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education Handbook of Theory and Research* (3rd ed.), pp. 173-222. New York: Agathon Press.
- Eldercare looms large, (1998, 11/30/98). *Women & Marketing, 11*, 10.
- Galinsky, E., Bond, J. T., & Friedman, D.E. (1993). *Highlights of the National Study of the Changing Workforce*. New York: Families & Work Institute.
- Gappa, J. M. and S. M. MacDermid (1997). *Work, family, and the faculty career*. Washington, D.C., American Association for Higher Education.
- Gmelch, W. H. (1993). *Coping with faculty stress*. (Vol. 5). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gmelch, W. H., Lovrich, N. P., & Wilke, P. K. (1984). Sources of stress in academe: A national perspective. *Research in Higher Education, 20*, 477-490.
- Gmelch, W. H., Wilke, P. K., & Lovrich, N. P. (1986). Dimensions of stress among university faculty: Factor-analytic results from a national study. *Research in Higher Education, 24*, 266-286.
- Green, S. B., Salkind, N. J., & Akey, T. M. (1997). *Using SPSS for Windows: Analyzing and understanding data*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Gunderson, M. (1989). Male-female wage differentials and policy responses. *Journal of Economic Literature, 27*, 46-72.
- Hagedorn, L. S. (1996). Wage equity and female faculty job-satisfaction: The role of wage differentials in a job satisfaction causal model. *Research in Higher Education, 37*(5), 569-598.
- Hensel, N. (1991). *Realizing gender equality in higher education: The need to integrate work/family issues* (ASHE ERIC Higher Education Report). Washington D.C.: George Washington University.

- Herndon, M.D. (1995). Elder care comes of age. *CUPA Journal*, 46(3), 35-38.
- Hobbs, F. B. (1999) *The elderly population*. Internet Report of the U. S. Census Bureau . [Http://www.census/population/www/pop-profile/elderpop.html](http://www.census/population/www/pop-profile/elderpop.html). January, 21, 1999.
- Howard, R. D., Snyder, J. K., & McLaughlin, G. W. (1992). Faculty salaries. In M. A. Whiteley, J. D. Porter, & R. H. Fenske (Eds.), *The Primer for Institutional Research* (pp. 51-62). Tallahassee: Association for Institutional Research.
- House, J. S. (1981). *Work Stress and Social Support*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hughes, D., & Galinsky, E. (1988). Balancing work and family lives: Research and corporate applications. In *Maternal employment and Children's development: Longitudinal research*, edited by A. E. Gottfried and A. W. Gottfried, pp. 233-268. New York: Plenum.
- Hunter, E. (1999, 2/28/99). Who cares? A late 90s look at those who care for others. *The Women's Times*, 1.
- Malaney, G. (1986). Differentiation in graduate education. *Research in Higher Education*, 25(1), 82-96.
- McMillen, L. (1987, February). Job-related tension in and anxiety taking a toll among employees in academe's Stress Factories. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 33, 1-12.
- Morgan, J. (1996). Reaching Out to Young Black Men. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 13(16), 16-19.
- National Center for Education Statistics, (2002). *Digest of Education Statistics*, [<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/digest2001/index.asp>]. NCES [5/3/03]
- National Center for Education Statistics, (1997). *The Condition of Education*, [<http://nces.ed.gov/>]. NCES [1999, 1/6/99].
- Olsen, D. (1993). Work satisfaction and stress in the first and third year of academic appointment. *Journal of Higher Education*, 64(July/August), 453-471.
- Olsen, D., Maple, S. A., & Stage, F. K. (1995). Women and minority faculty job satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education*, 66(3), 267-293.
- Raabe, P. H. (1996). Constructing pluralistic work and career arrangements that are family-and workfriendly. In S. Lewis & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Rethinking Employment: The Work-family challenge*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rausch, D. K., Ortiz, B. P., Douthitt, R. A., & Reed, L. L. (1989). The academic revolving door: Why do women get caught? *CUPA Journal*, 40, 1-16.
- Strober, M. H., & others. (1993). *Report of the Provost's Committee on the Recruitment and Retention of Women Faculty*. (ERIC ED366269). Palo Alto: Stanford University.
- Tack, M. W., & Patitu, C. L. (1992). *Faculty job satisfaction: Women and minorities in Peril*. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Teevan, J. J. (1992). Academic employment decisions and gender. *Research in Higher Education*, 33(2), 141-60.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census, (May, 1995a). *Sixty-five plus in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Bureau of the Census.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census (1995b) *Statistical abstract of the United States: 1995*, 115th ed. Washington, DC: U. S. Bureau of the Census.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census (2003).

Linda Serra Hagedorn, Ph.D., is an Associate Professor, Associate Director of the Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis, and Program Chair for the Community College Leadership in the Rossier School of Education at the University of Southern California. She has published widely on various aspects of higher education including student retention, student gains, faculty salary, and sexual harassment on campus.

Linda J. Sax, Ph.D., is Associate Professor In-Residence, Director of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) and Associate Director of the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA. The recipient of the 1999 Early Career Award from the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Dr. Sax's research focuses on gender differences in college student development, specifically how institutional characteristics, peer and faculty environments, and forms of student involvement differentially affect male and female college students.