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ABSTRACT

This study examined how female faculty in a university commission for women negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. The academic context provided a unique lens through which to examine the strategies that women use to negotiate competing demands of internal and external social, historical, cultural, and economic factors. The study asked three questions: 1. What challenges do women faculty members encounter in their pursuit of career aspirations? 2. What are the cultural, family, religious, traditional and peer-based expectations that conflict with female faculty’s personal career aspirations? 3. How do female faculty members negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia? This study used an exploratory, holistic case study design (Yin, 2003) that built upon a conceptual framework adapted from Ezzedeen and Ritchey’s (2009) inductive model as well as gender discrimination, women’s labor, gender socialization, and gender role literature. Qualitative data included face-to-face interviews with 12 participants, journal field notes, and commission documents to address the research questions. Data analysis techniques included open coding, axial coding, categorical aggregation, pattern matching, line-by-line reading, and the constant comparative method to identify emergent themes. Researcher reflexivity, triangulation, and transparency in the narrative addressed validity threats of bias and reactivity. Findings from this study include the challenges that female faculty encounter in their pursuit of tenure and promotion, socio-culturally based expectations that female faculty perceive to conflict with personal career aspirations, and the strategies they use to negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. The findings from this study contribute to the research literature, scholarship, and practice of adult education, higher education, and workplace policy.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

Tensions between personal aspirations in the world of work and family socio-culturally based expectations are ongoing and complex for women faculty in higher education. Research suggests that parenting within the academy is a gendered phenomenon. For example, Mason and Goulden’s (2002) study of Ph.D. recipients between 1973 and 1979 revealed that raising children, especially in one’s academic career, has a negative effect on women’s but not on men’s careers. With such split responsibilities for domestic work and for a woman’s career, researchers wonder whether it is possible to manage home and work and achieve success in academic pursuits—promotion and tenure.

Even though work and family tensions in higher education are widespread and affect women in academia, most empirical studies have examined the professional versus familial outcomes of work and family challenges for tenure-eligible faculty, such as childbirth, marriage and divorce. Often times, these tensions are conveniently brushed aside or simply confused with lack of academic competence on the part of women faculty. In the interim, persistent pressures for some women cause stress on the job or clashes in families, particularly for those women who are married with children or must care for elderly parents (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012). Besides, lives of working women are further complicated by society’s “traditional” expectations that tend to burden women with all kinds of gendered responsibilities and roles to play in the home as mother/caregiver, wife or daughter (Santore, 2009). These dilemmas led to the research question: What are the socio-cultural, (family, religious, and traditional) and peer-based expectations that conflict with female faculty’s personal career aspirations? A case study of these conflicts and
tensions between personal career aspirations and traditional family expectations further interrogated the concept of work-family conflict.

This case study aimed to investigate the clash of values that women faculty encounter in higher education to understand the socio-cultural and historical dynamics that perpetuate or produce conflicts or struggles in women who aspire to pursue an academic career and have a family. Slaughter (2012) uncovered the myth of work-family balance and suggested that stories of women can sum up the dilemma: “Women of my generation have clung to the feminist credo we were raised with, even as our ranks have been steadily thinned by unresolvable tensions between family and career, because we are determined not to drop the flag for the next generation” (para. 7). Slaughter’s depiction of women’s dilemma alludes to the tensions between social expectations, moral obligations to future generations of women, and economic responsibilities that push women to have high-paying, prestigious careers and the biological, cultural and historical expectations and responsibilities that accompany motherhood, “marriage and baby blues” (Mason & Goulden, 2004). Stories such as these gave this researcher pause to rethink the dilemma and examine the complexity of the issues of work-family conflict.

Though not always explicit, workplace practices, particularly in higher education, seem to hint in subtle ways that for academic women to excel in the world of work like their male counterparts, they must remain single or devote disproportionate amounts of time to their job (Mason, Wolfinger, & Goulden, 2013). But this view seems to contradict aspirations of women who might wish to have a family and pursue a successful career. Most often, the indicators for success to which women aspire in a career include pay, prestige, and promotion (Valcour & Ladge, 2008). For women, a career means greater dedication to one’s job (Ezzedeen & Ritchey, 2009). In fact, career dedication is expected to be ongoing. But for women who aspire to have a family and advance in their careers, the competing expectations of fulfilling the roles of wife,
mother/caregiver, and dedicated employee can be challenging, thus causing stress on the job and tension at home (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012).

Furthermore, for some women, pressure is likely to be exerted from other quarters such as religion, the extended family, peers, and subtle “patriarchal” attitudes that have been around from time immemorial. It is well documented that “cultural expectations about what is appropriate gender-specific behavior can limit the range of options available to women and how they can negotiate those options” (Damaske, 2011, p.170). Cultural expectations refer to the rules/boundaries/gatekeepers that exist in the relationship between a woman and her society. Stereotypical expectations about appropriate gendered roles in society affect women more than men (Cheryan, Siy, Vichayapai, Drury, & Kim, 2011) and constrain the choices they make to both enter a particular academic field (Moss-Racusin et al., 2012) as well as the decisions they make while in that field (Cheryan, Master, & Meltzoff, 2015). In sum, the social expectations around gendered roles for women constrain the ways in which they can negotiate academic expectations.

For example, in higher education, faculty members aspire to achieve tenure, which is determined by three criteria: research, teaching, and service (National Education Association, 2014). Typically, tenure is accompanied by rewards and privileges that include academic freedom in the form of right to due process and continued lifetime employment contracts (Van Patten, 2009). Consequently, the pressure to achieve tenure can pose serious dilemmas to women faculty who must decide whether to have children and stop the tenure evaluation clock or postpone the desire to have a family to achieve tenure. In sum, early career women are left in a quandary without a clear path to resolve this dilemma, or even strategies to address barriers, stress, and conflict or overcome the myth of work-family balance. This predicament raises the central question of this study: What accounts for the tensions between personal “career” aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations?
The struggles discussed previously that women faculty seem to encounter are real and persistent. For example, my mother told me that she encountered many challenges trying to work and raise three children in her generation. Equally, I witnessed first-hand how my female friends struggle to prioritize “work” and “motherhood.” In fact, my own experiences in search for career success and consideration of how to have both a fulfilling home life and career have been daunting. They have pushed me to ask: what does success mean for a woman, both individually and socially, and why is achieving success so problematic for women? My personal struggles with career-related decision-making dilemmas and those of my female friends prompted me to investigate these challenges for women in academia. Is it possible for women to minimize the tension between work and family? Or, is this a myth?

Sometimes women’s ability to negotiate career and family is viewed as something tangible and yet its attainment is ubiquitously problematic and elusive. I observed this situation when I began to teach adult basic education, professional development, and job training courses. As a just-married woman of childbearing age, and a person who aspires to have a career in academia, I wondered why the tension between career and family? The reality seems to indicate that women in academia struggle with work-family conflict, even when they continue to make more contributions to parenting and housework than men do (Wolfinger, Mason & Goulden, 2008). Researchers suggest that these inequalities cross socio-economic and racial lines (Beddoes & Pawley, 2013).

Some human resources departments and professional organizations advise that women in academia maintain clear boundaries between the two spheres of career and family by separating family from the workplace in events such as “stopping the tenure clock” and maternity leave (American Association of University Professors [AAUP], 2013). Yet women faculty who “stop the clock” by arranging to push tenure review back one year earn less than those who do not in both the short and long term (Cummings, 2012). For women who seek tenure and plan to be
married with children, competing demands of academic work (including research, publishing, attending conferences, networking with colleagues and attending late meetings) in addition to those of parenthood exacerbate female faculty’s stress on the job.

Stress on the job is not unique to working women generally. Other racial minorities, gendered minorities, and those with disabilities also experience stress between their racial, gendered or ability-related identities and career aspirations (Bhopal & Jackson, 2013). Thus to understand the tensions and dilemmas between work and family for women faculty one must examine them in relation to other social and economic categories to which they belong (Shields, 2008). These social hierarchies add layers of complexity to workplaces such as universities that value merit-based rewards and are essential to academic institutions’ meritocratic discourse (Acker, 2004).

While economic pressures exist for both men and women of every social, racial and gendered category, scholars have identified double standards for women in the workplace that do not necessarily exist for men. For example, both marriage and parenthood penalties exist for women, but not for men (Crittenden, 2002; Hochschild & Machung, 1989; Juraqulova, Byington, & Kmec, 2015; Mason & Goulden, 2002). A marriage penalty refers to the negative effect that marriage has on women’s wages (Hersch & Stratton, 1997), while a marriage premium indicates that being married increases men’s wages, on average (Hersch & Stratton, 2000). The motherhood wage penalty refers to career penalties that a woman experiences after she becomes a mother and indicates lower wages relative to both men’s (with or without children) and childless women’s (Juraqulova, Byington, & Kmec, 2015; Miller, 2011).

Such penalties pose a dilemma for women who must defer motherhood, which may be an important mechanism for gender equality in the workplace (Fuchs, 1989; Miller, 2011). Yet the biological realities of fertility and childbearing may make delaying motherhood undesirable (Clark & Hill, 2010). This presents yet another dilemma for women who desire to have children
while maintaining or striving for a rewarding career. I investigated such dilemmas and challenges that women faculty encounter in higher education, asking: What challenges do women faculty members encounter in their pursuit of career aspirations?

**Purpose of the Present Study**

The purpose of this exploratory case study (Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Yin, 2003) was to explore the tensions and dilemmas that female faculty in a commission for women at a large, public research university expressed between socio-culturally based expectations and personal career aspirations. At this stage in the research (Cresswell, 2003), socio-culturally based expectations are tentatively defined as the expectations that female faculty participants conveyed from family, tradition, peers, culture, and religion as conflicting with their personal career aspirations for tenure in academia.

**Statement of the Research Problem and Context**

The present study is in many ways a reflection of my own dilemmas that I encountered as I made career-related decisions. I joined the Adult Education Program at Penn State University after a series of career changes. These experiences in the quest for career success pushed me to wonder and consequently begin to explore how success is perceived in diverse disciplines. Changing careers frequently and discussing personal and professional struggles with other women, reading media accounts, and studying statistics about women’s career development have influenced how I view the struggles of women in academia and the efforts they make to achieve professional equality with men while managing the responsibilities at home. Organization of the workplace that requires separation of professional work from domestic gendered expectations
signifies the dilemmas for working women. The underrepresentation of tenured women faculty and administrators at the highest ranks of academia despite higher levels of educational attainment present a unique context for investigating the problem of how female faculty negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia.

**Gender Inequity**

Under representation of women in the workforce is widespread. For example, reports by the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) indicate that the global gender pay gap ranges from 3 percent to 51 percent with a global average of 17 percent (ITUC, 2008). Equality in pay has improved in the US with women earning 81 percent of what their male counterparts earned on average in 2010 (up from 62 percent in 1979) (Department of Labor, 2011). However, the Great Recession of 2007-2010 caused this figure to decline to women earning 46.7 percent of what men earn (Department of Labor, 2011). In academia, the gender pay gap is the largest at doctoral universities, where women make approximately 78 cents on the dollar across all faculty ranks (Newman, 2014). The concern is that women’s contributions to the workforce are not meaningfully recognized, valued or rewarded in spite of their qualifications.

In an increasingly global economic environment, the influence of human capital theory (that emphasizes knowledge, attitudes and skill development primarily for economic productivity [Baptiste, 2001]) has influenced lifestyle and wellbeing for all global citizens. For example, the more likely women are to invest in human capital such as education and skill building, the less likely they are to rear children (Cummings, 2012, Hakim, 1995; Kemkes-Grottenthaler, 2003), which suggests incompatibility between work and family, especially at the higher levels of educational attainment. In fact, tenured women are twice as likely to be single twelve years after
obtaining their doctorates than their male counterparts (Mason & Goulden, 2004; Schiebinger, Henderson & Gilmartin, 2008), and two thirds of women with doctoral degrees who began working at research universities prior to having children never have them (Cheung & Halpern, 2010). Women on the tenure track or who have tenure have a 144 percent greater probability of divorce than their male counterparts and a 75 percent greater probability than do non-tenure track female faculty (Mason & Goulden, 2004). It would seem, therefore, that being a married mother and successful in the academic workplace can be contradictory terms for women faculty.

Despite making significant educational and career advancements in all academic disciplines, women continue to experience gender inequality on the tenure track. First, although more than half of all doctoral degrees in the U.S. are conferred to women (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012), fewer women are represented at top levels of the faculty hierarchy than men. According to the American Association of University Professors, in the 2011-2012 academic year, 38.6% of all male faculty held full or associate professor positions, compared to 20.6% of all female faculty. In contrast, 5.6% of all male faculty held instructor or lecturer positions, while 7.9% of all female faculty held these positions (AAUP, 2011).

Second, the general trend for gendered breakdown of academic faculty shows higher Ph.D. graduation rates for women, with more men represented in successful positions of tenure and higher pay and more women represented in part-time, lower paid instructor and lecturer positions. According to the Harvard Crimson and Brown Daily Herald, for example, women represented only 22 (Stein Lubrano, 2012) and 27 (Macfarlane, 2012) percent of faculty at each university, respectively. Although Spalter-Roth & VanVooren (2012) most recently found that female faculty in sociology are “equally likely to have ‘ideal’ careers as men with children and childless men” (p. 1), the national trend shows that there continues to be fewer women at the top of the faculty hierarchy in tenured positions across disciplines, and more women than men in adjunct and part-time positions with lower pay (Mason, 2011).
Third, the average age of degree recipients in the United States at the Ph.D. level is 34 and 33 for men and women, respectively. This makes the period of transitioning from graduate student to pre-tenure track and eventually tenured professor coincide with prime childbearing years for both men and women (AAUP, 2013). However, the biological realities of childrearing make it unrealistic (and undesirable) to postpone having a family until tenure is achieved (Mason, Goulden & Frasch, 2009). Women are likely to take on more of the burden for childrearing and domestic responsibilities than men (Bianchi & Milkie, 2010). In fact, male professors in the sciences do about half as much housework as their female peers, and even universities with family-friendly policies do not recognize the time devoted to labor outside of the workplace (Schiebinger & Gilmartin, 2010). The gender inequity that persists in academia in many ways reflects the organization of the workplace. The domestic division of labor retains the imprint of a male breadwinner society which presents a challenge to gender equity within the labor force and in society more generally.

**Women’s Labor**

While economic pressures exist for both men and women of every social, racial, and economic category, a recent study by the Harvard Business Review revealed that male executives see the work-family debate as a primarily women’s issue (Grose, 2014). This is perhaps because the perception is that men’s gender role in the family is to provide financially, and therefore work that enables men to fulfill that role does not generate feelings of guilt or inadequacy (Groysberg & Abrahams, 2014). In contrast, the gendered roles of women as mothers and caregivers contradict with the traditionally male role of economic provider (Cernea, 1978), wherein the economic provider belongs in the workforce and the caregiver does not. This suggests that for women who aspire to have a rewarding career and fulfilling family life, the expectations placed
on them by competing work and family domains do not align in the same way that they do for men. These competing expectations between work and family frequently lead women to perform a “second shift” of domestic responsibilities after work (Hoschild, 2012). The “second shift” refers to an additional domestic labor component for women that is not traditionally expected of men, and may cause women to modify their careers by working part-time so they can care for family, or to abandon the workplace altogether (Ward, 2014).

Social scientists put women’s labor into two categories: workplace labor and “feminized labor” (Hossfeld, 2009). Feminized labor refers to activities that relate to maintaining a home including childcare, support work (regarding the family’s emotional state), status production (work that a wife does to bolster her husband's career), and housework (Collins, 1992). Feminized labor is viewed in general as the binary gendered divisions of labor that discuss women’s place within the family in the private home in opposition to men’s place in the public workforce (Arendt, 1958; Hossfeld, 2009). The domestic labor that occurs privately in the home is more frequently considered to be a woman’s domain and the paid labor that occurs in the public sphere to be men’s. Based on this scale, upon entering the workforce, women are expected more than men to participate in care professions, which are often underpaid or undervalued (Mentzakis, Ryan & McNamee, 2011). Such gendered expectations raise the question: What are the cultural, family, religious, traditional and peer-based expectations that conflict with female faculty’s personal career aspirations in academia?

**Workplace Structure**

In addition to the difficult decisions that women in academia must make when pursuing both a family and tenure-track faculty position, inflexible workplace arrangements frequently punish workers with family emergencies. A flexible work arrangement can increase employee
productivity and decrease turnover (Damaske, 2011), yet even when family friendly policies are in place, they are frequently underutilized by faculty who perceive negative repercussions from taking advantage of them (AAUP, 2013). The law suit between one Ivy League university and a female professor who was denied tenure for taking advantage of maternity and family medical leave policies illustrates how inflexible the academic workplace can be for women who aspire to achieve tenure and manage family responsibilities (Weinberg, 2014).

Media debates and popular articles surrounding the concept of women “having it all” hint at the unique dilemmas that women encounter trying to manage work and family, where the notion of “having it all” (Hewlett, 2002) signifies maintaining a fulfilling career, relationships, and children (Giang, 2013). According to a 2013 Accenture study, over two thirds of both male and female employees surveyed believe they can "have it all" when it comes to a having both a successful career and a full life outside work, yet half of the respondents do not believe they can “have it all” at the same time (Accenture Plc, 2013). Increasingly, success for a woman means having it all: being the powerful professional, the loving wife, and the nurturing mother (Spar, 2013). Yet to manage such expectations, the reality is that women make decisions to negotiate career, relationships and children between frequently incompatible domains (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012). “It is likely that feelings about how successful one is in balancing job and family may come from specific events or decisions that represent a sacrifice of one domain for the other” (Milkie & Peltola, 1999, p.477). The realities of gender inequity, expectations and realities of women’s labor, and structure of the workplace are often incompatible with women’s career progression to full professor, and form the foundation for this study’s investigation of how the women who have achieved tenure negotiate the tensions and dilemmas that they have encountered in the pursuit of promotion.
Research Questions

The persisting gendered pay gap at the highest levels of academia, biological and sociocultural realities of childbearing and childrearing, and the structure of the academic workplace reveal dilemmas for women who aspire to manage academic and family expectations and responsibilities. Such conflict seems to suggest that work and family are incompatible for these women. This realization explains the quest for this study and the ensuing research questions:

• What challenges do women faculty members encounter in their pursuit of career aspirations?
• What are the socio-cultural (family, religious, traditional) and peer-based expectations that conflict with female faculty’s personal career aspirations?
• How do female faculty members negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia?

This study seeks to understand what accounts for the tensions between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations. It is important to ask what challenges women faculty encounter in their pursuit of career aspirations to understand not only what women’s aspirations are, but also to prevent imposing my own expectations and assumptions about work-family balance on these women. The tensions between scales of rewards for tenured positions and socio-culturally based expectations pose a serious dilemma to women faculty who feel conflict between work and family. More importantly women realize that discrepancies in the workplace are a human creation, particularly because academic career paths are structured differently at every institution while each individual is situated in a specific socio-cultural and historical family position with imposed expectations and particular personal aspirations.
Identifying the challenges that women faculty encounter in their pursuit of career aspirations allows for the complex interaction of varied career paths, family positions, and personal aspirations to emerge. Uncovering these complex interactions is foundational to exploring the challenges that female faculty encounter in academia and how they negotiate such challenges to achieve tenure.

The second research question seeks to understand the cultural, family, religious, traditional and peer-based expectations that conflict with female faculty’s personal aspirations. Universities are “greedy institutions” (Coser, 1974, p.6; Damaske et al, 2014) that demand all-consuming commitment and loyalty to be an ideal worker who gets promoted through the ranks. This conflicts with the competing demands of parenthood, which is also a greedy institution, especially for women (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012). Cultural, family, religious, traditional and peer-based expectations that carry over from historical traditions such as women’s place in the home conflict with modern career aspirations of women who desire to be top professionals. The second question seeks to understand how particular women with varied social-cultural backgrounds and aspirations to be tenured faculty perceive the discrepancies between these two domains.

To understand how female faculty members negotiate the tensions between career and family in academia means understanding the decisions that these women make to resolve work-family conflict in their own lives. Negotiation is a dynamic process frequently implemented to resolve struggles between conflicting values and interests through compromise or tradeoffs (Muldoon, 2005). For working women, tension between career and family requires cultural negotiation that includes tradeoffs dependent upon cultural norms, personal experiences and perceived risks. Cultural negotiation is the process of navigating competing or conflicting cultural beliefs, values and behaviors (Baden, 2005). For working women, cultural negotiation is the process whereby women who experience conflict between work and family domains shift value
systems to the appropriate context in order to harmonize the opposing value systems and reach a desired outcome. Such cultural negotiation allows working women to fulfill the often contradictory gendered and ideal worker roles required by work and family, and to minimize the tension between them by meeting the expectations and obligations for each.

**Significance of Study**

Understanding the tensions, conflicts and dilemmas between career and family ambitions and expectations for women in the world of work is significant for several reasons. First, this study will improve adult education practice. Some instructional techniques are directly linked to adult learning in the form of knowledge acquisition, changing attitudes, beliefs and values, and skill-building (Caffarella & Barnett, 1997). Thus, understanding how attitudes and beliefs about feminized labor influence women who negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia can expose contradictions between feminized labor (expectations about women’s work) and workplace labor (expectations about paid work) within academia. Exposing these contradictions contributes to the literature on learning and improves the development and delivery of professional development programs for adult working women. Therefore this study contributes to adult education practice, research and scholarship.

Second, this study contributes to workplace policy. Both the World Economic Forum and the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) prioritize global policy-making for the advancement of women and gender equality. The Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) set goals to fully integrate women into economic decision-making positions by “changing the current gender-based division of labour so that women and men enjoy equal treatment” (United Nations Economic and Social Council, 2014, p.3). Addressing gender issues in
professional education and training is important for effective delivery of programs to promote non-sexist attitudes.

Third, this study benefits women who participate in professional development programs that operate on assumptions about political and gender neutrality (Schied, Carter & Howell, 2001) within academia. This study informs policy makers and human resource officials who work toward diffusing the tension between work and family in adult education programs as they interact with women’s work in academia (e.g. distance education, continuing professional education, faculty development, commissions for women, and professional organizations). By describing the relationship(s) between professional and family variables that shape these tensions, this study exposes the competing expectations between feminized and workplace labor within human resources departments and continuing professional education programs. Understanding how female faculty negotiate in the academic workplace (where job training and career aspirations clash with traditional attitudes, beliefs and values about family) contributes to adult education research and gender policy. This study benefits both current and future generations of working women who aspire to have a family and career in academia.

**Summary**

As a woman who has changed careers frequently and who has discussed personal and professional struggles with other women, read frequent media accounts and examined statistics about women’s career development, I wonder why women struggle with work and family at many ages and stages of life. This wonderment has led to this study, which investigates how female faculty negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. To understand how female faculty negotiate promotion in the midst of such tensions benefits current and future women who aspire to work and have a family,
contributes to workplace policy, and aids in understanding gender issues in professional education and training. Exposing and examining this problem is important for women who consistently battle obstacles to promotion and remuneration.

Attitudes about women’s work and gender roles have changed little since the early 2000s (Cohen, 2013), but adult education is understood to be a process of changing attitudes through socialization. Many academic women aspire to have both a family and high-paying career, but women’s ability to negotiate the tensions of these domains is obscured by the ways that internal and external social, historical, cultural, and economic factors interact with family and career to influence policies, aspirations, and expectations that lead to workplace rewards such as pay and promotion. The academic context provides a unique lens through which to examine the tensions and dilemmas between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations for women.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

The literature review in this chapter provides the “intellectual glue” of my research study (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p.46) by helping this study to use what is known about work-family conflict, gender, labor, and discrimination to explore the new problem of how female faculty negotiate the tensions between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. This exploration required choosing relevant literature to support and limit the scope of my study, while also identifying how the present study addresses the gaps in existing knowledge (Butler-Kisber, 2010; Maxwell, 2005). The theories that best frame the topic of how female faculty negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia include gender socialization, gender roles, women’s (division of and feminized) labor, and discrimination.

Examining the tensions that female faculty encounter between their personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia requires exploring the existing theories of gender socialization, gender roles, women’s labor, and discrimination that underpin this dilemma. This chapter describes how these theories contribute to a theoretical framework for researching the problem of how female faculty negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations.

Gender Socialization

Understanding various theories of gender is essential to examine how female faculty negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally
based expectations in academia. Theories of gender such as doing gender, the social construction of gender, gender socialization, and gender roles can complement one another to understand how gender interacts with expectations and aspirations for female faculty in academia. A person learns the appropriate language, beliefs, and behaviors to conform to the values of a society or profession through the process of socialization (Strickland, 2001). Men and women are socialized as children by different gendered approaches from agents including family, church, peers (Cornwall, 1988) culture, and tradition that define their behavioral boundaries and patterns. Children understand themselves as gendered beings and develop gendered constancy that reflects the cultures and values of their society at the earliest stages of identity development (Wood, 2001). Theories of gender socialization acknowledge that men and women are socialized (not biologically determined) through symbolic interactionism (Mead, 1934) to perform different roles in society, thus meeting social and institutional expectations determined by a particular social status or position (Park, 2008).

Women and men must fit into society as appropriately gendered adults to be perceived as competent members of that society (Coltrane & Adams, 2008, p.175). Gender-specific expectations represent the implicit and explicit rules and customs that dictate appropriate social and cultural behaviors (Coltrane & Adams, 2008, p.175). Gendered differences between women and men are socially created via individuals' compliance with behavioral expectations that form boundaries for gender performance (Goffman, Lemert, & Branaman, 1997). Such boundaries become internalized and referenced when individuals compare themselves to others (Carter, 2014). Dilemmas occur when personal aspirations do not align with socio-culturally based expectations that convey the rules for appropriate social behavior.

Gender socialization alludes to rewards as social approval, and how performing a particular social role as a function of status will lead to the greatest social reward (i.e. power/prestige). Semali and Shakespeare (2014) recognize that the process of gender
socialization occurs through symbolic interactionism (Mead, 1934) and psychoanalytic signifiers (Lacan, 2006) to form mindscapes of gendered privilege that “favors [sic] masculinity over femininity in contexts such as paid labor,” (p.42). These gendered mindscapes become encoded and normalized in structural forms through human resource manuals and education credentials that make up the “silent culture” (p.43). The conflicting silent culture of gendered expectations that privileges masculinity in paid labor and that of women’s career aspirations generates tension between career and family.

The financial state of many families requires that women participate in the formal labor force, but the current and historical gender relations in which the male is dominant and female subordinate, as well as cultural norms surrounding women’s workforce participation, teach both women and men that women’s work is less valuable (Hardesty & Bokemeier, 1989). Traditional, socialized gender roles emphasize feminine characteristics that have roots in domestic abilities and include nurturing, virtuous, modest and sexually attractive characteristics (Femininity, 2008), which are not in harmony with the mindscapes of gendered privilege that associate masculine characteristics of agency, independence and dominance with paid labor.

**Gender Roles**

It is through gender socialization that men and women learn gender roles, which are polarized, and through which each learns the values and behaviors appropriate for men and women in society (Corrado, 2009). Gender role theory, and particularly gender role ideology, contribute to understanding the expectations placed on female faculty about how they should behave and think based on their biological sex. These theories inform how female faculty negotiate the imposed expectations placed on them (Santore, 2009) in a given interaction in which they reflect or express gender (West & Zimmerman, 1987).
Gender role theory states that young girls are socialized into gender roles that are culturally defined and associated with accepted tasks categorized as feminine and believed to reflect biological roles of reproduction (Roof, Quynn, Postema & Parke, 2007). Men and women learn polarized gender roles and the accompanying values and behaviors appropriate for men and women in society through gender socialization (Corrado, 2009; Wood, 2001), and they enact these roles differently given particular social interactions (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Female socialized gender roles in the home favor nurturing and selfless behaviors yet qualities such as autonomy, independence and action-oriented decision-making that are stereotypically masculine are fundamental to workplace leadership, culture, and job training within it (Cheung & Halpern, 2010; Miller, 2004).

Gender role ideology refers to the expectations placed on individuals about how they should behave and think based on their biological sex (Santore, 2009). A community’s gender roles are known, agreed upon, and reinforced by its members (Eagly, 1987), and institutional and social contexts play a strong part in shaping gender ideologies (Damaske, 2011; Gerson, 1985). For example, the female gender role ideology typically refers to women as nurturing, caring and selfless, and pressures women to fulfill social roles that align with these characteristics. In contrast, male gender role ideology typically refers to men as independent, task orientated, dominant and agentic (Shimanoff, 2009). The binary and socializing nature of gender roles lend themselves to the mindscapes of masculine privilege that both men and women engender and reinforce in the workplace context (Semali & Shakespeare, 2014). Women who desire to achieve high levels of academic success as tenured faculty members must negotiate the competing roles of professor that privileges masculine characteristics in the academic workplace and that of mother and caregiver that emphasizes traditionally feminine characteristics found in the home context.
West and Zimmerman’s (1987) theory of “doing gender” understands gender as constantly constructed, embedded in social interactions, and a fundamental social division through which we organize society. The tenants of this theory recognize that the individual self performs gender (Butler, 1990) in relation to social contexts. For example, in their study of academic mothers’ disciplinary perspectives, Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2015) used an exploratory qualitative approach and constant comparative analysis to uncover the challenges that female faculty encounter related to work and family in different academic disciplines. The exploratory qualitative approach was used as an introduction to the topic with constant comparative analysis because the topic is rooted in the participants’ particular experiences with the tenure and promotion process. The authors found that female faculty can successfully manage multiple roles, but that they maintained high levels of domestic responsibility regardless of career stage or discipline, and that the gendered role as a mother constrained their work-related time and caused significant stress.

Within the workplace, ability to ascend to powerful positions is somewhat dependent upon ability to navigate the roles into which one is socialized in the appropriate context and to fluidly move in and out of these social roles depending on the relevant group and situation (O’Neill & O’Reilly, 2011), or how they “do gender” (West & Zimmerman, 1987) in everyday interactions. Women are socialized into their gender roles, which provide normalized expectations for their behaviors. For women who aspire to achieve high-level positions in academia, this means overcoming “barriers related to gender and role socialization” (Vanhook-Morrissey, 2003, p.1), such as attitudes about the “natural” theory of gender that emphasizes the biological reproductive roles of men and women and the associated behaviors that accompany masculine and feminine labor.

The “natural” theory of gender opposes social construction theories of gender such as West and Zimmerman’s “doing gender” (1987) in favor of a theory that supports biologically
ordained roles for men and women. Systems of patriarchy and capitalism reinforce the natural theory of gender, which recognizes men’s natural abilities to be powerful authority figures and women’s to be submissive caretakers (Parziale, 2008). In many societies the subordination of women’s traditional roles have been accepted as naturally ordained, but this notion developed primarily in the eighteenth century “West” (Gordon & Hunter, 1998). For example, although economic imperatives have required that women work for financial gains at certain periods throughout history, their contributions were also expected in the domestic sphere, and if women were to be educated, it was always so that they would perform domestic responsibilities more effectively to fulfill their domestic role within society (Houle, 1947).

Women’s Labor

Domestic Labor

The distinctive tasks that men and women are expected to perform in the home and workplace based on their respective gender roles is known as gendered division of labor (Jackson, 2006). Nancy Folbre (1994) argues that women become economically marginalized because, although childbirth and caregiving are essential to develop human capital for the market, excluding women from the formal economy keeps costs hidden. Women’s income, which is frequently perceived to be supplemental to the family economy, in conjunction with their more frequently subordinate position in the workforce, promotes social norms that distribute more of the domestic labor to women. These social norms contribute to individuals' attitudes regarding the appropriate roles for women across contexts (Hardesty & Bokemeier, 1989). For example, time that a married woman faculty member spends on academic work (in the workplace or at home) takes away from time available for domestic responsibilities, which is the gendered role that she
needs to fulfill to maintain sexual attractiveness (Staines, Pottick & Fudge, 1986). This creates a tension between the gendered role requiring time spent on domestic responsibilities and the career-related role requiring time spent on academic responsibilities.

The problems surrounding division of labor, and particularly domestic labor, that results when both couples in a marriage are employed is known as time-based conflict (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985) and is “experienced when the time devoted to one role makes the fulfillment of the other difficult” (Karambayya & Reilly, 1992, p.586). In their 2008 study, Ezzedeen and Ritchey used an exploratory qualitative approach to investigate the role of spousal support in executive women’s career progression, and in their 2009 study, used interviews to explore the coping strategies that executive women employed to manage work and family. They found that traditional gender roles, which are solidified after parenthood, can undermine women’s career advancement because women take time from paid labor to devote it to domestic labor.

Although the gender gap has narrowed for married couples on time spent doing housework such as cooking and cleaning since the year 2000 (Bianchi & Milkie, 2010; Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer & Robinson, 2000; Bianchi, Robinson & Milkie, 2006; Sayer, 2005), gendered divisions remain with respect to childcare and paid labor. For example, mothers continue to hold the majority of childcare responsibilities while fathers maintain the majority of responsibilities for paid work (Bianchi & Milkie, 2010; Sayer, Bianchi & Robinson, 2004), and women are less likely than their male counterparts who have children within five years of receiving their doctorate to achieve tenure (Schiebinger & Gilmartin, 2010).

For women who aspire to achieve tenure and have a family in academia, increasing expectations in the 21st century for both workplace and involved parenting has exacerbated the tensions surrounding work and family, especially for highly educated workers (Bianchi & Milkie, 2010; Blair-Loy, 2003; Lareau, 2003; Sayer, Gauthier, & Furstenberg, 2004). In academia, male professors in the sciences do about half as much housework as their female peers, and even
universities with family-friendly policies do not recognize the time devoted to labor outside of the workplace, including childcare (Schiebinger & Gilmartin, 2010). Furthermore, male academics are more likely than their female peers to be married to someone who stays at home, while female academics are more likely than their male peers to be single (Schiebinger, Henderson & Gilmartin, 2008). For married college graduates, husbands’ high earnings discourage wives’ employment in direct conflict with her education, which encourages it [employment] (England, 2010).

**Feminized Labor**

The feminization of labor suggests that women who are married with children are not only more likely to take on more of the domestic labor than their husbands in the home (Schiebinger & Gilmartin, 2010), but also to perform similar roles in the workplace (Misra, Lundquist, Holmes & Agiomavritis, 2011). The feminization of labor refers not only to women’s increasing participation in the global workforce that is made necessary by globalization and industrialization (Hossfeld, 2009), but also to the type of work that women do with more tendency toward the care professions (e.g. childcare, geriatric care, nursing and/or housework) especially when compared to the type of work men do (Joyce, 2009). Though female labor participation in the paid workforce continues to increase, gender norms continue to hold the woman accountable for labor that occurs in the home, presenting added challenges to advancement in paid labor (Bartly, Blanton & Gilliard, 2005; Beatty, 1996; Rawney & Cahoon, 1990; Tichenor, 2005). Increasing parenting, household, and workplace expectations for working women leads to time-based conflict and tensions surrounding the types of labor that women are expected to and actually do, and the ultimate need to negotiate between these expectations to meet competing demands.
Gender Discrimination

The social sciences define discrimination as treating people differently because of their membership in a certain group (Heiphetz & Vescio, 2008). Gender discrimination refers more specifically to “any action that specifically denies opportunities, privileges, or rewards to a person (or a group) because of gender. The practice of letting a person's gender become a deciding factor when determining who receives a job or a promotion is gender discrimination” (Gender Discriminations, 2007). While both men and women can experience gender discrimination, it happens overwhelmingly to women as a result of women’s association with stereotypical feminine characteristics, which are less desirable than masculine ones in the workplace (Prügl, 2006). “While women's bodies are ruled out of order, or sexualized and objectified, in work organizations, men's bodies are not” (Acker, 1990, p.152).

In her theory of gendered organizations, Acker (1990, 1992) demonstrated that gender discrimination occurs through organizational cultures, practices, and structures that privilege men (Bird, 2011). Bird (2011) used a case study approach to investigate the gendered structures and corresponding discrimination that expose the conditions that enable male and female faculty to negotiate the formal and informal evaluation practices and performance expectations for achieving promotion and tenure. The case study approach analyzed discussion from eleven faculty members in five different academic departments as part of a workshop aimed at transforming the university’s culture to attract, promote and retain more female faculty. The study revealed that exclusion from male colleagues’ information networks, lack of transparency about the tenure process, and benevolent sexism illuminated the gendered nature of academic institutions that contribute to how men and women negotiate relationship power differently.

To understand how women negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia requires also understanding power, which
individuals exercise in the context of relationships in order to maintain normative rules for behavior (Kilgore, 2001; Usher, Bryant, & Johnston, 1997). In historically patriarchal societies where males have the privilege of dominance over females, gender discrimination is most frequently directed at females, and privileges male characteristics (masculinity) over female characteristics (femininity) in the distribution of rewards. “Given this socioeconomic arrangement, women’s work, both in the domestic and the private spheres, is highly devalued, yet it is extremely essential to the functioning of society; moreover, women’s work is fundamental to the capitalist mode of production” (Perry, 2009, p.353). Undervaluing women’s labor thus supports production as a function of the interaction between gender role (femininity), gender discrimination (masculine privilege) and distribution of rewards over a given period of time. Universities are gendered organizations with cultures, structures, and practices that devalue women in favor of men (Acker 1990, 2006; Dean, Bracken, & Allen, 2009).

Continuing professional education programs that do not adequately address gendered issues such as work-family conflict have different implications for men and women. Such programs may reinforce hidden curricula that favor masculinity (Hayes & Flannery, 2000) such as the example shown in Figure 2-1. This table depicts mission statements from five of the six top global banks of 2011 with strong masculine language that favors success (particularly in the form of wealth), aggression and self-reliance in opposition to language that aligns with stereotypical feminine characteristics of sensitivity, caring, and (by default) dependence (Wood, 2012).
Women are frequently marginalized from labor participation and material gain in workplaces that value independence and autonomy over collective, relational, and collaborative learning (Belenky, 1997). This reflects an implicit masculine standpoint that ignores women’s position within the labor system (Acker, 2004). Even within academia, division of labor follows traditional gender roles (Bird, Lit, & Wang, 2004; Carrigan, Quinn, & Riskin, 2011), favoring the most highly monetarily valued area of research that is considered to be “men’s work” over teaching and service considered to be “women’s work” (Park, 1996). Discrimination occurs when men and women are denied opportunities for work that falls outside of the traditional gender roles into which they have been socialized, and contributes to the tension between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations that female academics must negotiate (see Figure 2-2).
Figure 2-2. Theoretical Framework for Elizabeth Shakespeare’s Study

The following conceptual framework details proposed strategies that female faculty employ to negotiate the tensions and dilemmas that they encounter between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia, adapted from Ezzedeen and Ritchey (2009).

The Tensions and Dilemmas between Personal Aspirations and Social-Cultural Expectations that Women Faculty Encounter in Academia

Gender Socialization

Female Gender Roles

Discrimination

Men’s Labor (Career)

Women’s Labor (Home)

**Conceptual Framework**

A conceptual framework is a “system of concepts, assumptions, expectations, beliefs, and theories that supports and informs your research” (Maxwell, 2006, p.33). It is intended to inform the research design by presenting presumed relationships between the main things to be studied.
about the particular phenomenon under investigation (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The conceptual framework for the study of how female faculty negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia will use a conceptual framework that has been adapted from Ezzedeen and Ritchey (2009). This conceptual framework modifies Ezzedeen and Ritchey’s 2009 Inductive Model of Career Advancement and Career/Family Balance (see Figure 2-3) to one that explores how female faculty use these strategies to negotiate the tensions and dilemmas they encounter between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia (see Figure 2-4). Ezzedeen & Ritchey’s inductive model has been applied to populations of high-achieving women including business executives (Ezzedeen & Ritchey, 2009), politicians and non-executive directors of corporate boards (Seierstad & Kirton, 2015) but never to female faculty.

Figure 2-3. Inductive Model of Career Advancement and Career/Family Balance (Ezzedeen & Ritchey, 2009)
People overcome challenging circumstances using strategies (Becker & Moen, 1999; Jennings & McDougald, 2007; Moen & Yu, 2000) that include manipulating resources and redesigning roles and relationships (Voydanoff, 2005). For example, women frequently develop a neutral or androgynous interpersonal style that puts male and female colleagues at ease (Korabik, 1990; McGregor & Tweed, 2001) and rarely rely on organizational supports that they fear will reinforce stereotypes (Broadbridge, 2008; Ezzedeen & Ritchey, 2009). Ezzedeen & Ritchey (2009) identified value systems, personal social support, professional social support, and life course strategies as the strategies that women executives use to balance career and family, which inform the research question as a tentative theory (Maxwell, 2012) about how female faculty negotiate the tensions and dilemmas that they encounter between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. The model integrates the categories of value systems, personal social support, professional social support, and life course strategies to understand how female executives balance career and family.
• Value system refers to work ethic, ambition and passion for work (i.e. personal aspirations), as well as a belief in the ability to have both career and family rather than choose between them.

• Personal social support includes parents, spouses, children and friends who not only support working women’s career pursuits, but also contribute to beliefs about career and family.

• Professional social support includes supervisors, mentors, peers and others within the organization that support workplace advancement and/or positive work experiences. This category also includes policies that enable women to manage career and family such as FMLA and maternity leave, although the study indicated a lack of such support.

• Life course strategies refers to a series of career and family decisions that emerge over time such as the decision to have children, ordering of career and family and shifting priorities of each over time (Han & Moen, 1999).

Ezzedeen and Ritchey developed this model as part of their exploratory study about the coping strategies that executive women use to attain career and family balance (Ezzedeen & Ritchey, 2009). In their qualitative study, the authors found that the primary strategies that women use to balance career and family are: values and beliefs about career and family in the place of one’s life, personal social supports, professional social supports, and life course strategies. Focusing on adaptive strategies rather than sources of conflict with work and family allowed the authors to find that the participants of their study rejected the choice narrative (i.e. that women need to choose career or family) in favor of their ability to have both career and family. Adaptive strategies were used to explore how women balance these two domains, but the authors propose, “reframing the debate away from weather ‘having it all’ is possible to a better understanding of how some women experience it” (Ezzedeen & Ritchey, 2009, p.405). This is fitting for my study, which seeks to understand how women faculty negotiate the tensions
between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia because not only is it a more empowering message for women (Ezzedeen & Ritchey, 2009), but also the adaptive approach suggests that it is possible for women faculty to meet their personal aspirations. This differs from the binary approach to understanding work/family conflict that implies a necessary sacrifice of one domain or the other.

The authors’ proposition to reframe the debate away from the women’s ability to “have it all” to how they experience “having it all” is useful for but slightly different from the questions posed in this research study, which seeks to understand how female faculty negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. Beliefs about career and family in the place of one’s life, personal social supports, professional social supports, and life course strategies inform the research design by presenting a theory of actionable strategies that female faculty use to negotiate the presumed relationships between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations. This study adapts the Ezzedeen and Ritchey (2009) model by exploring how female faculty use personal and professional social supports, values and beliefs about career and family, and life course strategies to negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia.

**Summary**

Gender discrimination, women’s (division of and feminized) labor, gender socialization, and gender role theories best frame the argument of how female faculty negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia by addressing the personal, social, and structural components of the tensions that occur between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. García-Manglano
(2013) recognizes that qualitative works about women’s work-family orientations by authors including Gerson (1985) and Damaske (2011) have revealed complex relationships between women’s personal preferences and structural forces that shape outcomes, and that researchers need to pay more attention to these mechanisms. As researchers, we must respect the underlying issues that threaten our ability to understand the complexity of women’s work-family conflict. Seidman (1998) advises that we grapple with issues of trustworthiness and validity to avoiding ignorance and increase our ways of knowing (p.20). I decided to employing an exploratory case study approach as the most appropriate method to understand how tenure-track female faculty negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. This exploratory case study approach advances our knowledge of the complex relationships between women’s personal preferences and structural forces that shape outcomes by exploring the socio-culturally based expectations that result in real, current structures in relation to the tensions that female faculty in academia express.
Chapter 3

Methods

Research Design

This study employed a single holistic exploratory case study design (Yin, 2003) to address the research question: How do female faculty on the tenure track negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between their own personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations from peers, family, tradition, culture and religion in academia? This exploratory case study methodology aligns with my core inductive ontological and poststructural feminist epistemological worldviews. I used multiple sources of evidence including document review, in-depth interviews, and journal field notes to study this case (Cresswell, 2007). I analyzed the data using multiple strategies (see Appendices F, G, H) including categorical aggregation, direct interpretation, patterns, the constant comparative method, and detailed view of the “facts” of the case (Creswell, 2007, p.163). I addressed validity threats of bias and reactivity (Maxwell, 1996) by acknowledging my own biases, seeking out contrary evidence, being transparent with both the participants (through member checking) and the reader (through honest narrative and making the logic of inquiry used in the project explicit), and triangulating methods, theories, and data sources (Denzin & Lincoln, 2009).
Assumptions and Rationale

The research design for this study employed qualitative methods, specifically an exploratory case study approach (Yin, 1994) of a university commission for women. Professional development programs and organizations such as university commissions for women that work toward issues of gender equity such as workplace climate, professional development and advancement, maternity and child-care policies, and salary equity are rich sites for data collection to study the personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations that create tension between career and family. This commission was set in the academic context upon which this study focuses, and members of university commissions for women included female faculty from various disciplines and at various stages of their careers. Studies that examine tenure and motherhood recognize that the complexities of this conflict cannot be decontextualized from the institutional context in which they work (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2015), and that the context must be considered (Gummesson, 1991) to examine the entirety of this social phenomenon. The case study design was ideal for this type of investigation because it allowed me as investigator to retain the “holistic and meaningful characteristics” (p.2) rather than fragmented, reductionist understanding (Patton & Appelbaum, 2003) of the real life processes, events, life cycles (Yin, 2003), and relationships of female faculty to capture these tensions and dilemmas as they negotiate the tenure and promotion process.

The commission for women represented an instrumental case (MacQuarrie, 2010; Stake, 2005) for its potential to increase theoretical insight about how female faculty negotiate tensions between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. A holistic design is embedded in the instrumental case study approach by allowing the researcher to consider interconnections with the entire context in order to understand the phenomenon in its totality (MacQuarrie, 2010). This study reflects a holistic approach, in which I considered the
totality of the university context and its interconnections for exploring how female faculty negotiate tensions in academia, and the interpretive standpoint that I used to understand this phenomenon (Heidegger, 1962; MacQuarrie, 2010).

Conducting a case study of a university commission for women was ideal for investigating the conflicting expectations and challenges that women faculty encounter in pursuit of their career aspirations as professors. The role of the commission for women is to advise university presidents and advocate for women’s concerns including: advancement and retention, workplace climate, professional development, mentoring, equal pay, family leave and childcare policies. Given this advocacy role, it is assumed that commission members had thought about women’s issues in relation to themselves and their own academic work, had interest in women’s career-related issues, and were dedicated to improving the quality of care for university women.

The goal of case studies is to gain an in-depth understanding of the unit of analysis, or the case, rather than strive for generalizability (Yin, 2003). Qualitative case studies can “examine a specific case but illuminate a general problem” (Merriam, 1988, p.13). The present case study examined a university commission for women, and illuminated the general problem of conflict between female faculty’s personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. I purposefully chose this case study to gain information-rich data (Merriam, 1998) and utilized this case to illustrate how women negotiate the competing demands of work and family. I chose to study the commission because some of the tenured and tenure-track female faculty members on the commission are in the enviable position of working towards or having earned tenure. They were uniquely positioned in the institution (as commission members) to understand the policies and structural challenges that constrain women’s abilities to successfully negotiate the contradictions, dilemmas and conflicts between work and family in academia.
The Research Paradigm

The decision to use a case study method reflects my core ontological belief in the idea of multiple realities, epistemological beliefs about what can be known about those realities, and methodological beliefs in the process by which this knowledge can be discovered (Cresswell, 2007; Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). My interconnected ontological, epistemological, and methodological worldviews best align with inductive qualitative, poststructural feminist, and exploratory case study approaches to investigate how female faculty negotiate the tensions between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations for career and family as women in academia (Butler-Kisber, 2010; McCall, 2005; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 1990; 2002).

The qualitative research process examines the meaning that individuals or communities ascribe to a certain social or human phenomenon (Creswell, 2007, p. 37). The qualitative nature of this study allowed me to focus on the participants’ personal aspirations to have a career and family. It also allowed for meaning to emerge from the participants themselves over the course of the study in response to the research questions such as which personal aspirations conflict with such academic and cultural or peer-based expectations for them. This approach enabled me to examine how participants negotiate the tensions between their particular personal career aspirations and the varied cultural, familial, religious, traditional, and peer-based expectations in which they are situated.

The research questions designed around this analysis align with an inductive qualitative approach that builds theories and hypotheses from the participants’ responses, rather than tests existing ones (Merriam, 1998) and accepts the existence of multiple realities (Cresswell, 2007). They also align with the case study approach, which is “designed to bring out the details from the viewpoint of the participants by using multiple sources of data” (Tellis, 1997). It contrasts with a
positivist or nomothetic [or ‘etic’ meaning outside the constraints of everyday life (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p.5)] approach that attempts to understand (or predict) general laws about human behavior (Hayes, 2000). The lack of generalizability and predictability in the varied contexts in which work-family conflict occurs for working women has led many researchers to reject the positivist and post-positivist ontologies of absolute truth and realism in favor of more critical, postmodern, and poststructural frameworks (Usher, Bryant & Johnston, 1997) to study this phenomenon.

The inductive approach to understanding how female faculty negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia fits with interpretive paradigms including “constructivist-interpretive, critical (Marxist, emancipatory), and feminist poststructural [or poststructural feminism]” (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p.13). Poststructural feminism refers to the ways that women challenge structural and psychological systems of power that oppress them, and provides a framework to analyze the connections between these psychological (beliefs and attitudes), social (structural and economic), and historical (cultural and traditional) conditions to reconstruct knowledge (Hayes & Flannery, 2000). The acceptance of multiple realities that challenge the dominant paradigm of male leadership in academic work also allowed women faculty participants’ own understanding of the challenges, tensions, and conflicts between work and family to emerge.

Postmodernists and poststructuralists believe that knowledge is socially constructed, fluid, and multifaceted (Chase, 2000; Kilgore, 2001; Pietrykowski, 1996; Usher, Bryant & Johnston, 1997). Poststructural feminism challenges the positivist and post-positivist notions of solidarity and absolute structure in favor of multiple social influences that result in shifting identities in relation to power at a given time and place (English, 2006; Hayes & Flannery, 2000). Koro-Ljungberg (2008) argued that “post-structuralism is not bent on denying reality; ‘rather, it studies the differences, absences, and inter-textuality within these realities’” (as cited in English
& Mayo, 2012, p.63). This type of analysis allows for multifaceted approaches to the types of social, structural, and psychological issues that occur in particular contexts by considering knowledge to be contextual and fluid (Bagnall, 1998; Kilgore, 2001).

**Strategy of Inquiry**

This study employs a single-case, holistic, exploratory design that was chosen for its unique ability to contribute to “new learning about real-world behavior and its meaning” (Yin, 2012, p.4). In this study, the term exploratory refers to the case study design that allowed me to use a variety of data sources to explore and uncover the many facets of the phenomenon including the unique challenges of the academic context, perceived socio-culturally based expectations for these particular women, and complex nature of their tensions and dilemmas. Employing this approach enabled me to discover how female faculty negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia (Baxter & Jack, 2008). The term single-case in this study signifies the choice to explore one instrumental group of tenure-track women in a university commission for their ability to increase theoretical insight about how female faculty negotiate tensions between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia (Stake, 2005).

For this study, the holistic approach refers to how I considered the totality of the university context and its interconnections for exploring how female faculty negotiate tensions in academia, and the interpretive standpoint that I used to understand this phenomenon (Heidegger, 1962; MacQuarrie, 2010). The holistic approach to exploring how female faculty negotiate tensions and dilemmas in academia prevented me as a novice researcher from analyzing the negotiation strategies between participants at the individual subunit level without returning to the
global issue that takes context into account for how female faculty as a group negotiate these tensions and dilemmas in academia (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Yin, 2003).

The case study is appropriate for addressing how and why questions (Yin, 2012) such as how female faculty negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between their personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. I chose the single-case design because it allowed me to interview tenured female faculty members in the unique position of membership in a large, public research university’s commission for women (Yin, 2013). This strategy allowed me to consider context in my analysis and response to the research questions (Baxter & Jack, 2008) to explore how female faculty negotiate the tensions between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. Often the purpose of an exploratory case study is to identify preliminary propositions and hypotheses for a particular research problem (Streb, 2010). I chose an exploratory approach to identify preliminary propositions for developing future generalizable and causal studies about how female faculty negotiate tensions, specifically between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations.

Each workplace context brings different realities to working women. The uniqueness of the academic workplace for women faculty makes the case study of a commission for women within that context an appropriate choice for investigating how female faculty negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. Both gender studies and the field of adult education have strong interpretive traditions, which recognize that variables shape phenomena in a particular time and context representing an emic, case-based position that focuses on specifics, which are mutually and simultaneously influential (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Yin, 1994). These particularities are constructed and shaped by the historical, social, economic, cultural, political, gendered and ethnic factors that result in real, current structures.
The specificity of context required to understand the tensions between female faculty career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations best fits with a case study approach. Conducting a qualitative, exploratory case study (Yin, 2003) allowed me to recognize multiple realities as they emerged within the academic context (Cresswell, 2007; 2009) including those that challenge the assumption that academia is a gender-neutral workplace. Employing this type of emergent design recognizes participant perspectives and allowed for the initial plan for research to evolve over the course of the study (Cresswell, 2009) as the definitions, ambitions and expectations that participants expressed emerged from the women faculty themselves.

The Role of the Researcher

As a female doctoral candidate who works full time, and one who also is married and has strong relationships with parents, siblings, and peers, the discourse surrounding tensions that women encounter between work and family is very personal and important to me. My strong feelings about this topic have led to my interest in this research study but also, I have realized over the course of the study, caused me to challenge my own assumptions about other working women and their approach to family and career. Namely, although I have experienced dilemmas in the choices I have made about having a fulfilling career, marriage, and motherhood, I cannot as an ethical researcher assume that all women encounter the same choices or challenges.

My initial conception of this study in the proposal phase was from the frame of work-life balance, wherein one who achieves balance is a success, and one who does not have balance is unsuccessful in either the career or family domains. Upon reviewing my initial document, I realized that imposing that standard on working women would not give them an opportunity to voice either their own ambitions or what they perceive to be the career and family expectations that cause particular tension for them. This realization caused a turning point in my approach to
this study, wherein I reframed my gaze from proposing a study that would confirm my own beliefs, expectations, struggles, aspirations, and assumptions to one that would uncover the beliefs, desires, expectations, aspirations and struggles of female faculty in the tenure process within a university commission for women.

This redirection of the study led me to realize that my role as the researcher and key instrument for collection and analysis of data is to present a holistic account of the case (university commission for women) that shows multiple perspectives and acknowledges the research as being interpretive (interpreted by me as the researcher). The interpretive position allows space for women faculty as a traditionally under-represented group in academia to have a voice. In this interpretive research tradition I am the primary analytical instrument (Merriam, 1998), and recognize my active role and responsibility in creating knowledge throughout the research process.

**Negotiating Entry**

The purpose of this study was to explore how tenured and tenure-track female faculty negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between their own personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. Prior to embarking on this study, I used the literature review and conceptual framework to create an interview protocol. I then field tested the questions in a pilot study with two tenure-eligible women from the general population of faculty at the same university as the commission for women. The field test helped to clean up the language and streamline the research questions to achieve conceptual clarification (Yin, 2003), reduce potential misunderstanding about the interview questions (McNamara, 2009), develop relevant lines of questions to obtain the most useful data for answering the research questions (Creswell, 2003; Yin, 2003), and ensure that the questions elicited responses from each interviewee in the same
general areas of information (McNamara, 2009). The pilot study resulted in the semi-structured
interview protocol found in Appendix A. Following the pilot study, I prepared to collect data for
this case study by first introducing myself and my study to the commission for women. To
appropriately do this while being respectful of both the commission and its membership, I
Emailed the co-chair of the commission to set up an initial meeting explaining my study and
seeking permission to contact commission members for participation.

In the online meeting through the Zoom Video Conferencing platform, I introduced my
study and informed the co-chair that I had obtained IRB approval. As a current member of the
commission who has attended meetings, the co-chair already knew my affiliation with the
commission. He did not have many questions, and agreed that the study was interesting and could
benefit the commission as well as university women. The co-chair noted that because the
commission membership list is public I did not need permission, and advised that I begin
contacting members via Email.

Sampling Strategy

The important criteria for selecting participants was their ability to contribute to
understanding (Merriam, 1998) of the tensions that female faculty encounter between socio-
culturally based expectations that they feel and their own personal aspirations on the tenure track
within academia. I accomplished this by selecting all tenure-track female faculty members of the
commission for the past five years. I selected participants who were commission members from
2010 – 2015 using official membership lists obtained from the commission. I chose this
timeframe because in 2010 the university published a diversity initiative (The Pennsylvania State
University, 2010) that outlined a five year plan (2010 – 2015) with the aim of promoting equity
(including gender equity) and inclusivity by establishing institutional processes in alignment with
the university’s strategic plan. Additionally, the commission for women published a report in January 2010 about the status of work-family balance within the institution that indicated challenges and recommendations for improvements.

To gather participants, I contacted the administrative support assistant of the commission for women who directly Emailed me the membership lists from academic years 2010/2011 to 2014/2015. This ensured accurate and official records from the commission. From these lists, I selected faculty with Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, Associate Dean, or Head as their rank for a total population of 35 potential participants (N=35). Initially I contacted only current members, and then expanded the list to include past members of the commission to secure enough participants to obtain rich data. Following an initial solicitation Email in which I blind copied members, I sent individual follow-up Emails to those faculty members who had not responded directly to solicit their participation.

Of the 35 members contacted, 3 Emails were returned as those members are no longer employed at the institution, 13 never responded, 7 responded that they were ineligible as non-tenured nor tenure-track faculty; 2 agreed to participate but were unresponsive to setting an interview date, and 10 participated (see Appendix E).

This made for a total of 12 participants, including the 2 participants in the pilot study. Between six to twelve interviews are sufficient in qualitative case study research to achieve saturation of themes (Guest, Bunce & Johnson, 2006), and participants represented a diversity of disciplines, campuses, religions, and races, with varied parental and marital status (see Table 4-1). In-depth interview studies do not allow for random sampling or stratified random-sampling approaches and there is always an element of self-selection with interview studies as participation requires consent (Seidman, 1998). Rather than seek generalizability, this study aimed to capture tenure-track female faculty’s experience in depth as they struggled with the tensions and dilemmas between personal aspirations and expectations in academia.
**Data Collection**

Yin (2012) states that “good case studies benefit from having multiple sources of evidence” (p. 10), such as interviews, documents and reports, audiovisual material, observations, and field notes (Creswell, 2007). These multiple sources of evidence give power to the qualitative process (Dooley, 2002). This study primarily used three types of data: interviews, field notes, and document analysis (see Appendix A for Case Study Protocol). The primary source of evidence included data in the form of 60 minute semi-structured one on one interviews with 10 case study participants and 2 pilot study participants to document the challenges that women faculty encounter in their pursuit of career aspirations; the cultural, family, religious, traditional and peer-based expectations that conflict with their personal aspirations; and the decisions that they make to negotiate the tensions between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia.

Prior to interviewing participants, I conducted a document review to identify how factors such as family medical leave, tenure and promotion, and department-specific policies represent structural and organizational challenges that conflict with cultural, family, religious, traditional and peer-based expectations in the academic context. I gathered these documents from the commission’s website. They included official reports such as the commission’s mission and bylaws, reports on the status of women at the university, work family balance at the institution, resources for pregnant and parenting members of the university community, and video recorded meetings. I reviewed these documents to investigate context-specific challenges that female faculty encounter in their pursuit of personal career aspirations in academia. I also remained current on university policies and current issues by regularly reviewing the commission’s social media websites, such as their Facebook page.
I chose to conduct interviews as the primary data collection method to build upon and explore participants’ responses to open-ended questions. This in-depth exploration allowed me to examine links and patterns among women with different lives and in varied academic fields who are affected by common social and structural forces as well as to better understand the complexities of this problem (Seidman, 1998). The choice of semi-structured interviews reflected the goals and stage of my research to build upon and explore the tensions and dilemmas the female faculty encounter, and how they negotiate these conflicts.

The less structured approach to interviewing in this exploratory case study allowed for participants to focus on what they understood to be most relevant to them. Merriam (1988) and Creswell (2007) recommend beginning interviews with an introduction to the topic. The first question on the interview protocol introduced the topic and allowed for the participant to express the most personally relevant aspects of the tensions and dilemmas that she encounters between her particular career aspirations and perceived socio-culturally based expectations in academia. I designed the interview protocol intentionally to elicit the most relevant aspects of these tensions from participants and incorporated Kvale’s (1996) introducing, probing, follow-up, structuring and indirect types of questions in the interview process (p.133-135).

The semi-structured interviews allowed me as the researcher to maintain a protocol that explored the main research areas while also giving me the freedom to diverge from the protocol to pursue an area in more detail (Burnard, Gill, Stewart, Treasure, & Chadwick, 2008). This structure also gave each participant the freedom to express particular dilemmas between her own career aspirations and expectations from peers, family, tradition, religion and culture as a tenure-track female faculty member in academia. Using this approach, a variety of issues emerged, providing broad perspectives, and gave me flexibility in how and when I asked the questions (Edwards & Holland, 2013) to best explore the main research areas in a conversational manner.
I conducted as many interviews as possible in participants’ offices as they were private, convenient and familiar to participants (Seidman, 1998) between February 2015 and April 2015. Of the 10 interviews, 3 were conducted over the phone, 1 was conducted online via Skype, 1 online via Meetings.psu, and 5 were conducted in participants’ private offices. The telephone and online interviews were conducted when the participants were located at branch campuses and were therefore not directly accessible. Consent forms (see Appendix C) were sent as attachments in each of the solicitation Emails to participants and participants were asked to acknowledge that they received the consent form at the beginning of each interview. Participants were also given an opportunity via Email and at the beginning of each interview to ask questions or voice concerns that they had about the study.

I recorded all interviews using a password protected iPhone as well as a backup analog recording device that is kept in a secure location when not in use. I also took hand-written notes during the interviews should both recording devices have failed (Merriam, 1988) as well as to note areas of interest that I wanted to explore in more detail with additional questions. I transcribed each interview myself as soon as possible after the conversation.

Following each interview I wrote field notes in an ongoing journal that recorded the main points of the conversation as well as my sentiment about the interview. I then transcribed each interview myself following the interview to ensure confidentiality and to become better acquainted with the data. Upon completion, I re-read each transcription while simultaneously listening to the interview recording to ensure accuracy and thoroughness of the transcription. I used Excel software to help with coding and data organization. I stored the interview recordings, transcripts, and analyses in password-protected files to which only I have access to ensure confidentiality and anonymity.
Data Analysis

A critique of the case study approach is the “lack of rigor in the collection, construction, and analysis of the empirical materials, [which] is linked to the problem of bias…introduced by the subjectivity of the researcher” (Hamel, Dufour & Fortin, 1993, p.23; Merriam, 2009). To overcome this critique, I used multiple strategies to analyze the case and interpret the interviews, which were the primary source of data for this study. Creswell (2007) and Stake (1995) recommend four types of analysis in case study research including categorical aggregation, direct interpretation, patterns, naturalistic generalizations, and detailed view of the “facts” of the case (Creswell, 2007, p.163). I used categorical aggregation, pattern matching, line-by-line reading, and the constant comparative method to interpret the interviews and develop pertinent hypotheses and propositions around how female faculty on the tenure track negotiate the tensions between their personal career aspirations and the expectations that they perceive from socio-culturally based aspects of their lives (see Figure 3-1).
First, I transcribed each interview, re-read my transcription while listening to the respective recording to make sure my transcription was accurate, and sent it to the participant for member checking. Only 1 participant’s transcript required modifications in response to her clarification. In line with an interpretive lens that accepts the existence of multiple realities, I conducted an inductive analysis to explore the data doing line-by-line readings of the final interview transcripts to identify emergent themes (Harrell & Bradley, 2009). I conducted open coding of the transcript using highlighter to delineate different concepts within the text (see Appendix F).

This line-by-line analysis included open coding and conceptual ordering as part of the constant comparative method in grounded theory (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). I used the more specific coding methods from grounded theory to mitigate the lack of routine formulas in the case
study approach (Yin, 2003) and to directly interpret the data. A grounded theory coding approach that focuses on process through the constant comparative method complimented the pattern matching approach. “The constant comparative method, if used properly…allows for a very systematic and even rigorous handling of data” (Merriam & Simpson, 1984, p.103). I used the constant comparative method to draw meaning from single instances in the data and reconstruct it for direct interpretation of the interviews (Creswell, 2007).

Grounded theory is a methodological approach that utilizes formal, systematic methods to analyze data through the process of coding (Creswell, 2007) and constant comparative analysis (see Figure 3-2). The process of coding refers to categorizing data with a word or short phrase that represents the theme of the data in relation to the research question (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The coding strategy is characteristic of a grounded theory approach to research, and refers to the process of categorizing bits of data with a short name that also summarizes the essence of that segment, and it is one of the first steps in the approach to data analysis in grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006). Glaser (1978, 1992), Corbin and Strauss (2008) and Charmaz (2006) all refer to the coding process in grounded theory as an aspect of the constant comparative method.
I used the concepts in my study as they related to the research questions to assign axial codes to the text (Strauss & Corbin, 1994). I then aggregated all of the codes by participant into an Excel spreadsheet (see Appendix G) to directly interpret the text prior to beginning the constant comparative method and pattern matching stages of data analysis.

I used the deductive technique of categorical aggregation to identify and group similar instances in the data seeking emergent themes (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 1995). This included gathering answers to the same question from all participants (Harrell & Bradley, 2009) and going back to gather similar occurrences that emerged from participants at different points in their interviews (see Figure 3-3).
To then identify patterns in the data, Yin (2003) proposes pattern matching, wherein the researcher links patterns in the data to criteria and propositions as an analytical technique for interpreting findings. I used pattern matching to match the data to the propositions in my conceptual framework (see Appendix H), which were:

- Female faculty encounter challenges on the tenure-track in academia;
- Female faculty experience tension and conflict between personal aspirations and socioculturally based expectations in academia;

Female faculty employ value system, personal social support, professional social support, and life course adaptive coping strategies (Ezzedeen & Ritchey, 2009) to negotiate the
tensions they encounter between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia.

I employed the four approaches of categorical aggregation, pattern matching, line-by-line reading, and the constant comparative method to minimize the likelihood of oversimplifying the tensions between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations for women faculty in academia (Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Strauss & Corbin, 1994). I used these methods in this case study of a university commission for women to develop conceptual categories that extended, challenged, and refuted existing theories (Merriam, 1998) and avoided the pitfalls of ignoring existing theories (Urquhart, 2007; Walsham, 1995). This analysis was an iterative process as I continuously examined the evidence, generated new propositions, re-examined the evidence, and revised the propositions in a cyclical process to reach data saturation (Yin, 2003).

**Strategies for Validating and Verifying Findings**

This study employs a single-case, holistic, exploratory design. Case studies are especially prone to validity threats as the term can be conflated with reliability and generalizability, which, in contrast to quantitative studies, play a minor role in qualitative research (Creswell, 2003). Similar to Maxwell (2005), I do not employ the term validity to imply an “objective truth” (p.106), but perhaps more accurately to refer to threats, alternative explanations, or ways I might be wrong. Maxwell (2005) states that, in qualitative research, addressing these validity threats requires identifying the specific threat in question because addressing them cannot be done prior to the data collection as is common in quantitative research (p.107). The two biggest threats to this research study were researcher bias and reactivity or reflexivity (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2010) in the interview process.
To overcome the threat of bias, Maxwell (1996) recommends acknowledging the researcher bias to understand how my own values and expectations influenced the study. I acknowledged my own researcher bias throughout the course of this study by constantly reflecting and recording this reflection in my journal field notes. I used the journal to record not only important points about each interview after the conversations, but also to record my growth as a researcher throughout the process. This included how my thinking about the problem evolved to influence my analysis and interpretation of the data. I was intentionally introspective and self-critical during the proposal stages of this study and thereafter. As stated earlier in this chapter, I realized my own biases early as a female who struggles with work life balance myself, and that my role as the researcher is not to confirm my own beliefs, struggles, and aspirations (Yin, 2003), but rather to present a holistic account of the case that portrays multiple perspectives and gives voice to the participants as I am the primary analytical instrument (Merriam, 1998). Clarifying this bias created an open and honest narrative (Creswell, 2003). In addition to acknowledging my own bias, I also remained open to contrary findings (Yin, 2003), and sought out challenging, discrepant, or contrary evidence (Creswell, 2003; Maxwell, 2005) to recognize different perspectives and add credibility to the account. I sought out contradictory evidence within the data itself but also by keeping current with related publications that could introduce discrepant or contradictory evidence.

To confirm accuracy of participants’ beliefs and attitudes in response to the research questions, I member-checked interviews (or, as Maxwell, 2005, states, employed respondent validation) by sending participants the transcripts, giving them each an opportunity to clarify any potential miscommunication, and allowing them to ask questions and provide comments. Throughout the course of the interviews, only one participant returned a transcript with modifications to clarify her statement. To confirm accuracy and consistency of data, I
triangulated methods, theories, and data sources, and used an honest, transparent writing style in the narrative to reveal my self-reflection throughout the process of analysis.

I employed the triangulation method because the theoretical literature and methodology focused the lens through which I approached data analysis, particularly constant comparison and pattern matching, in relation to the research questions. Triangulating the theories, methods, data sources, and findings continued to push the analysis forward because I included emergent exceptions (Golafshani, 2003) until I exhausted the data. Additionally, I searched for convergence among each source of data, including existing literature, interview transcripts, journal field notes, and commission documents to form emergent categories and subsequent themes that resulted in the findings of this study (Cresswell & Miller, 2000; Golafshani, 2003). By acknowledging my own biases, seeking out contrary evidence, being transparent with both the participants (through member checking) and the reader (through honest narrative), and triangulating methods, theories, and data sources, I have addressed the validity threats of this holistic exploratory case study of the commission for women.

**Summary**

In this exploratory case study of a university commission for women, I collected multiple sources of evidence including journal field notes, face-to-face interviews with participants, and documents from the website, social media, research reports and recorded commission meetings to address the research questions. I used multiple strategies of data analysis including categorical aggregation, direct interpretation, patterns, naturalistic generalizations, and a detailed view of case facts to build emergent themes in relation to how female faculty members negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. The emergent, exploratory case study design that employed these four approaches explored the
challenges that women faculty encounter in their pursuit of personal aspirations, the socio-culturally based expectations that they perceive to conflict with these aspirations, and the strategies they use to negotiate tensions between these dilemmas in academia. I directly addressed validity threats of bias and reactivity (Maxwell, 1996) by acknowledging these biases in my own thinking as the researcher, seeking out contrary evidence, being transparent with both the participants (through member checking) and the reader (through honest narrative), and triangulating methods, theories, and data sources.
Chapter 4

Presentation of Research Findings

Introduction

This chapter reports the findings from document review and analysis of primary interview data in which participants draw upon their own feelings and life experiences that was audio recorded, transcribed, analyzed using open coding, axial coding, pattern matching and constant comparison, and interpreted to explore how these particular female faculty negotiate the tensions and dilemmas in academia. Field notes, journal recordings, and commission documents are all resources that contributed to the findings. This chapter begins with a summary of participants’ demographic data, a table summarizing the findings, and the narrative of findings that address each research question with quotes from participant interviews. Pseudonyms have been assigned to ensure the confidentiality of participants.

Demographic Data

Table 4-1 presents a snapshot of participant demographic information including their campus, college, tenure stage/title, race, nationality, religion, marital status and parental status. All participants that agreed to be interviewed for this study have achieved tenure, and self-identified as heterosexual. They are faculty in 8 different colleges at 7 different campuses, with varied racial, national, and religious backgrounds. All but two of the participants are currently married, with one being single (never married) and one being divorced. All but three of the participants have at least one child.
Participants in this study represented faculty in 8 different colleges (see Table 4-1) and 12 different disciplines including: English; Advertising & Public Relations; Chemistry; Communications Arts & Sciences; Collections, Information, and Access Services; Biology; Physics; Human Development Family Studies; Petroleum & Natural Gas Engineering; Education Psychology; Adult Education; and Educational Theory and Policy. Although this study did not investigate discipline-specific challenges or negotiation strategies, the variation by discipline allowed common themes to emerge across disciplines in response to the research questions, thus providing a foundation for understanding how female faculty negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia.

Findings from this exploratory study provide a foundation for investigating how (and if) these negotiation strategies differ by academic discipline or across populations of working women in different contexts.

Table 4-1. Participant Demographic Information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>College/Discipline</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th># of Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Agricultural Science</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Collections, Information, Access Services</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Communications/Advertising &amp; Public Relations</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Earth &amp; Mineral Sciences/Petroleum &amp; Natural Gas Engineering</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Education Theory &amp; Policy</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Education Psychology</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Development/Human Development &amp; Family Studies</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>Liberal Arts/English</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Liberal Arts/Communications Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candice</td>
<td>Science/Physics</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Science/Biology</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 1: What challenges do women faculty members encounter in their pursuit of career aspirations?

I analyzed interview transcripts using the four approaches of categorical aggregation, pattern matching, line-by-line reading, and the constant comparative method described in Chapter 3 to identify emergent themes with sub-categories in response to Question 1. Findings from the analysis of participant interviews that address research question 1 are summarized in Table 4-2.

Table 4-2. Research Question 1 Findings by Theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1 Findings</th>
<th>Sub-Categories</th>
<th>Code Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Academic Workplace Culture | • Promotion-Based Expectations  
• Culture of Silence | • Pressure to publish  
• Career commitment  
• Unclear tenure criteria  
• Unpublished leave policies |
| Academic Workplace Structure | • Changing Schedules  
• Geographic Dispersion | • Academic schedule fluctuations  
• Schedule changes each semester  
• Geographic distance from discipline |
| Discrimination | • Stereotypes  
• Male Privilege | • Unfair  
• Men didn’t see  
• Old boy network |
| Negative Personal Feelings | • Isolation  
• Self-doubt  
• Fear | • Don’t understand profession  
• Lucky  
• Outlier  
• Hazing |

All participants expressed challenges in their pursuit of career aspirations for tenure, with four main themes emerging as the biggest challenges that participants encounter in their pursuit of an academic career: academic workplace culture, academic workplace structure, discrimination, and negative personal feelings.
1.1 Challenge: Academic Workplace Culture

Several participants indicated that the culture of the academic workplace presents a challenge for women, both with and without children. These challenges included promotion-based expectations, particularly with regard to publishing and a culture of silence surrounding tenure and promotion criteria as well as maternity leave policies.

1.1.1 Promotion-Based Expectations (Research)

Participants noted three clear criteria for getting tenure, which included teaching, research, and service, with research presenting the biggest challenge. Of these three components, publishing research emerged as the biggest challenge for participants to achieve tenure and promotion. Kelly specifically referred to increased tension when research is a strong aspect of the tenure process, stating “But, um, I do think there are tensions in all those areas that you mentioned between sort of what expectations are for faculty, especially where there’s a strong research component.” Cindy supports this claim with her comment: “And [my mentor] he’s somebody who lives, breathes publications. And I mean some of the research and the publishing, it was just fun for him. And, I like the research but the publication process was more challenge to me” and Jane notes how the demands to publish increase on the tenure track when pursuing a full professor position:

“And the tenure…to go from Assistant to Associate it’s a 6 year process, and you’ve got to publish. So even though we’re at a small campus of [insert], you have to publish, so you’ve got this many publications, blah blah blah. My goal has always been to be Full Professor. And so that means that you have to publish more manuscripts than you published the first time. You’ve got research, teaching, and service.”

May and Cindy also commented on how the promotion-based expectation is higher for research than teaching and service.
May: “Librarianship, research, and service are all the three pillars for librarians, but in actuality the real thing is you have to publish. I mean, you just have to write. And so it was 6 years, and I just wrote, wrote, wrote, wrote, wrote, wrote. And I worked every Sunday. Every Sunday. And um, was successful, was tenured there…but in reality you just really need to publish, and so I did.”

Cindy: “But I took a tenure-track job, and I have a Ph.D. It’s a research degree, and so and I took a job that required a significant amount of research to get promoted and tenured.” Cindy, Dana, Nicole, Jane, Kelly, and Kim indicated that finding the time to maintain a strong publishing record while balancing teaching and service obligations is a challenge. Cindy’s mentor advised, “you’re a great citizen but it’s giving you angst about making sure you have enough publications, but you don’t have the time to both as others who do very little service.” Kim mentions, “so I knew I wouldn’t be a bad teacher. And service is like, well ya know do it, just try not to do too much of it. That’s almost the rule. It’s all about where…kind of where you publish.”

Kelly, Nicole and Dana specifically commented that the focus on teaching at a branch campus makes finding time to publish research challenging. Kelly stated: “This semester I have 3 lab sections that are all on Monday and so you’d think I have Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday open for my research, but I end up doing a lot of service as well, and a lot of advising of students. So, I don’t carve out the time for research that I should.” Nicole said,

“I think part of it was finding time. On our campuses we do a lot of teaching, a lot of service, and then we’re supposed to publish as well…And so trying to get…for me it’s always been the research aspect…Like for publications, I know that I, ya know what I have some colleagues that did the same. I’ve sort of tapered off because I’ve taken on sort of different administrative roles that…ya know, I don’t know, so they’re not academic roles, they’re administrative roles so that [the research] kind of tapered off.”
1.1.2 Promotion-Based Expectations (Travel)

Some of the participants noted travel as a challenging aspect of the tenure process, including Cindy and Anna. Cindy, who does not have children, commented on the challenge that travel brings to family life, stating:

“When I, my husband and I are separated during the week, we don’t even have the kind of lifestyle that makes family life…well, not really possible. I mean, it would be a huge problem to try and resolve that. And I kind of…like I don’t feel like I have that kind of time to be a really good parent.”

Participants expressed the challenge to meet the expectation of extending their academic reach beyond their own institution by attending conferences and events that require travel. Dana, Ashley, and Anna, who are mothers, commented on how challenging this aspect of an academic career can be. Dana refers to “feeling awful” at times when she had to travel, stating “The only issue came when if I was travelling and the kid was sick and didn’t want me to leave. That’s when I really felt awful.” Ashley mentions the extra planning required to attend conferences, saying, “Some. So travelling to conferences periodically or to research meetings. And yeah, we gotta really plan ahead carefully [laughs].” Anna commented that travel is one of the biggest challenges in her pursuit of career aspirations because of her role as a mother:

“So when you talk in terms of challenges and looking also for negatives in a way, they don’t ya know pop up immediately. But perhaps you know one thing that is associated with progressing through your tenure program, and after tenure as well, is how important it is for the tenure process to have connections and engagement outside the university, um, how important it is to have networks of participation say at conferences, or to be a visiting scholar here or there to really enrich your experience. Even, say a dinner event. It takes a lot of planning for me to say, we have guests from so and so company, can you come. Well, you need to tell me in advance so I can really plan for it because of my responsibilities of care that I have at home. So that’s one challenge, and that’s one element that I think is very important in being able to manage your impact beyond the walls of So that’s one thing that I can think of.”

Later in the interview, Anna also states, “I think, because of my roles as a mom and having a family, travel is very difficult in general. That’s one of the biggest challenges for me.”

At the end of the interview when asked if there is anything she’d like to add in regards to the
topic of how female faculty negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia, she again comments on this expectation to travel as a challenge for female faculty, saying:

“So many institutions now are endorsing the idea of having family travel funds to help support caregiving expenses when you travel…because a good number of people just, sometimes when I travel my husband will sometimes need a babysitter just to help say on a Saturday or a Sunday ‘cause I’m not there. So that type of thing, or if you’re travelling with a child and you need ya know, caregiving support when you’re travelling or being able to pay for the ticket of your kid when you’re travelling just because he depends on you…It is an issue…I think that there are many universities that are formalizing care travel funds or family travel funds.”

1.1.3 Promotion-Based Expectations (Career Commitment)

Several of the participants expressed the sentiment that career commitment is a challenging expectation to meet on the tenure track due to the time required, but that it is necessary to prove that one deserves tenure. May and Dana recognize the overall time commitment that being a faculty member requires, with May stating, “I think one of the biggest challenges is time. There’s only 24 hours in a day, and with pursuing a career, and as a faculty member you’re, um…you have you know your primary job responsibilities, you are also providing service to the profession, you are…you have your research. I have all of those things.” Dana comments, “you can spend hours writing a proposal, you’ve got to make sure it reads right, you’ve got to collaborate, you’ve got to…it’s a huge time commitment.”

Anna mentions the need to meet professional demands in order to prove oneself worthy of tenure, saying “especially for tenure-track and tenured faculty where if you’re tenure-track, you are all in in terms of professional demands and things that you need to accomplish to prove yourself worthy of that tenure and promotion.” Cindy also expresses tension between the expectation to “do enough” toward tenure and responsibilities at home that also demand her time.
“And I just told him [my discipline coordinator] flat out, look, I just got divorced…I don’t have anyone to cook for me, clean for me, or anything of the sort. It’s just me now. And I, so I’m gonna do my best, and I just don’t ya know need to be harassed about it. If I don’t get tenure because I didn’t do enough, it’s my fault.”

Kim, Dana, and Ashley supported this claim by expressing how administrators expected them to dedicate all of their time to their work. Kim states:

“For example, so our Dean is female, no children. Our Associate Dean just stepped down, she’s also married, no children, and we didn’t have a tenured faculty member with children until just a couple years ago. So I think there’s a lot of expectation around research, conference travel, other things that – in addition to teaching – creates stress, and the time that you have for family it’s very tempting to steal it from family and dedicate to research on the weekend and that kind of thing.”

Dana: “I remember this experience and this was a former DAA at another campus where I started out initially…and we were working on a Baccalaureate program and the deadline was close and we were closing on that. And that campus was almost an hour and 10 minutes from where I live. But I remember distinctly that this gentleman whom I’m gonna call x…I remember he said to me at 6 or 6:30 I said I gotta wind it up, but I can work on it online, and um from home, and we can exchange documents. And he said, oh it’s just about another hour or so, why don’t we just wrap it up now here and then we don’t have to worry about it when we go home.”

1.1.4 Culture of Silence

The culture of silence was another theme that emerged as a structural challenge that female faculty encounter in academia in addition to promotion-based expectations. The phrase culture of silence is used to refer to silencing as a form of secrecy or concealment through omission, particularly “in which women experience themselves as mindless and voiceless and subject to the whims of external power. Silence is thus contingent upon the individual's relationship to a community of speakers, institutional structures, and the individual's relationship to power and language. Silences also express power struggles because certain voices or accounts count while others are discounted.” Participants expressed a lack of clarity around tenure criteria,
unpublished leave policies, and inconsistent leave policies across departments as contributing to a culture of silence that makes achieving it challenging.

1.1.4.1 Unclear Tenure Criteria

Participants expressed the lack of clear criteria for promotion to tenure to be a challenge. Anna recognizes the challenge that loosely defined tenure criteria present to faculty, saying "and other things that have to do with challenges of tenure that doesn’t pertain only to the fact that I’m female faculty, I think in general, the metrics of success for tenure and promotion are very loosely defined...”

Cindy, May, Kim, and Candice all relate the lack of clear expectations for obtaining tenure to a feeling that doing enough is not possible. Cindy comments that, “They [administration] won’t tell you how many articles you have to have published to get promoted and tenured, but you just can’t do enough, and don’t rest, and ya know,” with May stating “of course there’s no…well, what’s enough [to get tenure]? There’s nothing like that in any of the disciplines, really,” and Kim commenting, “and they don’t tell you here a number of how many publications you need.” Candice more explicitly expounds on this idea with her statement about the concept of outdoing herself: “But then once I was on the tenure track, they put a lot of pressure on you that you have to outdo yourself, in a way. I was thinking, like I have to outdo myself and also I have to outdo all these people that have received tenure…so it was just, it was very tough.”

Candice goes on to state that subjectivity by the tenure review committee also contributes to the notion of unclear criteria and a challenge to achieving tenure:

“This [tenure] is very subjective, it’s not very objective, because ya know it really depends on who’s on the committee, and they can like, they can actually just ignore your strengths or they can ignore your weakness depending on how they choose to look at your dossier…So it really depends on how the committee looks at your dossier.”
1.1.4.2 Unpublished Policies

In addition to unclear tenure criteria, participants also expressed the challenge of not knowing official policies surrounding family leave, which contribute to a culture of silence that female faculty encounter in pursuit of their career aspirations to be promoted on the tenure track. Ashley expresses the challenges she encountered with unpublished leave policies during her pregnancy:

“Um, so I went within 2 years and we got pregnant. It was kind of planned, but not so planned. We figured it would take a little bit longer, and nobody knew what the rules were. So I talked to the senior faculty woman who had most recently had a baby, and she’s like, oh no, there’s no leave, there’s no nothing. And I was devastated. I was like, are you kidding me? I am so screwed. And that turned out not to be the case. So between the time that she had had kids and the time that I was now having them, nothing was in writing, but the unofficial policy was you could have 12 weeks of paid leave, which equated to a semester. So I had to like write the HR person back and say this is my understanding, is this correct? And that was the only proof that I had that this existed, which was weird. And I…because it felt so awkward and the fact that nothing was in writing, I actually would, as I heard other women were pregnant I would make a point of introducing myself and say “hey, here’s what you need to know” [laughs] and here’s the copy of my email. That’s the policy…Don’t ask me why it’s not in writing.”

1.2 Challenge: Academic Workplace Structure

In addition to the cultural challenges of academia that include promotion-based expectations and a culture of silence, participants expressed that they encountered challenges within the structure of academia in their pursuit for tenure and promotion. In particular, participants expressed changing schedules and the geographically dispersed nature of academia to be challenging. The geographically dispersed nature of academia refers to the challenges that participants expressed with the requirement to relocate themselves and their families to different locations, frequently different states, in the pursuit of promotion up the academic hierarchy.
1.2.1 Changing Schedules

Participants with children noted that having an inconsistent teaching schedule from one semester to another presents a challenge to managing childcare responsibilities. Kim, Nicole, Dana and Ashley discuss the challenge to obtaining childcare when their academic schedule changes each semester. Kim states, “We also tried to work it [childcare] around my teaching schedule, but my schedule changes fall to spring, so it was hard to…ya know now what’re we gonna do, ya know, try to reorganize everything to make it work.” Nicole comments on the stress that schedule changes cause when managing work and family, recalling a statement she made to her husband: “And I needed some extra assistance in the beginning because our kids are starting school, I’m starting school, your job continues at the same pace. Mine has fluctuation so these times I’m very stressed.”

1.2.2 Geographic Dispersion

Geographic dispersion emerged as a common theme over the course of participant interviews, with most participants expressing distance from family or academic discipline as a challenge that they encountered in pursuit of their aspirations for tenure. One participant, Kelly, who is unmarried and does not have children, expressed how the distance from family has allowed her to experience less pressure to manage responsibilities outside of her work, stating:

“I don’t have like immediate family here and so the family pressures maybe aren’t as significant for me as they may be for others…I think that's partly being…I'm very independent and I think partly being out of state and not even out of state, but across the country. So, so, so there's not really, I want to say the possibility so much for those pressures to be there 'cause there's not really anything to do about it.”

Candice, May, Dana, Anna, Nicole and Ashley commented on the pursuit of tenure and promotion pulling them away from family. Candice, who has no children, comments that the
geographic factor of academic work influenced her parental status, stating, “and then once I graduated with my Ph.D. and I did post-doc work and my husband, he did another post-doc, but we’re separate, ya know at like different locations. So having the children is out of the question because who’s going to take care of the kids?” May and Dana expressed the challenges that they encountered by following the geographically dispersed academic career path, with May stating:

“So um I got this job and moved, yet again, my husband and the youngest one here…with the two older ones then being back in Illinois. It was very difficult, and the big girls were mad at me for 2 years. But it was really hard to come here.” Dana comments:

“and when I came into academia on tenure track, the job moved really quick. And we moved my kids…and just relocating to a new state, a new city with 2 small children, figuring out their, you know their school. Their preschool, their daycare, their set of friends, and their physicians, and ya know the whole gamut.”

Anna, Nicole and Ashley further expressed the challenge of caregiving when pursuing an academic career that led them geographically far away from their families. Anna explains the distance as a challenge to both children and elderly caregiving when siblings live far away:

“The siblings live in Venezuela, and my brother-in-law is my husband’s older brother, he lives in Virginia…And that’s one thing, I’m glad you pointed that out because now going back to one of your earlier questions of challenges associated with tenure, and I talked about travel, and I think in part one of the reasons why travel is hard is because we don’t have a very strong support network that could be say a family-driven network. We have friends, we have people that if we needed anything I think they would be happy to but it’s different the connections you can have with your parents, with your siblings where it’s ya know, I need to travel, can they [the children] stay with you…we don’t have that. And that makes it just one more layer of difficulty that not having that family network around that you can rely on for maybe those other caregiving needs…my mom, she’s healthy, she’s active, and my in-laws are also healthy, they’re active, but I think both my husband and I we feel responsibility for figuring out or stepping up to the plate whenever they have caregiving needs.”

Nicole also discusses her parents living far away and the challenges that she encounters with finding childcare when family does not live nearby:

“My parents live in Wisconsin, so they’re kind of far…I have to admit I’m jealous; my brother-in-law and sister-in-law on my husband’s side, they have one child and they live 45 minutes from my in-laws and they go out every stinking weekend and my in-laws
watch their kids...watch their kid, they have one kid. And so I’m kind of jealous ya know because I’m like, ya know for us, it was find a babysitter. Good luck finding a babysitter, and they’re $10 an hour versus taking them up to the grandparents’ and saying goodbye, ya know I’ll see ya in two days. So I kind of wish we had that. I wish we were closer, in some respects, for that…”

In addition to the challenge that geographic dispersion presents for female faculty who pursue tenure and promotion in academia, participants also expressed the geographic distance from their discipline to be a challenge of the academic structure. Cindy expressed the geographic separation from her discipline, as a barrier to mentorships and collaborations within her discipline:

“So I have had some mentorship, but I find that in a system like we have where I’m the only specialist in rhetoric and digital media, so I have to try to establish connections with people who are off campus, but it becomes a little bit tricky because our lives are primarily situated at our individual campuses, so its just not as easy as...having colleagues in the area of rhetoric would have been helpful in terms of the mentorship through the promotion and tenure process, but I didn’t have that...but I kind of wish I had had more support from those in my discipline, but that’s not possible at such a small campus.”

Dana also expressed the challenge of being at a small branch campus for collaboration and interaction: “I wanted to get funding and the idea that a small branch campus being one of the only HDFS faculty member, and collaborating with the Psych faculty members on campus, and our departments tend to be no bigger than 2 or 3 people. So there’s limited interaction.” Anna mentions the geographic dispersion as a reason for having male vs. female mentors in her department: “They’re both male, yeah, they’re both male. I’ve had...ya know seek advice from female faculty from time to time and they have been very good, but because these two male faculty, they...they’re so nearby in my department that makes it also convenient.”
1.3 Challenge: Discrimination

In addition to the challenges that female faculty encountered with the academic workplace culture and structure in their pursuit of tenure and promotion, discrimination also emerged as a common theme in response to the question “What challenges do women faculty members encounter in their pursuit of career aspirations?” Within the concept of discrimination, female faculty encountered stereotypes and male privilege as challenges on the tenure track. I distinguished discrimination as a separate finding from the cultural and structural challenges of academia because participants expressed having a sense of it, using words such as “undercurrent” or “seen around” that imply that discrimination goes beyond (while also being entrenched in) the culture and structure of academia. For this reason I categorized discrimination as its own challenge for women faculty in pursuit of career aspirations in academia. Participants expressed discrimination in the form of stereotypes, male privilege, and inequality in academia. Jane sums up the challenges that female faculty encounter with discrimination by describing the tension she feels from students and colleagues with her role as a strong female:

“And even some females have trouble with the strong female role, but mostly the males, especially here because a lot of students being first generation college students, and they’ve been raised in very traditional male roles. A man is in charge, and a woman is not really in charge. And they’ve not seen the role of strong woman in this position that she’s in here, so… So I learned personally that I had to first work to make a male comfortable with me as a person…Because if I asked a question about something, I would be considered dumb. Like, why are you asking that question? That’s an easy question. So, I learned probably a good 20 years ago at least that I needed to make people comfortable with who I was – more so males than females – so that I could then get to what I wanted to…”Cause it’s hard for students to put it together. It’s really difficult. And I think, it’s nothing specific, there’s always just this undercurrent…And um, so, it’s challenging.”
1.3.1 Stereotypes

Jane, Anna, Kelly, Candice, Cindy and Nicole all expressed stereotyping of women in academia to be a challenge in the pursuit of tenure. Anna addresses the tension between stereotypes in academia and pressures to be home, particularly in the STEM field, stating:

“sometimes I see around me female colleagues that…things like biases and stereotypes that say in the STEM fields for example, that there are so few women in our fields that that sometimes discourages some of my female colleagues in our group to…especially when they’re presented with questions like ya know should I really be here and doing this, or just be with my family, and surrender to those pressures as well,”

Kelly, Candice, Cindy, Jane, May, and Kim all provide examples of the stereotypes of women as being docile or submissive that they have encountered as challenges in the pursuit of tenure. Candice recalls encountering stereotypes of women as docile from other male students in physics as an undergraduate:

“But I do remember when I was a Bachelor’s student, when I was an undergrad student, ya know, and in a physics department, and we have about…in our class, we had like 40 students, and we had 7 female…And we had quite a few male students tell us, can we girls wear skirts [laugh], and it’s like, gimme a break, ya know, it’s like, who the hell [stops herself]…so, yeah, so. But I always thought that was kinda funny, I mean, who are they to us to tell us what to wear? Because I’m female doesn’t mean I have to wear skirts all the time, especially from the guys who are just our classmates and who are expecting us to present a sort of female prototype, like you have to wear a skirt or you have to talk very…how do you say that…docile? Docile think they have to be very nice to them, very modely. Yeah, so.”

Kim recalls an experience that she witness from a female peer who displayed a stronger, “less feminine” personality, and the resulting challenges she encountered:

“Another faculty member that I’m very close to came in the same year as me who had 2 children. I think her experience has been a little different because she’s more…um, she’s a stronger personality, which might be considered less feminine, in a sense. She’s more direct, and says this is what I want, wants to be in charge of things, wants to control things or whatever…And she’s had [whispering] some tough experiences to the point that…sources, very reliable sources have told me that the department chair tried to get rid of her because he couldn’t deal with her being very…particularly, strong women he can’t deal with and so there’s a lot of um, making life extremely complicated. For example, when she came back from her second…first…I think both, actually, gave her the worst teaching load you can get in my department…She got that sort of as a punishment. I
thought it was a punishment because she’d had the baby… but later found out it was just because of [whispering] personality. He just couldn’t deal; he thought this [her becoming a mother] would be the perfect chance to get rid of her. So um, I think that there is… no, if you’re a woman, don’t be too strong. Because… that creates this um… conflict that… causes people to push back, and there are consequences I guess.”

1.3.2 Male Privilege

In addition to the challenge that female faculty encounter from stereotypes about being a submissive woman, male privilege was a theme that emerged as a challenge that female faculty encounter in pursuit of tenure and promotion in academia. Jane gives the following example:

"And I think, it’s nothing specific, there’s always just this undercurrent. And maybe in a workshop, asking my husband questions about what I was doing, and he couldn’t answer it. So, that’s, I just learned that I had to approach people a little differently… And um, so, it’s challenging…I mean, I can’t get away with what a man can get away with. So if I want to accomplish something, I’ve got to do it differently… A man is in charge, and a woman is not really in charge. And they’ve not seen the role of strong woman in this position that she’s in here, so…”

May discusses how male faculty have the privilege to not see the challenges that female faculty encounter in academia, stating: “I felt it keenly when um there were 3 associate deans and 2 were males. Didn’t matter how big of feminists they were, there were just things they didn’t see. Like they didn’t see that with the search committee. It wasn’t, it just wasn’t in their head.”

Candice recognizes feeling at a disadvantage as a woman in academia, stating, “Yeah, ‘cause I think as a female we all experience at some point in life, oh it’s not fair. Like I’m a woman so I’m at a disadvantage so yeah. So in that regard, it’s like you have to be… as a female I feel like I have to be very competitive because it’s ya know it’s like a male dominated society, ya know, in physics. And so it’s like I have to work very hard to get a faculty job.” Jane reiterates the sentiment that there is discrimination toward female academics, commenting “I’m not sure how liberated women actually are. I mean, I feel like I’m a liberated woman, but some people just don’t think that way. Especially in science.”
1.4 Challenge: Negative Personal Feelings

While many of the challenges that female faculty expressed were external in terms of the culture and structure of academia, they also expressed their own internal negative emotions to be a challenge of pursuing tenure in academia. Specifically, isolation, fear, and self-doubt were the negative emotions that emerged as challenges that participants encountered in pursuit of career aspirations in academia.

1.4.1 Isolation

Participants expressed family and peers’ lack of understanding of their role as a woman professor, which was a challenging negative feeling for these women. Kelly, Anna, Nicole, Jane, and Kim expressed that people don’t understand the responsibilities that come along with being a tenured faculty member. Kelly identifies this lack of understanding as a challenge to finding a romantic partner, saying:

“and I think a lot of folks don’t understand in academia that it’s not just teaching but also research that’s involved…and I did find, not so much educational level as that….um, people with more traditional 9 to 5 jobs – I guess I’ll put it that way where um they don’t have things to do over the weekend like write a paper or grade assignments or something like that um I find if the guys are not in academia themselves, they have a hard time, um, understanding that, while I may not be in the classroom all the time, that that doesn’t mean that my time is completely free. So I think that is a definite tension.”

Kim relays how lack of understanding about a being a working mother in academia causes tension from different institutions in which she participates:

“And I said, oh, we always talk about how being in the church but being a successful career woman and how sometimes you have to position it a certain way or whatever when you talk about it, and I kinda laughed, I said, because ya know in the church, I feel like people look down on you because you’re a mother with a career, but then when I’m with, when I’m here [at work] it’s like, oh you’re not doing enough, and so…and my sister-in-law said, oh, so these people think you’re not OK, and these people think you’re not OK.”
1.4.2 Self-doubt

In addition to isolation and lack of understanding, participants expressed a feeling of self-doubt as a challenge to pursuing tenure in academia, using words phrases such as: pressure on yourself, feel about yourself, self-doubt, and self-confidence. Candice explains:

“Because in addition to the pressure that you put on yourself, there is actual pressure from the selections because, especially when you hear that some people didn’t get tenure because they didn’t do research that well or they didn’t, they failed this component or that component, so…I think it was very stressful, and then sometimes you have self-doubt because you think no matter how well you have done, you think you can’t please the people on the committee…”

Anna comments about how destructive self-doubt can be, particularly in the tenure process:

“…the problem is when you let those stereotypes create an indentation in how you feel about yourself and have doubts about weather you belong or not and then you project it. If you have doubts about that then people around you begin to doubt even more, and that reinforces that cycle. And that can be very counterproductive for something like, say the tenure process when you’re trying to prove yourself, and your intellectual worth as well…”

Jane recounts her personal experience with self-doubt during her own process:

“And you see this happen with women, ya know, who are married, and may or may not have children, and they don’t finish. And you say, why didn’t you finish? And it’s because you have to be so…you have to be so self-motivated. And even when you are and you feel confident about who you are, it’s still difficult…I understand why people quit…you just, this is it. I can’t do this. I’m gonna go run away and hide in a little den somewhere. I’m sorry I’m unfortunately referring back to emotions from that time.”

1.4.3 Fear

The negative emotion of fear emerged as a challenge that female faculty encountered in their pursuit of career aspirations. This finding emerged as participants explained experiences that they had during the tenure process using words such as “trust,” “anxiety,” “nightmare,” “horrifying,” and “hazing.” Jane gives the following example when she describes how, as a woman in academia, she is cautious asking questions: “I would never ask them for help because
they would think I wasn’t smart, or oh gosh she’s just a female. She doesn’t know what she’s doing…so there’s people that you can trust, that’s a small group. That’s a very small group, and you have to pick and choose carefully…”

Kim describes how the tenure process at her graduate institution instilled fear that motivated her to publish constantly when she hit the tenure track herself:

“Yeah, OK, so tenure process. I graduated from the University of Florida, and they had gone through this really tough time where out of the last, I think it was 10 hires, that they’d had in the department I was in, only two of them made it through tenure. People kept…people either knew they weren’t gonna make it and left or went up thinking they were gonna make it and didn’t, and it was just this horrifying experience for everybody. And so, I hit the tenure track with all kinds of anxiety. I was like, oh this is gonna be a nightmare, ya know, I’m not gonna know, ya know like what’s gonna happen…I’d seen so many people think they were getting it [tenure] and they didn’t so I didn’t…so I just ended up publishing constantly, like working constantly…’cause I was just like, oh my God, I’m so scared. So yeah, that was my experience.”

Cindy mentions the hazing process and the “scare tactic” used in the tenure process:

“although…there was a bit of hazing involved. Just this kind of scare tactic that, ya know, you can’t possibly publish enough….And I was just like, I resented that hazing…And when I got tenured, I got…I was kind of having this PTSD moment, where I felt the hazing. And while I was grateful, yes I got the job and I’m tenured, I was doing a good job. There’s no reason I should have been fired and if I had done something inappropriate or illegal, then I should have been fired. So I didn’t really care for the hazing.”

Question 2: What are the cultural, family, religious, traditional and peer-based expectations that conflict with female faculty’s personal career aspirations?

The second research question asks: What are the cultural, family, religious, traditional and peer-based expectations that conflict with female faculty’s personal career aspirations?

Findings from analysis of participant interviews that address research question 2 are summarized in Table 4-3.
Table 4-3. Research Question 2 Findings by Theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-Categories</th>
<th>Code Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family-based Expectations</td>
<td>• Childbearing</td>
<td>• Expectations for grandchildren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Caregiving</td>
<td>• Expectations to be educated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Labor</td>
<td>• Division of labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Education</td>
<td>• Mother should be home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiously-based Expectations</td>
<td>• Female Leader</td>
<td>• Liberal theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Submissive Wife</td>
<td>• Patriarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Caregiving Mother</td>
<td>• Role as mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally-based Expectations</td>
<td>• Domesticity</td>
<td>• Submissiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Submissiveness</td>
<td>• Mother stays home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Feminine Dress</td>
<td>• Please the man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-based Expectations</td>
<td>• Participation</td>
<td>• Patriarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understanding</td>
<td>• Expectations for grandchildren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Neutral attire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hide femininity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Involvement in childrens’ activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Peers understand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants expressed different expectations from family, religion, culture, tradition, and peers that conflict with their personal career aspirations, with the emergent themes of family-based expectations of childbirth, caregiving, and domestic labor; religiously-based expectations for female leader, submissive wife and caregiving mother; culturally and traditionally-based expectations for domesticity, submissiveness, and feminine dress; and peer-based expectations for participation and understanding.
2.1 Family-based Expectations

2.1.1 Childbearing

Some of the participants expressed that family-based expectations to have children conflicted with their career aspirations, while others mentioned that they did not perceive this expectation. For example, Kelly, Candice and Anna indicate initially that they did not perceive family-based expectations to have children, but Kelly, who does not have children, recognizes that the family expectation exists, stating “it helps that my brother’s married and he has kids so the grandkids end of things is taken care of.” Candice similarly recognizes that while her family did not explicitly put any pressure on her or her husband to have children, they would drop hints about having children:

“oh, uh, [laughs] the uh the subject of ya know having children probably came up but we were just like, we don’t want to talk about it. Uh, tension-wise I think occasionally when we went back to visit our families they would just like, were dropping hints but we just kind of ignored it.”

Anna expresses how her parents were ready to be grandparents but that the expectation did not conflict with her personal career aspirations, saying “I felt…well…they felt so ready.

They felt so ready to be grandparents but were always able to provide space. I think my husband and I were more eager to be parents and then they followed. But it didn’t come really from them.”

Alternatively, Cindy acknowledged feeling tension from the family-based expectation to have children in her previous marriage, stating: “Oh, definitely. When I was married before, I was pressured from my previous husband and his family.” She further goes on to recognize the family-based expectation to have children that she felt from her own mother who expressed thinking that something was wrong:

“The only pressure really that came was from like family friends. And my mother also…’cause my mom started thinking, oh what did she do wrong, because all her other
friends had grandchildren...Well, she finally put it that way because she had been taking the stance of, well why don’t you want to? And it felt more a challenge to me, like what’s wrong with you? Why don’t you want to? And then she started finally, when she finally said it that way, that I mean is there something that you guys didn’t get? Because my brother has no children either. But my brother’s also, in addition to not having children, he has a gay partner and...but we’re both teachers. And so we are doing nurturing things with lots of younger people, but we haven’t wanted our own children. So, but she put it that way, is there something that happened in your upbringing. I mean is this something we did to make you not want to have children?”

2.1.2: Caregiving

Kim, Candice, Dana, Cindy, Anna and Nicole expressed family-based expectations for caregiving of both children and parents to conflict with personal career aspirations. Kim explains the family-based expectation to stay home with her children:

“Well um, this is a place where I’m often caught because I grew up in a place where my mother stayed home. I have four sisters – three sisters and a sister-in-law – and that’s the focus. When you have kids, you stay at home. One sister’s in school, so there’s...that’s a little bit of a difference ya know, a deviation from the norm. And there’s not overt judgment. Nobody says anything, they’re all very proud, but I think that they think that my daughter would be better off if I were at home. Ya know, so I feel the pressure of being at home and that’s what’s best for my daughter, if I were home as much as possible.”

Dana expresses how the expectation to stay home with children caused tension when she had to travel for work and her children were sick, stating “The only issue came when was if I was travelling and the kid was sick and didn’t want me to leave. That’s when I really felt awful.”

Candice, Cindy, Anna and Nicole discuss the family-based expectation to be a good daughter by caring for elderly parents to further complicate their lives as female academics. Nicole notes how she must change her work schedule to accommodate her parents when they visit, stating: “so I’ll juggle my work schedule to try to free myself up to spend as much time with them that I can and be the daughter that I can be.” Candice comments on the financial and emotional burden that the family-based expectation of caring for her parents causes, stating:
“The responsibility. That’s a very funny question, because my parents they are both retired, and all the money they had, even with their retirements, all the money has actually been spent. So now it’s actually…I’m the bread…ya know I support them, yeah so. But then I wouldn’t, yeah, in a way that’s a responsibility, but then if I don’t support them, who’s going to support them, and I have a very decent job, and I get paid well and my sister she has her own family. She has 2 kids ya know, and just kind of financially, there’s just not much money that she can spare. And my two brothers, they…as long as they don’t ask money from my parents, we are thankful. So, yeah. Yeah. I think in a way, I want to be away from my family, from my parents, because of financial struggle. I felt living with them was uh, was a burden to me, emotionally. Not physically, but very emotionally. I feel like, oh it’s like they’re always worried about this and that. I feel it was such a burden on me. On my emotional state.”

Cindy comments on the burden that is on women to nurture both aging parents and young children at the same time to be “a total nightmare” in addition to work, stating:

“But men children technically aren’t that helpful anyways. They can’t deal with this nurturing of a parent and being there and the thoughtfulness of providing for the needs, so…and then the burden is on the women for being nurturing both their parents and children at the same time, and then trying to work and it’s…that sounds like a total nightmare…Ya know, with my job it’s not possible while I’m still working to be in California the whole time. And my husband’s here…”

Anna also comments on the complexity of the issue, but frames it as a responsibility rather than an expectation, stating:

“So it’s something complicated. I don’t see it as expectations from them, I see it as a responsibility that comes from us…My sister is in the medical field, so I know that is going to help but I know that at some point we have to come up with a plan of how to keep them as happy and independent as possible, but yea that’ll come at some point.”

2.1.3: Labor

Participants expressed family-based expectations for labor, particularly domestic labor, to conflict with personal career aspirations as tenured faculty members. Nicole gives the example of how housework falls on the woman, not only due to how labor is divided within the household, but also due to the socio-cultural expectations that it is the woman who cares for the home, as articulated by her husband:
“So, currently my husband likes to cook…he likes to cook, but he doesn’t like to shop. So I always do the grocery shopping. I’m always running out to pick up something, like we’re running out of milk so I’ve gotta go pick up milk, or toilet paper, or something. So I’m always running out to pick up something. For example, my youngest one needed matza squares for school to celebrate Passover. Well, he was at the grocery store and he didn’t bother to pick them up, so now I have to stop. So I’ll be honest, the division of labor is heavily on my shoulders…And he even said to me this morning, when somebody comes into the house, and the house looks messy it becomes the woman’s ya know, why didn’t she clean up? Why didn’t she do this? So ya know, no matter what you do, no matter how you think you divide up the labor, it’s always on the woman. I would say it’s probably a good 75/25-75 on my end.”

Cindy explains how her upbringing led to an “expectation of taking responsibility,” stating:

“my brother and I affectionately refer to our parents as Adolf and Ava Hitler [laughs] and but that is a very strict European upbringing, and you were expected to do chores. You did chores. You just instill that early on so that they know that there’s an expectation of taking responsibility so that you’re doing your part as a family member. And so the families that, ya know like the mother does everything, the cleaning, and…well, I was the maid of my house at 10. So I was solely responsible for cleaning the house.”

Nicole further explains how the expectation for doing domestic labor competes with her ability to work when she’s at home:

“If I’m at home… I can’t work from home. Because I end up doing the dishes or I’ll go grocery shopping, or I’ll do things for the house. I’ll end up doing things I’m not supposed to be doing because I’m supposed to be working. So I find it a lot easier for me to go to work than it is to work from home. So for the tenure process, the research was the big…was trying to get it done.”

2.1.4: Education

One notable finding that emerged from some of the interviews while exploring family-based expectations and work was that participants expressed the family-based expectation to go to college, but not family-based expectations to work. Jennifer, May and Ashley commented on this, with May stating, “I had no expectations to work or not work. I had expectations to go to college” and Ashley commenting that her “parents were reasonably well-educated so there was
kind of an expectation that I would definitely go to college.” In regards to family-based expectations for work, Jennifer explains that “the focus was more on education than on work.”

2.2 Religiously-based Expectations

Not all of the participants in this study expressed a connection to religion, and some even expressed an intentional disconnect from religion. Participants that did express religious affiliation had mixed responses when asked about religiously-based expectations. For those women who expressed a tension between religiously-based expectations and career aspirations, emergent themes included the expectation that women be submissive wives and that they stay at home with the children. In contrast, participants who expressed that no religiously-based expectations conflict with their personal career aspirations as female faculty, emergent themes included their church’s liberal theology, in particular women in leadership roles.

2.2.1: Female Leaders

Kelly, who is active in her church, comments on the church’s liberal theology and women’s leadership roles in the church, stating:

“I am active in uh, my church, it’s Protestant…so it’s a Presbyterian church so it’s Protestant and Christian and many of the folks that go to the church are academics. It’s um a fairly liberal theology and this church happens to emphasize music, and sort of social justice issues…well Presbyterian they ordain women, so women provide a lot of leadership in the church. So that’s not been an issue that way at all, and it’s not unusual to have educated women, or women in academia, or women in leadership positions.”

Dana also remarks that her religious Hindu beliefs never conflicted with her career aspirations, stating:

“Hinduism is a very broad, open religion, I mean it’s not…. And so my religious beliefs never got in the way of doing anything in terms of my career…one of our constructs is of a Hindu deity that is called Ardhanarishvara and it’s half man and half woman, and the
idea is that…this construct of the idea of gender is there in that construct. That there is the feminine side and the masculine side and both are equally valued. So yes, I don’t feel that way and I never grew up with that feeling. I come from India, and India was one of the first countries that had the head of the country as a female, and so you know Ghandi was one of our initial prime ministers and so the idea of a woman being relegated to some other role is not something that I grew up with.”

2.2.2: Submissive Wife

For those participants who did express a conflict, the religiously-based expectation for women to be submissive wives, and to stay home with children were emergent themes. Cindy, Kim, and Nicole expressed the religiously-based expectation that a wife be submissive as a tension with their pursuit of an academic career. Cindy recognized that her value system didn’t connect with the religiously-based expectations of women to be “the little helpers,” stating:

“As I became more aware and more feminine, I was like, OK this stuff is all about men and for men, and nuns aren’t even…they’re the little helpers, the little wives of God. And priests have a full sacrament and a high position in the Catholic church, and so I just feel…now…it’s been since I was 21 years old and so I don’t feel Catholic anymore. I don’t connect, um, with the values.”

2.2.3: Caregiving Mother

Participants expressed religiously-based expectations for the woman’s role as a wife and mother to be in tension with their career aspirations as female faculty members. Kim sums up the dilemma by articulating the religiously-based rules that intertwine with family-based expectations:

“So I grew up in a Christian home…And we um went to a Christian school, so we were very much in that environment growing up. And, um, my family’s still very much in that…kind of that is a priority in life, and also what, I think what motivates sort of the role of the mother comes from that very much…I moved away from that to some degree… But it’s still only part of…for me it’s a tension because I grew up in a world where the rules were one way and I live now in a world where they’re different…And internally I still struggle, but certainly when I go…like this weekend at Easter I was at home with family, and so I feel even more of that tension of: am I a good enough
mother? Am I sacrificing? I feel that a lot, and it comes partly from family belief system, but that really sprung from the religious belief system. You know what I mean?”

After probing further about the rules, Kim responds:

“Religious rules, many of which are unspoken, but I think the rules aren’t that…they’ve changed since I was little. When I was younger the rules were, well women stayed at home, the priority was children and anything else they did outside of that was a sacrifice for family that the husband is the head of the household and made sort of the big decisions. The wife’s role is to take care of the children and to um educate them, and domestic things. Kind of that was the role that I saw growing up…I think over time, the kinds of churches that my parents go to still have changed a little bit to think, oh women can work part-time or they can ya know have a career as long as they’re mostly at home and their priority is still children, family, that kind of thing. So those are…I guess the rules are…the religious rules are women should stay home, and at least they should make children a priority. And um, that the work that they do outside of the home distracts from what needs to happen with kids. That was the rule. Not my rule, but that was the rule. The religious rule, I guess.”

Nicole furthers this sentiment when she discusses the religiously-based expectation that a woman should be in the house, stating, “So, yeah religion does play an important role…but there is a push, ya know, and there is that influence, that guilt of ya know why don’t we go to church more often, why don’t we…that the woman should be in the house, how many kids, that type of stuff.”

2.3 Traditionally-based Expectations

Throughout my analysis of the interviews, I attempted to keep the findings related to culturally-based expectations separate from traditionally-based expectations, but my own thinking evolved throughout this process to understand tradition and culture as one in the same for the purpose of this study. This evolution came about as I tried to parse out the different aspects of tradition and culture, but coming to recognize that tradition is rooted in culture. The difficulty of separating the two during the analysis phase was likely due to my failure to distinguish the two categories prior to conducting the interviews. Therefore analyzing the participants’ responses to the two categories of questions became murky because there was no distinction between tradition
and culture in the questions. This section groups both traditionally-based and culturally-based expectations that conflict with female faculty’s career aspirations together. Themes of domesticity (to stay home), submissiveness, and feminine attire emerged as traditionally-based and culturally-based expectations that conflict with participants’ personal career aspirations in academia.

2.3.1: Domesticity

Despite participants’ diverse cultural backgrounds, the culturally-based expectation for women to stay home emerged from several of the interviews. Dana, who is of Indian heritage, and Nicole, whose background is German, Czeck and Slovak, both comment on this expectation. Nicole mentions the culturally-based expectation to stay home, stating:

“So my family is German, Czeck and Slovak. And we’ve actually visited relatives, distant relatives in Slovakia and in the Czech Republic…our one grandmother stayed home and she spoke Czeck because her mother spoke Czeck. And so there was that impetus on staying home, and I think that’s where my mom got it from to be a stay-at-home mom.”

Dana explains the subtle culturally-based expectation of her role as a mother to stay home with young children to cause tension with her workload demands, stating:

“and there is also a cultural expectations in my community, I’m from India, it’s very subtle, not an open one, but it’s maybe mom should be at home, especially in this initial years. So I did stay at home for 4 years, before I came into academia full time. So yeah there were times when I would feel it, especially when the kids would fall sick and I had to balance my workload demands and my personal family life demands, but it just felt like it was too much”

In addition to the traditionally-based expectation to stay home with children that those female faculty mothers expressed, Cindy, who does not have children, also expressed the traditionally-based expectation to bear children. She describes how both she and her parents received peer-based pressure from her parents’ friends to have children, recounting:

“I mean it’s like sometimes people say, ya know, don’t you want kids? ‘Cause it’s a compulsory thing…But with my first marriage I was bugged all the time. I think now
they see that I’m very menopausal and probably won’t happen, and…but at the time I…I was bothered by it a lot, like why don’t you? You’d be a great mother, you’re so great with your dog, or something, ya know that kind of comment…but so I would get those questions all the time, and at first it bothered me because I didn’t know how to answer the question, um, a) ya know, mind your own beeswax, or b) ya know that I was treated basically like what’s wrong with you? What’s happened in your childhood that you don’t wanna have kids? I must be damaged somehow…Oh, they [parents’ friends] would straight out come out and ask me when are you gonna have kids. And they would say, do you want kids? And I would say, no thank you [laughs]. And um eventually they stopped asking…I think the thing was, I think my mom felt too, and I would visit my mom in California um usually like a week or two at a time. So I would have, I would be there on occasions when they would be together and have dinner with them. And, it’s like, the grandparents, all this talk about their grandchildren, and they babysat…But ya know it’s this sort of pride....”

2.3.2: Submissiveness

In addition to the traditionally-based expectations for domesticity and childbearing, the theme of submissiveness also emerged from participants’ interviews regarding traditionally-based expectations that conflict with their personal career aspirations. Cindy recalls an interaction with a senior-level faculty member:

“Yeah, also, one thing stands out with some of my colleagues, there was a man in the English department who was close to retirement so a mature man…And I remember being at a table for student scholarship or a student awards ceremony and so we had some graduating seniors at our table who were in English, and I felt that I wanted to show that…treat them like they weren’t students anymore, that they graduated, that they are moving on and that to treat them with the kind of…ya know a different kind of respect…But my colleagues were uncomfortable ‘cause they were still in the like treating these students as students. So they hushed me. So they said, like the guy said to me, like he said to me: like my mother used to tell me, eat. Be quiet and eat. Close your mouth and eat. And he did this, he did it in this half kidding way, but it was...there was a serious message there.”

2.3.3: Feminine Dress

Traditionally-based expectations for women to display or accentuate their femininity emerged as a traditionally-based expectation that conflicts with participant’s personal career aspirations in the academic workplace. Candice refers to the expectation to act in the “traditional,
girlie” way as a source of tension for herself and her colleagues who want to be considered gender neutral as physics professors, stating “I think a lot of us we don’t think of ourselves as female, we think about ourselves as being neutral. It’s like OK I do have a female body but it doesn’t mean I have to talk or act like the traditional, girly that sort of things.” Along with the traditionally-based expectation to “act girly,” traditionally-based expectations to dress femininely emerged as a source of tension with female faculty career aspirations, as Candice recalls an interaction with her division head in reference to her attire:

“So, let’s see, so when I was younger, I dressed like very casual like in jeans and stuff. And then when I got this job I think like probably 2 years…the first year or the second year. The division head he looked at me, and he said, Candice, Candice, don’t we pay you well enough? I was like, what? I mean, in a way he was saying that I should not dress like a student, he was saying that I dress like a student, but I like to wear jeans and t-shirt, but then he was saying like I should put some money on my wardrobe…I was taken aback. I was like, what? ‘Cause I thought you know on the job, I teach physics, I mean do I have to look ya know… So I don’t know if it has something to do with ‘cause I’m female, I don’t think that’s kind of…it’s not that. I think it’s more like ‘cause I dressed like a student. And he felt like you probably should dress, and look a lot older than you present yourself, I think.”

Kelly similarly explains:

“I do think there is, and I think sort of circling back to the beginning. I think academia and women’s roles that people still have a hard time with is the research end of things. And to me research is practical. Ya know, if you’re in a lab or out in the field, ya know, um, frilly things aren’t really…really practical…and it’s not so much that I feel that I can’t [dress nicely] on campus , it’s that if I do people notice… [laughs]. But we have another faculty member; she happens to be a physicist; and I think that um, she always has really cute [laughs] outfits on and it seems to work very well for her. I think for me, I’m too practical. So uh, yeah, on campus I…I tend to I mean dress in sweaters and slacks and such, but I mean…I don’t think I’m consciously ya know trying to hide my femininity or anything but I do think – and this may be the influence of the sciences – but uh that, yeah, that often… I think female scientists who look very feminine often aren’t taken as seriously [voice raises as if question]. And again I think that’s a subconscious bias…like I said I’m more just practical. I dress practically.”

May comments on dressing neutrally: “I believe totally in comfortable shoes. Librarians are not a….although now our new librarians dress very differently, but um no. There’s kind of not really that issue in library science. No. We tend to be kind of neutral dressers by nature...” Ashley makes a similar comment, referring to a conversation she had with a colleague: Ashley:
“[laughs] I am not one who really embraces femininity in a really strong way, and I would say one of my colleagues pointed that out to me, nicely. And said, you know you don’t dress in the most feminine way. And I said, no I don’t. Never have, never will [laughs]. Another friend and I joked, love me, love my jeans. I said, I want that. I’m gonna be like that. So, I would say I do my own thing and generally speaking it’s OK”.

Kelly and Cindy remarked on the relationship between attire and sexuality, with more modest attire (both in terms of gender neutrality and expense) being preferable to attire that draws attention to femininity that may undermine her ability to be taken seriously. Kelly mentions this explicitly when she says:

“To use the Jane Goodall example again, ya know she usually is dressed comfortably, and not necessarily in a dress. And I’m not saying women have to be in dresses to be [laughs] feminine, but eh, because science…well, most fields, but science also was originally dominated by men, um, that perceived or real or. I guess it was more I just had a perception that women were dressed in a way to flatter the womanly parts of them [laughs] wouldn’t be taken seriously…I will say that I…I sort of feel the same way in politics, right, in that the women you see in politics also tend to wear…and I mean some of it can be practical too, but ya know they wear pant suits and sort of things. You don’t see a lot of um women in politics, ya know, wearing what I would call extremely feminine outfits and I think it’s just unconsciously, um, it takes men’s…I can’t believe I’m gonna say this…but unconsciously it takes men’s minds to something other than the work that the person is doing. It can be a distractor.”

Cindy explains a similar understanding of the relationship between feminine attire and overt sexuality, which undermines the intellectual role of the professor:

“I really wanted the job to be more about what I had to offer intellectually than just on appearance, but that was also a lesson I had to learn that while I wanted that, appearance matters a lot in establishing credibility…I never dressed sexy. I never wore tight clothes. I never wore low-cut and high skirts. So that was never a part of how I wanted to project my identity.”

2.4 Peer-based Expectations

Few of the participants expressed peer-based expectations that conflict with their personal career aspirations as female faculty, Kim did express a feeling of judgment from her peers both in academia and outside of academia when she states:
“Um, well certainly, the mother thing, I think in general, women can be really hard on each other, I think. And so I think that I have felt that people have tried to find something wrong with what I’m doing and being a mom. Almost like a gotcha. Like, oh well…you’re successful, but look what you sacrificed. Ya know look at what you didn’t do because of what you were able to do…I think people think, uh-huh, but what did you give up to do that?...people who have a career look at this little group of women who have careers here will look at people who didn’t choose to do that, and say, oh look at what they didn’t do. Kind of like, everybody’s in their own little fort shooting arrows at the others. Kind of like, this is our world, look what we’ve done, and we’re protecting it.”

Some participants in the study express peer-based expectations to participate in activities outside of work with their children, but most of the tenured women faculty who participated in this study expressed a sense that their peers understood their career aspirations and therefore they did not identify peer-based expectations as a source of tension.

2.4.1: Participation

Ashley and Nicole express feeling peer-based expectations to participate in school activities such as Parent Teacher Organizations (PTO) or as part of their children’s extra-curricular activities such as Girl Scouts. Ashley comments, “I’ve been mindful that some people would sure love to have more involvement on my part. It’s just not realistic for me at this point.” Nicole also expresses the expectation to be involved in her children’s activities, such as the example she gives with Girl Scouts, saying “So ya know I’m juggling, I’m dong Girl Scouts and all that stuff. And homework, it’s all on me. And so, yeah it’s…can be difficult.”

2.4.2: Understanding

When asked if she felt tension from peer-based expectations, May expressed that she did not feel peer-based expectations that conflicted with her personal career aspirations. She states:
“No. Um, they may have been surprised, but I didn’t…I didn’t feel that. they just knew that I had to do that. And if I wanted to keep working, that I had to earn tenure, and if I wanted to earn tenure, I had to write, so that’s…yeah. And I don’t know if any kind of…my family didn’t live in town. Greg’s family, nobody had a job like that, so um, no. And it’s a university community so that’s not, so no.”

Candice and Cindy also commented that they don’t feel expectations to have children from peers who are also professors and colleagues. Candice says,

“And to be honest, ya know I have a lot of friends, female friends in physics. They are either single, divorced, or no children [laughs]. So I think we are all facing the…not many people have kids, ya know, so it’s like, alright, we’re kind of in the same situation, ya know and that sort of thing. But peer-wise, because most of my female friends, they were in the same boat.”

Cindy comments similarly, saying “I find it to be true when I’ve read of studies that the higher education you get, the fewer children you have, the longer you delay having children, and the larger percentage that you don’t have children, end up having children at all. And, and I find that to be true with my colleagues.”

**Question 3: How do female faculty members negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia?**

The third research question asks: How do female faculty members negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia?

Findings from analysis of participant interviews that address research question 3 are summarized in Table 4-4.
Table 4-4. Research Question 3 Findings by Theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-Categories</th>
<th>Code Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Professional Social Support   | • Women’s Information Networks  
|                               | • Mentorship              
|                               | • Collaboration           | • Word of mouth                                    
|                               |                           | • Encouraging mentor                               
|                               |                           | • Network of female faculty                        
|                               |                           | • Co-authors                                       |
| Personal Social Support       | • Husband                 | • Piece together childcare                        |
|                               | • Peers                   | • Supportive husband                              |
|                               | • Parents                 | • Parental childcare (grandparents)               |
|                               |                           | • Supportive parents                               |
| Financial Social Support/     | • Domestic Labor          | • Housekeeper                                      |
| Outsourcing                   | • Childcare               | • Daycare                                          |
|                               | • Research                | • Graduate students                                |
| Life Course Strategies        | • Timing of Pregnancy     | • Timing of children                               |
|                               | • Number of Children      | • Ph.D. after children                             |
|                               | • Sacrifice               | • No children                                      |
|                               |                           | • Worked weekends                                  |
| Workplace Strategies          | • Stopping the Tenure Clock| • Stop tenure clock                                |
|                               | • Maternity Leave         | • Maternity leave                                  |

Participants used different behaviors to negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and the socio-culturally based expectations in academia that they described in research questions 1 and 2. Consistent with my conceptual framework, participants employed negotiation strategies including personal social supports, professional social supports, and life course strategies to negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia.

3.1 Professional Social Support

Participants employed professional social supports including women’s information networks, collaborations, and mentorships to negotiate the tension between socio-culturally based expectations and personal career aspirations in academia.
3.1.1: Women’s Information Networks

The findings indicate that female faculty participants utilized professional social supports such as women’s information networks to negotiate the tensions between socio-culturally based expectations and personal career aspiration. Participants utilize women’s information networks, especially to negotiate childcare options and leave policies. When speaking of childcare and learning about the best options, May comments that “a lot of it’s word of mouth” and Jennifer describes how she utilized a “network of female faculty” to learn about family leave policies:

“When I got pregnant I asked other female faculty about family leave policies. You may not know this because it’s not published anywhere but [redacted] official family leave policy is 6 weeks, but the college of education gives 6 months maternity leave for male or female faculty. When I got pregnant I asked other women faculty and learned about the maternity leave policies. This differs by college and also even within programs. But I would say there is a network of female faculty.”

Ashley discussion obtaining information about leave policies and the tenure and promotion process from a network of supportive female faculty, stating:

“And I really have made a point…so we have one graduate at Temple and...and I have been working on some projects together, and she just had her baby a year or 2 ago, and every now and then she’ll shoot me an email saying, how would you deal with this? And the other has been hired back into our program here. The other’s out at Minnesota. I’m like, you guys need to really network. Moral support is essential in this job.”

3.1.2: Mentorship

Brenda, May, Cindy, Dana, Anna, Jane, and Ashley discussed utilizing mentorships to negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between socio-culturally based expectations and personal career aspirations for tenure in academia. Brenda notes how she has met people along the way to show her the next step:

“So like you go on your journey, right, and then you meet people. Usually incredible people. Like I definitely have, like that’s one of my biggest, like I don’t know what happens but just like one after another, friends, mentors, like incredible people who always happen to be in the right time the right place to show me the next step.”
May also comments on how she “had great mentors” and earned tenure:

“So I started on the tenure track, did earn tenure, was in a leadership program through the Association for Research Library, had 2 wonderful…I mean throughout this I’ve had great mentors. So I had wonderful mentors…and earned tenure.”

Anna notes that she utilizes different mentors for different things:

“So I have a good couple of mentors, uh colleagues in my group, that I’d say admire for very different things. For example, I can relate to one of them for say his ability to be so highly recognized in his field, and very productive, and so many publications, and so active and he’s everywhere. Um, so looking for that kind of advice and if there’s any aspect of a person that I really find that I’m attracted to in terms of I’d really like to follow that model, that they have provided me some really good mentorship. Um, and there’s another mentor I have that’s more looking for ya know just doing the right thing, and on integrity and being persistent and doing good work slowly, so very different philosophy. So I can have a couple of mentors that have very different philosophies of what is considered to be a successful professional but are both good mentors in a way because they provide different aspects and different dimensions.”

Cindy recounts that her mentor provided guidance on the expectations for tenure and promotion:

“So I had somebody that we called at the time Head of English, and that was a man. And he did mentor me about kind of general stuff. It wasn’t specific to the research, but he could say the expectations of tenure and promotion in general. And so that was helpful, and I did have a …I do have a female who was tenured and promoted already, and uh from time to time she was also helpful…”

Dana expresses appreciation for her mentors and notes how difficult the promotion process can be without a mentor, stating,

“there’s sometimes the absence of mentor/mentee relationship, and so that was hard…[but it was] very very rewarding that I had people look out for me, guide me, tell me what to do, what committees to spend time on, what to avoid, and so on. That was very helpful.”

Jane states that she would have quit without the support of one of her mentors:

“but my mentor who gave me opportunities…was quite supportive, and provided me with numerous opportunities from which really good things have come about since that time. And without him, I would have quit. If it hadn’t been for my respect for him and not wanting to disappoint him I would have quit the semester before I finished.”
3.1.3 Professional Support 3: Collaboration

In addition to information networks and mentorships, collaboration emerged as a professional social support that female faculty participants use to negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between socio-culturally based expectations and personal career aspirations. Kelly, May, Anna, Nicole, and Ashley, commented on collaboration as a method for negotiating these tensions. May recalls how her co-authors helped her by providing publication opportunities:

“So, um, so I had um… a couple of really great co-authors who really helped me to learn how to write. And [one of the co-authors] she was sooo wonderful in helping me and she really, ya know just sharing the credit, writing with me. She was writing a book and asked me to write a book chapter. A dear friend of hers was writing a book, and he asked me to write a book chapter for that. So I really had people who opened the doors. A lot of times, it’s ya know people can open the door for you and you have to go through the door. But if nobody opens the door for you, it makes it a lot harder to go through it. And I had people who opened the doors for me, and so I hope I open the doors for others.”

Kelly outright states, “for my particular research I wouldn’t have gotten tenure if I didn’t have collaborators and other people to conduct research with.”

3.2 Personal Social Supports

In addition to professional social supports including women’s information networks, mentorships, and collaborations, participants also employed personal social supports to negotiate the tensions between socio-culturally based expectations and personal career aspirations. Female faculty use personal social supports including supportive partners, supportive peers, and supportive parents to negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between socio-culturally based expectations and personal aspirations in academia.
3.2.1 Personal Support 1: Husband

May, Kelly, Candice, Kim, Jane, Dana, Anna all expressed that having supportive husbands helped them to negotiate the tensions that they encounter in academia as female faculty. Support from spouses that women expressed ranged from willingness to move, understanding the profession, providing financial support, and providing caregiving. May comments on her husband’s willingness to move:

“I think part of it is my husband’s been really willing to move, um, ya know…My husband had been telecommuting so he was able to then just…since he was telecommuting…then he was just able to telecommute from here so that made it much easier. So we’ve never had to move for…it was only the first move that we had to find a job for him so we both had careers, um and both had to find jobs. Every other time it’s been…he’s been able, he was able to keep his job through both moves, and that was really helpful.”

Dana discusses how her husband was able to provide financial support and work from home, which allowed her to travel and build her CV toward tenure, stating:

“The way it worked out for me is my husband is a CPA and he chose to work from home for 6 years. I shouldn’t say 6 years, almost 5 years, but at that point is when I was submitting my tenure application and I would know either way then one way or another and he decided that he had spent enough time. So in a way juggling things became easier for me because he began his company from home and he was trying to build up his practice. And he did it for 5 years primarily so I had the flexibility to travel to national and international conferences and build my dossier.”

Similarly, Kim’s husband was able to work from home and provide caregiving while also contributing financially to the family income. She recalls:

“So my husband is in computer programming project management. He doesn’t actually do computer programming, but he’s a project manager for the programming. And he works from home. When we lived in Florida, before we had kids, he worked in an office, and then we left, we moved here for my job because I was finishing my Ph.D. My daughter was 2, so I was going to school and she was little. We moved here and he negotiated an opportunity to continue to work from home, so he works from our house…but he moved at that time from full time to 20 hours a week. So he was working part-time and he was kind of the primary caregiver at home. We also had somebody come in for the 20 hours that he was working. And I was there for part of them, for 2 days, and someone else would come in for 3 days for the time that he was working. Um, and so he was sort of primary caregiver, and he took care of [our daughter]…so he now works full time because that job morphed into something full time, so he had to do that, um, when
she was 4 I think. So, but he’s at home full time, so on snow days, he’s there. When she comes home from school he’s there if I’m not home yet, so we work it that way.”

Kelly and Candice both mention having a supportive partner who understands the profession helped them to negotiate the tensions and dilemmas that they encountered in academia. Kelly states:

“I did very recently [laughs] I was actually dating someone else who was also a professor and it was nice because they understood. So like we’d get together Saturday evenings ‘cause Sundays generally you’re preparing for the coming week so...That uh we could, like...yeah, so we both had time on the weekends that we could...we could spend with each other, but the rest of the time it was understood that we would be busy with work or research or or whatever.”

Candice also comments:

“Well, I think in a way...uh, he’s also in physics, but we’re divorced so [laughs]. But uh ya know I think he was because we had um, we went to the same grad school, so we are like classmates...we’re 2 years apart. But in a way ya know he was like, he was in physics program, so we went through the whole prog, we went through studying together and all that stuff. So he knew.”

Cindy and Ashley were the only participants who did not mention having a supportive husband or partner to help them negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between socio-culturally based expectations and career aspirations in academia, with Nicole being the only participant to mention that she had to demand help from her husband:

“Oh yeah, I have to ask for help, and sometimes I demand it. Ya know, I’ll turn to my husband and say, I cannot be home. You have to take care of this…and I let him figure out how he’s gonna handle it. Because I’ll be honest, I wash my hands I’ll be like, I have to work, just like you have to go to a board meeting and I manage to juggle everything, if you can’t come home and work, you need to figure out who’s gonna watch them, what you’re gonna do. And that’s up to you because I don’t work that many nights. If I have to work late one night, you have to figure it out.”

3.2.2 Personal Support 2: Peers

In addition to a supportive spouse, participants expressed negotiating the tensions between socio-culturally based expectations and personal aspirations in academia by having
supportive peers. For example, May states the importance of having caring and supportive people around, saying “you can’t do it all, so you need to have support… Um, but I feel like I have had a great career, and ya know I think…um, having people who support you, having people who care about your career just makes a huge, huge difference.” Ashley recalls how her peers helped her to care for her children when she and her husband were both working:

“Yeah, at first we had wonderful neighbors that are around the same ages as ours. And all four of us were working. The parents were working. And we decided between the four of us that are working we’d make one good stay-at-home parent. And for I think 3 years, we just rotated. So we got, you know one worked as an ER doctor so he had an unpredictable schedule. Mine was fairly predictable, hers was fairly predictable, and then [my husband] would set his schedule to be home on certain days so he could pick up the kids after school. And we would have really sunk if we didn’t have that, I think. So that was a real blessing.”

Kim expresses the need for supportive peers to provide emotional support and counter feelings of isolation as a female academic:

“And so, I do feel like not everybody would agree that the choices that I’ve made are good, and so I try to surround myself as much as possible with people who do, and can see that both can happen simultaneously. It’s funny, I was talking to my sister-in-law this weekend, and we’re talking… And I said, yeah, and it just came out of my mouth, I said, yeah, [my friend] and I are making our own club, and we’re OK [laughs]. I think that’s what I try to do. I try to find people that are in the same place, they have similar beliefs but also similar levels of success and have been able to balance it, or are at least trying, and feel it’s OK. And find that group and be with them. And it’s small – it’s 2 of us right now…It feels like you’re kind of alone in all these different worlds. And trying to find someone that understands that it’s OK.”

3.2.3 Personal Support 3: Parents

In addition to supportive partners, supportive parents also emerged as a theme for how female faculty negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between socio-culturally based expectations and personal career aspirations in academia. With respect to her parents, Ashley states that “they’ve been very supportive.” Kelly, May, Anna, expressed parental support in the form of emotional support, such as the choice of career, and the choice to move for the job. Anna says,
“of course you know my family celebrate - my mom is alive and my in-laws as well, we celebrate our accomplishments in general and the fact that we’re doing OK and that we’re able to have careers that allow us to be independent and fulfilled but that’s really it.” May comments, “His [my husband’s] dad was also super helpful too, and he was able to say, ya know you just have to go where the job is. And he was really, he was very supportive. And my family was very supportive too.”

Nicole also mentioned how her parents and in-laws helped with childcare, giving the example of her mother-in-law watching the children when both she and her husband must travel at the same time “Like my husband and I went away for a week for our 15th wedding anniversary. And so my mother-in-law came and watched the kids and then my husband and I went on another trip and my mom came and watched the kids.”

3.3 **Financial Social Support/Outsourcing**

Personal social supports, professional social supports, and financial support or outsourcing emerged as a theme for how female faculty negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between socio-culturally based expectations and personal career aspirations. Participants mentioned outsourcing domestic labor, childcare, and research to minimize these tensions and dilemmas.

3.3.1 **Financial Support 1: Domestic Labor**

Participants outsourced domestic work to negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between socio-culturally based expectations and personal career aspirations. For example, Kim says “we always had somebody help us with that [housework]. Because we started with me, and after like,
weekends of tearing my hair out we had to bring somebody in. And she still helps out.” Nicole shares that they have a housekeeper to help negotiate the tensions between the socio-culturally based expectation to maintain a clean household and her personal career aspirations, stating, “We do have a housekeeper that does some cleaning and um the laundry and stuff, but when it comes to the daily stuff, it’s me.”

### 3.3.2 Personal Support 2: Childcare

Participants also expressed outsourcing childcare to negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between socio-culturally based expectations and personal career aspirations. Again, Nicole recalls,

“There have been times when I’ve called the babysitter and said, well I have to go out, can you watch the kids Thursday and Friday, and they’ll say OK…part of me figures I spend so much time watching them and taking care of the house and all of that, that if I get a break I get a break and I’m gonna take advantage of it.

May remembers paying for childcare when her children were young, stating, “Well, half my salary went to childcare. Fully half. So it was the expectation that…so I knew that we would have to find childcare for them.” Anna notes that daycare is their primary support networks, stating: “We were very very happy with the daycare we had, so we stayed there. They are our primary support network.”

### 3.3.3 Financial Support 3: Research

In addition to childcare and domestic labor, Kim mentioned how the tensions caused by time that it takes to publish research became less after she achieved tenure because she outsources much of that work to graduate students, stating:
“Now I have grad students do a lot of the research, like the papers, the conference papers and the journal articles, I’m guiding them, and they’re doing a lot of the writing. So it’s a little less of my own independent work, and helping grad students with their work. So it’s changed a little bit in that sense, so the time – it’s not like I’m writing a full paper from beginning to end, and doing all the research like I used to.”

3.4 Life Course Strategies

In addition to professional social supports, personal social supports, and financial social supports, participants used life course strategies including timing of pregnancy, number of children, and sacrifices to negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between socio-culturally based expectations and personal career aspirations in academia. Jane, May, Ashley, Candice, Cindy, and Nicole all expressed using one of these life course strategies to negotiate these tensions and dilemmas in academia.

3.4.1 Strategy 1: Timing of Pregnancy

Nicole recalls planning for her second child to be born in the summer as she had already stopped the tenure clock with her first, stating that her “second one [child] was born in 2005, in July. And I tried planning it so she would be born in the summer, which made it a lot easier for me. And then I didn’t take any time off for that and then I got tenure in 2007. So I have 2 girls ages 13 and 9.” May and Jane did not pursue an academic career until after their children were older, as Jane acknowledges:

“I didn’t have any children at home…Um, and there’s difficulty being a woman wanting to be accomplished, wanting to be successful, wanting to move forward, um I think it is…it is difficult. And we don’t even have small children at home so I can’t even imagine... And I’ve met young women, and said, ya know you’re thinking of getting a Ph.D. and you’re married and you have children, let’s sit down and talk about it because it’s going to be challenging.”
Dana mentions that she was home with her children for 4 years, stating, “I had just finished my post-doc, so I wasn’t yet a faculty member anywhere. I was just teaching as an adjunct.” Ashley continues the conversation about the importance of timing for having children when on the tenure track, as well as how many children to have as a way to negotiate the process, mentioning:

“you can only stop the clock once on the tenure, in the tenure track. So it meant I had one kid. So I started [with] her in ’97. I had my son Gavin in 1999 and couldn’t stop it again. It didn’t make sense to have a kid until I either did or didn’t have tenure, so I got pregnant the year that I was going up [for tenure]. It was kind of carefully planned and then I was already of advanced maternal age, and we thought maybe we shouldn’t push our luck so…we might have thought about having more kids, but two is good.”

3.4.2 Strategy 2: Number of Children

Amy recalls the tensions and decision to have one child, despite the culturally-based expectation to have three:

“I thought that I would have a second child, not three – that’s a little overdoing it. But I kind of thought that it would be the second one…but that, the family part was a question because I was like, we must have a second child. OK so we must have a second child, what will be the right time to have a second child? And then, I had this question, and I asked this question, and I asked this question and it, there was not the right time. And then I finished my Ph.D. and I began my um, career as Assistant Professor and it just finally dawned on me that, well, I don’t have to. I mean, I really don’t have to.”

Participants also mention the importance of having “momentum with publishing” and research prior to becoming pregnant on the tenure track. Anna gives an example of this when she mentions,

“I have 6-year-old twin boys and a 2 ½ daughter. And I was expecting my twins when I was on the tenure track so I had them on my fourth so yeah. How I managed that? A lot of people around me who care so much about me were really scared about how that was going to work out. Um, I was on…I would say I was on a pretty good track before being pregnant with my twin boys so I would say I managed to gain a lot of momentum with publications and funding and getting things started that even though things slowed down with my kids, I had a number of things going.”
Candice and Cindy both discussed how they focused on career over children, as they both “kept putting it [childbearing] off,” as they pursued tenure, with Candice stating:

“Yes… I don’t know, when I was a grad student we were all overwhelmed. My husband, when he was a grad student as well so we were just like, alright we want to pass our qualifying exam and we want to get our Ph.D. So, and during that time as a student it’s just like, having the children while you were a student, that thought never occurred to me… But when they come to this age, it’s like do I want to go through that? It’s just like, I don’t know. I’m too old for that. [laughs] I don’t know, that’s my feeling.”

Cindy says: “And so I guess that’s one of the things also, I kept putting it off saying, oh maybe, after the doctoral program, oh no maybe after I get tenured. Ya know I wanted to do a great job professionally, and if I chose to have children I wanted to do a great job raising children.”

3.4.3 Strategy 3: Sacrifice

In addition to timing and number of children, sacrifice emerged as a life course strategy for negotiating the tensions and dilemmas that participants encounter in academia. Candice, Cindy, May, Dana, Nicole, Jane, Kelly, Ashley, and Anna all mention sacrifice. May comments that “having a family, having 3 daughters, having, ya know, a full life, there’s always tension because somebody… something’s always getting short shrifed.” Dana discusses how she sacrificed taking a faculty position at a “high-powered university” for her family, stating “I did get an offer at Purdue. But I didn’t take it because I knew I couldn’t manage family life with a high-powered university, so I instead opted for a commonwealth campus at [redacted].”

Kelly mentions feeling that she sacrificed marriage for her academic career, stating:

“I think that uh both for getting a Ph.D. and for getting tenure you have to be fairly, um, focused and, and on task, so it doesn’t leave a whole lot of room for relationships that are already established. So I do think I made a trade-off there, maybe sacrifice is too strong a word. But I do think I… I made a trade-off there… So I don’t really feel like I sacrificed family for my academic career… I do feel a little bit, um, I probably sacrificed a husband… for lack of a better word for it [nervous laugh]. Just because at this point and this location there’s not a lot of opportunities. Um, I think I was… but I was also maybe a
little over focused on my studies as a grad student, so….I think as a faculty member I was more interested in finding a meaningful relationship, and it feels like it’s a little…late.”

Candice expressed a similar sentiment when she said, “I do think that when you get older and you do feel like, oh I should have children. all this, but then when you get older that kind of feeling of ‘I should have one’ does come back to ha…does come back and …but then again so um, I do think that’s a kind of sacrifice that I have made. “In addition to sacrificing family life and/or a more prestigious position as a female academic, participants also sacrificed religion by leaving the church as a way to negotiate the tensions between socio-culturally based expectations and personal career aspirations in academia. Nicole says “I don’t…I walked away from that [religious guilt]. I don’t need that influence on me, which I think college helps you realize.” Cindy discusses leaving the church and later the religiously-based expectation to have children that was alleviated as a result of disconnecting from the church, saying:

“But there was a moment when I realized that I really wasn’t Catholic anymore…I don’t want to be a hypocrite, and that cafeteria Catholic kind of thing. And I actually felt betrayed by the religion because I realized I was unforgiveable …I had been so emphatic about disconnecting and saying I am not Catholic, I, in many ways I’m just not actually Catholic in that that requirement to reproduce in a world that I feel is overpopulated, um, just was meaningless to me.”

3.5 Workplace Strategies

3.5.1 Strategy 1: Stopping the Tenure Clock

In addition to sacrifice, timing of pregnancy, and number of children, participants utilized workplace policies including stopping the tenure clock and time off from teaching to negotiate the tensions and dilemmas that they encountered in academia. Nicole recalls stopping the tenure clock when she had her daughter, stating:

“When I got the job here it was in 2000. I had just gotten married after I interviewed here so then I started in the fall of 2000. And the first year child was born in 2002 and I took a
month. And I had somebody cover my classes and then I…she was born in February so I took the month of February off. I came back in March and finished the month of March, April, and May with my classes, and then I did take a year out of my tenure-track.”

3.5.2 Strategy 2: Maternity Leave

Jennifer recalls taking maternity leave although she did not stop the tenure clock. Anna also did not stop the tenure clock when she had her children:

“I did not stop the clock. I did consider it; I didn’t feel that it would be seen negatively in my dossier so I felt that I really had the choice of stopping it or not stopping it. I consulted with my department head, and he felt that it wasn’t necessary. That if I could continue doing some of the work that I was doing that it could be ok. Of course I would have been able to accumulate more if I hadn’t had the twins, but he didn’t feel…he didn’t encourage me to stop it, and in a way I think that was because I was looking for that answer, I was really trying to look for that. Like do I really need to delay one more year, um I almost wanted to get it over with…The spring semester I was able to take my semester of teaching leave according to the university and my unit was very accommodating of that. And it was summer, and I was able to really that summer semester following that spring to come back gradually…”

Summary

This chapter presented findings in response to each of the three research questions:

1. What challenges do women faculty members encounter in their pursuit of career aspirations?

2. What are the cultural, family, religious, traditional and peer-based expectations that conflict with female faculty’s personal career aspirations?

3. How do female faculty members negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia?

This chapter reported the findings from document review and analysis of primary interview data in which participants draw upon their own feelings and life experiences that was audio recorded, transcribed, analyzed using open coding, axial coding, pattern matching and
constant comparison, and interpreted to explore how these particular female faculty negotiate the tensions and dilemmas in academia. Field notes, journal recordings, and commission documents all contributed to the findings for how these particular female faculty in the Commission for Women negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between socio-culturally based expectations and personal career aspirations in academia. Chapter 5 will discuss the significance of this study to theory as well as the literature. I then identify the implications of my findings, assessing their significance for workplace policy and women who aspire to pursue a career in academia. Following the implications, I present recommendations for policymakers and elected officials.
Chapter 5
Summary, Discussion, and Recommendations

Introduction

In chapters 1-4, I presented the background and rationale for the study, purpose of the study, literature review related to the study topic, methodology and research findings. Next I present conclusions that include summary of findings, the significance of this study to my conceptual framework and the literature reviewed, and the implications of my findings, assessing their significance for scholars, policy, and advocates of women’s rights. I close the chapter with suggestions for future research to more deeply examine how female faculty negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia.

Summary of Findings

The goal of the present study was to explore how female faculty members at a public research university negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. The findings were as follows:

1. Female faculty encounter challenges to achieving career aspirations for promotion and tenure that include: academic workplace culture, academic workplace structure, discrimination, and negative personal feelings.

2. Family-based expectations for childrearing, caregiving, labor and education, religiously-based expectations of female leadership, being a submissive wife and caregiving mother,
traditionally-based expectations of domesticity, submissiveness, and feminine dress, and peer-based expectations of participation conflict with female faculty’s personal career aspirations, presenting additional barriers to tenure and promotion.

3. Female faculty utilize the following strategies to negotiate the tensions that they encounter between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia:
   a. Professional social supports including women’s information networks, mentorship and collaboration.
   b. Personal social supports including husband, peers and parents.
   c. Outsourcing of domestic labor, childcare, and research.
   d. Life course strategies including timing of pregnancy, number of children and sacrifice.

Discussion

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study adapted Ezzedeen and Ritchey’s inductive model to identify the strategies that female faculty use to negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. The literature review identified theories within the broader concepts of gender socialization, gender roles, women’s labor, and discrimination as fundamental to informing this study. This exploratory case study interviewed twelve female faculty members of a commission for women between December 2014 and May 2015.
Ezzedeen and Ritchey’s (2009) inductive model of career advancement and career/family balance, the conceptual framework, and the literature review provided a baseline reference point for comparison of this study. I drew conclusions by comparing the study results to the conceptual framework for similarities and differences about how female faculty negotiate between their personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. Findings from this study showed that female faculty employ multiple career and family/balance strategies similar to those of the executive women in Ezzedeen and Ritchey’s (2009) study.

The exploratory nature of this study that investigates the questions of how female faculty negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia differs from prior studies of female faculty by comparing the findings to those of Ezzedeen & Ritchey’s study. Adapting Ezzedeen & Ritchey’s (2009) inductive model revealed many similarities but some important differences between academic and business institutions. For example, differences between the geographically dispersed nature of academic work when compared to the organization of business or corporate work is largely absent on the literature for women, work, and family. For example, academic travel that is required for faculty to build a network of professional social supports within academic discipline, and promotion-based expectations to travel reveal potential differences between the academic and business contexts that have implications for how women negotiate tensions between career and family. This study provides a foundation for future investigations of these similarities and differences for professional women.

This study found that female faculty employ professional social support, personal social support, and life course strategies similar to Ezzedeen and Ritchey’s inductive model to negotiate tensions between their personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. While these findings were consistent with the conceptual framework for this study, value system was not a strategy that emerged for how female faculty negotiate the tensions and dilemmas
between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations. Instead, participants employed financial social supports and workplace strategies to negotiate these tensions (see Figure 5-1).

Figure 5-1. Findings Compared to the Conceptual Framework

Professional Social Support

This study found that, in line with the conceptual framework, female faculty in the academic context employed similar strategies as executive women in the business context to negotiate the barriers to workplace advancement, including information networks and mentorship,
as well as collaboration. Jennifer commented that “there is a network of female faculty” and Ashley’s statement about telling junior faculty, “you guys really need to network. Moral support is essential in this job” indicate the importance that female faculty place on women’s information networks to negotiate the tensions that women uniquely experience between socio-culturally based expectations and career aspirations. Using the case study approach, Bird (2011) found women’s exclusion from male information networks to be a systemic barrier to promotion in the pursuit of an academic career. Findings from this study showed that female faculty used women’s information networks to negotiate this challenge.

Brenda, May, Cindy, Dana, Anna, Jane, and Ashley all commented on the advantages of mentorship for negotiating the tensions in pursuit of tenure and promotion, using words including: incredible, great, wonderful, really good to describe their mentors. Jane’s statement speaks to the significant role that mentorship has for female academics in pursuit of tenure:

“but my mentor who gave me opportunities…was quite supportive, and provided me with numerous opportunities from which really good things have come about since that time. And without him, I would have quit. If it hadn’t been for my respect for him and not wanting to disappoint him I would have quit the semester before I finished.”

Mentorship has been found to be one of the most significant aspects of retention for female faculty in pursuit of an academic career (Steele et al., 2013). Jackson et al (2003) found that 98% of the 16 faculty interviewed in their qualitative study identified lack of mentorship as the most significant or second most significant factor in preventing academic career progress.

Participants in this study also identified collaboration as a professional social support strategy to negotiate these tensions, with Kelly stating “I wouldn’t have gotten tenure if I didn’t have collaborators and other people to conduct research with.” Collaboration is an important aspect of achieving tenure and promotion for junior faculty to expand their academic reach beyond their own institution. For female faculty who must meet professional demands to publish
and domestic expectations for labor and caregiving, collaboration for publication purposes is imperative (O’Meara & Stromquist, 2015; Seierstad, & Kirton, 2015).

**Personal Social Support**

As described in the conceptual framework, personal social support includes parents, spouses, children and friends who not only enable working women to pursue career aspirations, but also contribute to beliefs about career and family. This study found that female faculty rely on personal social supports including their husbands, peers, and parents to negotiate, and in some cases, minimize, the tensions and dilemmas between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. Participants expressed that having supportive husbands who cared for domestic responsibilities and provided financially gave them the flexibility to meet the professional demands of tenure and promotion, minimizing the tensions between their career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations that they perform caregiving and domestic labor responsibilities. Dana recognized that her husband’s ability to work from home gave her “the flexibility to travel to national and international conferences to build [her] dossier.” Similar to Ezzedeen and Ritchey’s (2008) finding that executive women identified spouses as a major source of support in their career pursuits, female faculty also identify support from their spouse as a valuable support for career progression and, when not received, a source of tension.

Female faculty participants in this study also expressed that social support from peers enabled them to reduce time-based conflict by allowing them to piece together childcare and combat feelings of isolation through peers’ emotional support and understanding. Kim expressed this when she said, “I try to find people that are in the same place, they have similar beliefs but also similar levels of success and have been able to balance it, or are at least trying, and feel it’s OK…And trying to find someone that understands that it’s OK.”
The literature review for this study recognized that men and women learn the appropriate rules for social behavior through gender socialization (Park, 2008; Strickland, 2001), and that social approval is a reward for appropriate gender-based behavior. This study found that female faculty employ negotiation strategies such as women’s information networks and social support from peers to overcome the isolation that occurs when they cannot enact appropriate gender-based for social approval in the gendered university organization that privileges masculinity. Furthermore, female faculty peer networks confront gendered organizational practices and act as catalysts for women’s career agency (O’Meara & Stromquist, 2015). Personal social support from peers can not only minimize isolation and tensions for female faculty but mutual peer social support among women faculty is foundational for generating female faculty peer networks that can challenge gendered academic workplace structures.

Support from parents similarly enabled female faculty, particularly faculty with children, to reduce time-based conflict by providing childcare and emotional support. However, female faculty expressed tension from parental expectations to, in some cases, have children or perform a more traditional domestic role in the family. Ashley evidenced the social support from parents, simply stating, “they’ve been very supportive” whereas Cindy indicated tension from her mother to have children, stating “my mom started thinking, oh what did she do wrong…”

Life Course Strategies

Similar to Ezzedeen and Ritchey’s inductive model of executive women who negotiated work family balance by utilizing life course strategies such as the decision to have children, and the timing of children, this study also found that female faculty used similar negotiation strategies. Life course strategies refers to a series of career and family decisions that emerge over time such as the decision to have children, ordering of career and family and shifting priorities of
each (Han & Moen, 1999). While the decision to have children or not did not explicitly emerge as a finding for how female faculty negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations, Candice and Cindy discussed how they “kept putting it off” as they pursued tenure. Timing of pregnancy and number of children did emerge as negotiation strategies that female faculty used, providing further evidence that female faculty rarely utilize organizational supports such as stopping the tenure clock or maternity leave for fear that they will be discriminated against (Broadbridge, 2008; Ezzedeen & Ritchey, 2009) during review for tenure and promotion.

**Value Systems**

Value system refers to work ethic, ambition and passion for work (i.e. personal aspirations), as well as a belief in the ability to have both career and family rather than choose between them. The definition of value system in this study differed slightly from Ezzedeen and Ritchey’s (2009) inductive model, which identified value systems as a negotiation strategy that included ambition, passion for work, and a belief in luck and good fortune. Although some participants did express having luck or good fortune, work ethic, ambition, and passion for work did not emerge as a strategy for how female faculty negotiate the tensions between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations. In other words, female faculty did not express that having value systems including ambition and work ethic as a strategy used to minimizing these tensions. Instead, this study found that the academic workplace culture, and particularly promotion-based expectations, to be a challenge for female faculty. This difference in findings between female faculty and executive businesswomen suggests variation in workplace culture that may contribute to or minimize tensions for women in pursuit of promotion.
Financial Social Support

This study found that female faculty outsource different aspects of their paid and domestic responsibilities using financial support to negotiate the tensions between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations. Nicole commented that “we do have a housekeeper that does some cleaning and um the laundry and stuff…” and several of the participants discussed daycare and paid childcare through organizations or individuals. Kim was the only participant who mentioned outsourcing of paid labor insofar as graduate students do most of the writing for publications that she formerly did herself, stating “now I have grad students do a lot of the research…so it’s a little less of my own independent work.” It is important to note that Kim does not say that having graduate students do more of the writing gives her more time for family. While current literature exists to demonstrate that female faculty outsource domestic labor, very little literature exists on the outsourcing of paid labor through a financial hierarchy. The academic context is unique in this respect as faculty are in many ways entrepreneurs, obtaining grants to conduct research and allocating funds differently than female executives in business wherein organizations control the hiring process for paid labor.

Workplace Strategies

This study found that although women faculty sometimes employed policies as professional social supports such as FMLA and maternity leave that enabled them to manage career and family, they did not always employ these policies to negotiate tensions either because there were limitations to the policies (“can only stop tenure clock once”) or because they employed alternate negotiation strategies such as life course strategies to plan the timing of pregnancy. The strategy of timing pregnancies to negotiate work-family tensions is consistent
with the literature by Armenti (2004) in which female faculty meticulously plan the timing of pregnancy with respect to tenure due to a belief that having children before achieving tenure is detrimental to their career.

The strategy of timing pregnancy subverts policies that supposedly facilitate female faculty’s ability to have a baby and achieve tenure status, such as stopping the tenure clock and maternity leave. Utilizing such policies in a gendered organization that privileges men may be understood as an inherent act of defiance, especially when policy information is hidden in a culture of silence and difficult to access. Female faculty may expect protection from gender discrimination after achieving tenure or time pregnancy to avoid using such policies in order to maintain the appropriate gender role as submissive, nurturing and caregiving female rather than utilizing policies that defy the ideal worker norm (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012) and exhibiting masculine traits of agency, independence, and dominance.

**Reflections of the Researcher**

Researcher reflexivity is the researcher’s ability to recognize and document their own fluid and changing experiences and inform their study and its outcomes. Rigorous qualitative research requires being aware of how our own environment, thoughts, personal and social histories, and feelings inform us as we converse with participants, transcribe the conversations and represent them in our writing (Etherington, 2004). The struggles that female faculty encounter as discussed throughout this dissertation are complex and persistent. My interest in this topic is in many ways a reflection of the struggles that I have continuously experienced navigating a career and family prior to graduate school but more poignantly from the ages of 32 to 36, during the course of my doctoral work and this study.
My mother and I have a very close relationship, and she has expressed to me the challenges that both she and my father have encountered as a family trying to work and raise three children in her generation. During the age that I conducted and wrote this study, I also witnessed first-hand my female friends negotiate “work” and “motherhood” in a variety of different ways. I myself experienced challenges to advance my doctoral work while feeling tension with having a family. During the course of this work, I worried about fertility, became pregnant and suffered a miscarriage. As I continue to grapple with the realities of pregnancy, fertility and the sense that family, friends, colleagues, and religious or traditional institutions expect me to perform traditional roles as a good mother, wife, daughter, and member of society, I also continuously negotiate these conflicting responsibilities between work and family.

Over the course of this study I struggled to define the word success and moved away from the term in order to be specific in the scope and focus of my study. I now realize that what drove my interest in understanding the concept of success for women has been my own personal struggle with negotiating the tensions between these two domains of work and family. The conversation about this term for women in particular in the popular media is harmful and misleading in the way that often it portrays women’s experiences as singular, decontextualized, and uniform across populations. This study has allowed me to understand the complexity of this issue and the need to further understand its nuances in order to help both current and future generations of men and women negotiate and ultimately minimize these tensions between work and family.

As the researcher and key instrument for data collection and analysis, I recognize the importance of reflexivity for data validity data verification. I brought my own experience and ontological understanding into the study, which in turn affected my epistemological approach and ultimately my method. Poststructuralist, critical and feminist research paradigms increasingly emphasize the importance of transparency by clearly articulating the researcher’s own values and
experiences as they influence how they choose research questions, methodological approaches, and determine findings (Harrison, MacGibbon, & Morton, 2001; Ortlipp, 2008). My use of journal field notes influenced how I approached subsequent interviews as my thinking evolved, which in turn influenced how I analyzed the data and interpreted findings. For example, I explored the issue of feminine dress after it emerged from an initial interview as a source of tension for female faculty:

“Regarding femininity in the academy and in STEM in particular, with regard to dress: undercurrent of discrimination and questioning being perceived by males as lack of female intelligence…what does that have to do with attire such as “neutral dressing” and the confusion/sentiment around how female faculty should dress.”

Through the process of interviewing and analyzing journal field notes, I recognized how semi-structured interviews as a data collection technique allowed me to explore interesting research avenues as I became aware of them from prior interviews. This ultimately led me to realize that using a different methodological approach or data collection technique (such as surveys or even structured interviews) would have altered the findings.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

Limitations are potential weaknesses the researcher identifies in the study and delimitations are those things that define the scope and boundaries of the study (Gay et al., 2006). This exploratory case study investigated tenure-track female faculty in one university commission for women. Delimitations of this study were the exclusion of non-tenure track members of the commission, male members of the commission, and commission leadership. The findings from this study must be evaluated in light of the limitations of using an inductive design with self-reported data. The study was a unique, revelatory case (Yin, 2003) and is not generalizable across university systems or even university commissions for women (Ely, 1995). Although the study
included female faculty within different disciplines, the design does not allow for exploration of differences between or within disciplines (such as differences between STEM and the humanities).

**Significance of the Findings**

This study contributes to understanding the tensions, conflicts and dilemmas between career and family for women faculty in the world of higher education, which is significant for several reasons. First, this study contributes to adult education practice. Exposing these contradictions between socio-culturally based expectations and career aspirations in the context of the academic workplace contributes to the work-family literature for tenured female faculty and is important for improving the development and delivery of professional development programs for these working women. Therefore this study contributes to adult education practice, research and scholarship.

Second, this study contributes to higher education workplace policy. Organization of the academic workplace continues to reflect inherently male-centric policies (Mitchell, Johnson, & Poglitsch, 2014) that present challenges for women faculty in the achievement of tenure and perceived tension between work and family. Academic policies that do not account for the tensions that female faculty encounter between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations can affect women’s reproductive choices in their negotiation of work and family. For example, limiting female faculty’s ability to stop the tenure clock only once in the pursuit of tenure imposes on her reproductive choices. Understanding the complexity of these tensions between aspirations and expectations contributes to improving such policies for women faculty to marry career and family.
Third, understanding how working women negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in the academic workplace where traditional attitudes about women’s role and beliefs about family conflict with career aspirations and job training benefits both current and future generations of working women who aspire to have a family and career in academia. This study informs policy makers and human resource officials who work toward improving organizational structures to minimize the tension between work and family. Describing the relationship(s) between professional and family variables that shape the tensions in academia that women encounter exposes the competing expectations between feminized and workplace labor within human resources departments and continuing professional education programs.

Recommendations

As stated in the introduction to this dissertation, tensions between personal aspirations in the world of work and socio-culturally based expectations are ongoing and complex for women faculty in higher education. Faculty are an important population to examine for their ability to negotiate the tensions of these domains as they generate and shape public understanding through knowledge generation with research and publications. Taking into consideration the complexities of these tensions and the strategies that female faculty use to negotiate them after comparing the results of the case study with the conceptual framework that guided this study, and the literature review that informed it, I developed the following recommendations for practice and research, each of which should influence the other (see Figure 5-2).
Figure 5-2. Recommendations and Considerations

Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher Education Policy</th>
<th>Cultural Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make family-related policies visible and easy to locate for faculty across departments.</td>
<td>Institute a structured mentoring program for female faculty at each career stage across academic departments. Mentors should be within discipline, when possible, and geographically accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide funding for travel-related care to make travel more navigable for both male and female faculty with care responsibilities at home.</td>
<td>Promote commissions for women within universities so female faculty are aware of this resource and to help usher them through negative emotional components of the tenure process by mitigating fear and helping to overcome the isolation that occurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify existing policies such as stopping the tenure clock to accommodate female faculty who desire to have more than one child on the tenure track.</td>
<td>Make opportunities for collaboration visible to female faculty and educate junior faculty on the importance of collaboration for research productivity and expanding visibility beyond one’s own institution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations for Practice

**Higher Education Policy**

In prior studies of female faculty, scholars have investigated what female tenure track faculty members do to both have children and be “successful” in their academic careers (Mason, Wolfinger & Goulden, 2013; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2015; Wolfinger, Mason & Goulden, 2008).
However, this question does not specifically investigate the complex nature of these tensions nor the dynamics that perpetuate the tensions as women perceive conflicting messages from work-related and socio-culturally based areas of their lives. This study found that female faculty encounter problematic cultural and structural challenges within the higher education workplace in their pursuit of tenure that included promotion-based expectations, culture of silence, changing schedules and geographic dispersion. “Any conversation about contemporary academic careers needs to consider academic structures, restructuring, and academic practices” (Ward, 2015, p. 257). Making adjustments to these policies and structural components of higher education institutions will benefit both male and female faculty in their ability to negotiate the tensions between work and family. Therefore I recommend the following policies and policy adjustments to institutions of higher education to minimize the tensions that female faculty experience in their pursuit of tenure:

1. Make family-related policies visible and easy to locate for faculty across departments.
2. Provide funding for travel-related care to make travel more navigable for both male and female faculty with care responsibilities at home.
3. Modify existing policies such as stopping the tenure clock to accommodate female faculty who desire to have more than one child on the tenure track.

**Cultural Interventions**

This study found that female faculty utilized both personal and professional social support from peers to negotiate the tensions and dilemmas between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. These supports included peers, information networks, and mentors. Institutions of higher education that provide cultural interventions to structure these social supports for female faculty, and particularly junior faculty, will provide a
more inclusive culture for female faculty to advance through the tenure and promotion process (Vongalis-Macrow & SpringerLink, 2014). Therefore I make the following recommendations for improving the culture in academia for female faculty:

1. Institute a structured mentoring program for female faculty at each career stage across academic departments. Mentors should be within discipline, when possible, and geographically accessible.

2. Promote commissions for women within universities so female faculty are aware of this resource and to help usher them through negative emotional components of the tenure process by mitigating fear and helping to overcome the isolation that occurs.

3. Make opportunities for collaboration visible to female faculty and educate junior faculty on the importance of collaboration for research productivity and expanding visibility beyond one’s own institution.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study is particularly important for scholars and researchers as it has direct implications for their work and family lives. Future research should consider the following:

1. Do the findings from this exploratory case study of a university commission for women apply to other commissions for women or other universities? Surveying female faculty members of national professional organizations such as the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) would be an excellent way to do this. Statistical sampling would allow researchers to investigate the generalizability of this study’s findings across institutions and commissions.

2. Do the findings from this study differ by academic discipline? Building on findings from Ward and Wolf-Wendel’s (2015) study that investigates the role of academic discipline
on tenure-track mothers’ careers, more research is needed to understand how female faculty negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations within and across disciplines.

3. How do male faculty members negotiate these same tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia? The body of research investigating men and work-family conflict is growing, but more research is needed to understand the similarities and differences between: challenges that male faculty encounter in pursuit of tenure and promotion, the socio-culturally based (family, religious, traditional, and peer-based) expectations that conflict with male professors’ personal career aspirations, and how male faculty members negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia.
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Appendix A: Case Study Protocol

The following protocol was adapted from Yin (2003, p. 69).

I. Overview of the case study

A. The purpose of this case study was to explore the tensions and dilemmas that female faculty of a university commission for women at a large, public research university expressed between socio-culturally based expectations and personal career aspirations.

II. Field procedures

A. Submitted IRB and secured IRB approval.

B. Emailed potential participants and introduced myself as a researcher (see Appendix B).

C. Explained the purpose of the study, introduced research questions and the procedures that the participant underwent as a part of the study.

D. Reminded participant that participation was voluntary, that they may have ended their participation at any time; and that participants may have chosen not to answer specific questions.

E. Obtained consent (see Appendix C).

F. Scheduled interviews, conducted interviews using the interview guide.

G. Clarified and answered questions for participants during interview.

H. Thanked study participant for their time.

I. Asked for permission to follow-up with participant as appropriate in the future.

J. Asked if participants would like to see transcribed interviews and sent transcriptions to participants to be checked for accuracy.
III. Case study questions

For full interview protocol, see Appendix D.

K. What challenges do women faculty members encounter in their pursuit of career aspirations?

L. What are the socio-cultural (family, religious, traditional) and peer-based expectations that conflict with female faculty’s personal career aspirations?

M. How do female faculty members negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia?

III. Guide for the case study report

A. Context

1. Background

2. Description of current challenges and tensions for women faculty in higher education.

B. Single case analysis.

1. Summarized using tables and themes from interviews and secondary documentation.
Appendix B: Email to Participants

---------- Forwarded message ----------

From: Elizabeth Shakespeare <eshakespeare2@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, Mar 18, 2015 at 12:18 PM

Subject: Doctoral Research Study Participation

To: dsb177@psu.edu

Dear Dr. ___

I hope you are well and enjoying the semester. I am currently an affiliate member of the Commission for Women here at [redacted] University as well as a doctoral candidate in the Adult Education program. I obtained your contact information from the 2013/2014 Commission for Women membership list, and am writing to invite you to participate in my dissertation research study titled *The Tensions and Dilemmas between Personal Aspirations and Social-Cultural Expectations Women Faculty Encounter in Academia.*

A few members of the Commission have already been interviewed, and I think your participation would be both informative and beneficial to the study. I am writing to ask if you would be willing to speak with me for a one-hour interview as part of my data collection. The purpose of my research is to explore how female faculty members negotiate the tensions between personal career aspirations and socially or culturally based expectations in academia, and I have attached the consent form that has more details about this IRB-approved study. Please let me know if you have any questions and if you would be able to participate. I will be happy to meet with you at a time and location most convenient for you, or via Skype or Adobe Connect.

Kind regards,

Beth
Elizabeth Shakespeare Smith
PhD Candidate, Adult Education
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802
Appendix C: Consent Form

HRP- 590 - ORP Summary Explanation Research (Exempt Research) (06/19/2014)

Note: This Summary Explanation of Research for Exempt Research template may be used as a
guide for developing and obtaining informed consent in exempt human subject research.

You do not have to use this template, but subjects MUST be informed of the following:
• The researcher identifies him/herself as a Penn State researcher;
• The study is being conducted for research;
• A description of the procedures that the subject will undergo as part of the study;
• The individual’s participation is voluntary;
• They may end their participation at any time; and
• Subjects may choose not to answer specific questions.

Please note that the IRB DOES NOT review and approve informed consent forms for exempt
studies and this document DOES NOT need to be provided to the IRB.

Delete this box and instructions before saving your final form. Instructions are included in italics
below.

SUMMARY EXPLANATION OF RESEARCH

The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: The Tensions and Dilemmas between Personal Aspirations and Social-Cultural Expectations Women Faculty Encounter in Academia

Principal Investigator: Elizabeth Shakespeare

Telephone Number:

Advisor: Ladislaus Semali

Advisor Telephone Number:

You are being invited to volunteer to participate in a research study. This summary explains
information about this research.

• We are asking you to be in this research because you are a tenured or tenure-track female
  faculty member. The purpose of this research is to explore how female faculty members
  negotiate the tensions between personal aspirations and social-cultural expectations.
• This exploratory case study will use qualitative methods (interviews) to explore how female
  faculty members negotiate the tensions between personal aspirations and social-cultural
  expectations in academia. For this study, only Elizabeth Shakespeare, the Principal
  Investigator (PI), will be conducting the interviews. Each interview will be approximately
one hour in length. These interviews will occur during scheduled meetings with participants. Interviews will be recorded with a private voice recorder and transcribed by the PI, Elizabeth. Elizabeth will contact participants after the interview to confirm that the interviewer correctly heard and interpreted the interview from the participants’ perspective. At any time, the participant is free to skip any questions that she would prefer not to answer. Once the interview has been completed and the data has been analyzed, all data will be stored for 3 years before being destroyed.

- Efforts will be made to limit the use and sharing of your personal research information to people who have a need to review this information. Your data will be kept confidential through the use of a coded identifier. The master list of codes with names will be kept on a password protected hard drive separate from the study data and will be stored in a locked safe, to which only Elizabeth has access. If the master list needs to be printed, it will also be stored in a locked safe in Elizabeth’s residence to which only she has access. All copies of the master list will be stored for 3 years after date of research completion before being destroyed. Your research records will be labeled with your code number and will be kept in a password protected electronic file with the study data, to which only Elizabeth has access. If the research records need to be printed, they will be stored in a locked safe in Elizabeth’s residence with other hard copy data for this study to which only she has access. All copies of the research records will be stored for 3 years after date of research completion before being destroyed.

- In the event of any publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared.

Some of these records could contain information that personally identifies you. Reasonable efforts will be made to keep the personal information in your research record private. However, absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

If you have questions or concerns, please contact Elizabeth Shakespeare. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject or concerns regarding your privacy, you may contact the Office for Research Protections.

Your participation is voluntary and you may decide to stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to answer.

Your participation implies your voluntary consent to participate in the research.
Appendix D: Interview Protocol

Interview Protocol

Opening Script: Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study. My name is Elizabeth Shakespeare, and you can reach me at the contact information on the consent form at any time after this discussion if you have questions or would like to add anything to your responses. This research is for a dissertation titled “The Tensions and Dilemmas between Personal Aspirations and Socio-culturally Based Expectations Women Faculty Encounter in Academia.” The purpose of this exploratory case study is to investigate how female faculty members negotiate the tensions and dilemmas that they encounter between personal aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations in academia. I am going to ask you a number of questions and ask that you respond honestly. The interview should take approximately 1 hour. Do you mind if I record this interview for transcription? It will not be shared with anyone.

Do you mind if I record this interview for transcription? It will not be shared with anyone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Identifier</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
<th>Answers/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Do feel this issue is relevant issue in your life? Please describe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Did you always aspire to be a faculty member?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Please describe some of the more challenging aspects of your work life, such as any obstacles you have encountered and how you overcame them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>What are some of the challenges that you have encountered at home during your pursuit of an academic career?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Can you describe a time when romantically-based expectations to be a good partner contradicted with your aspirations to achieve tenure?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>How do you perceive culturally-based expectations of you to perform certain roles such as household labor while also aspiring to be a successful academic?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>How do you evaluate religiously-based expectations such as being a good wife while also aspiring to pursue excellence in academia?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>How do you view family-based expectations such as being a good mother when at the same time you aspired to achieve tenure?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Can you describe a time when you felt a dilemma between traditionally-based expectations such as caring for elderly parents when at the same time you aspired to be a tenured professor?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>How do you make sense of expectations from peers such as being feminine while also aspiring to climb the academic ladder?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Please add anything you think is important regarding how you negotiate these tensions between personal career aspirations and socio-culturally based expectations that we have not covered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Closing Script: That concludes my prepared questions. Do you have any additional comments you would like to add or any questions for me? Would you mind if I contact you for follow up questions or clarification? Would you like to read the transcript after I have typed it up?
Appendix E: Commission for Women Participants & Interview Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Application Year</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Follow-up Email</th>
<th>Interview Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliates</td>
<td>Association Professor</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Agreed to participate in follow-up interview</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Agreed to participate in follow-up interview</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Agreed to participate in follow-up interview</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Agreed to participate in follow-up interview</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Agreed to participate in follow-up interview</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Agreed to participate in follow-up interview</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Agreed to participate in follow-up interview</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All interviews were conducted in-person at the office of the Commission for Women.
Appendix F: Open Coding Data Analysis

stopped asking me. Ya know they finally said, OK, or I'll get that, oh, ya don't ya don't feel you missed out on it at all? And I'm like I really don't. I teach a lot of students every semester, and I have a job that I spent a lot of nurturing with. And my husband I'm kind of nurturing as well. So I feel that I don't want to have the lifestyle for myself of caring for...an underdeveloped being like that because I've been trained to think so critically that it doesn't appeal to me to teach words and that kind of thing at that level. But also...and I don't want to reproduce myself. It's one...one [of self] is more than enough. I don't have a religious background, I mean I do in that being Catholicism, but I no longer feel compelled to my religion to reproduce. So, and, ya know, I was in a Ph.D. program through 28, 29. And then it was like, OK, maybe after I get tenure. And so that was ya know like the 30s, then, and then it just never arrived. And then I kept, I sorta kept it in my mind, but I was going to get remarried. I told my husband, I said look, don't marry me if you want to have children. Because I never really had the urge and I don't see it happening. It is possible, and we can discuss it but it's very unlikely. So that's how it's been.

ES: Do you think that; can you talk to me about if you feel that that tension between the expectations to have kids and your career caused...did that have any impact on your marriage in your opinion?

4: Um, good question. I...I don't actually...so I met my current husband through um Match.com. And so when I created a profile, I had it on there. That, ya know, I love dogs, and ya know I really take care of my dogs, and ya know I don't have children, and ya know maybe in the future, but...and I was looking for people who didn't have kids, and ya know didn't necessarily want kids, and so I was pretty clear about that from the beginning. And, I don't think that my husband...every so often I'll say to my husband, ya know, when we've been around children...that ya know, do...are you sorry we don't have our own? And he says, nope. I'm like, me either! So it has probably made us closer because we are each other's family, and of course we have extended family. But by the time I remarried, I was...I had it down, I mean it's like sometimes people say, ya know, don't you want kids? 'Cause it's a compulsory thing. Ya know it's kind of like compulsory heterosexuality. People ya know get married, and especially because I got married, it was like, well ya know you got married, don't you want to have kids? And, yeah, and I wanted partnership, and and a kind of family that I could manage, and especially when I...when I, my husband and I are separated during the week, we don't even have the kind of lifestyle that makes family life...well, not really possible. I mean, it would be a huge problem to try and resolve that. But with my first marriage I was bugged all the time. I think now they see that I'm very menopausal and probably won't happen, and...but at the time I...I was bothered by it a lot, like why don't you? You'd be a great mother, you're so great with your dog, or something ya know the kind of
### Appendix G: Codes by Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjunction with young children</td>
<td>adapt</td>
<td>alter schedule</td>
<td>age during Ph.D.</td>
<td>carve out time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspired to motherhood</td>
<td>career commitment</td>
<td>ask for help</td>
<td>ambiguity of academia</td>
<td>challenge of publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career aspirations</td>
<td>childcare support</td>
<td>aspirations for motherhood</td>
<td>ambiguity of academia</td>
<td>changing schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career commitment</td>
<td>childcare support</td>
<td>career commitment</td>
<td>aspirations for motherhood</td>
<td>demands of parenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenge of funding</td>
<td>collaboration</td>
<td>changing schedule</td>
<td>career aspirations</td>
<td>demands of parenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changing schedule</td>
<td>compartmentalizing</td>
<td>childcare</td>
<td>challenge</td>
<td>demands of service work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choice of university for family (quality of university?)</td>
<td>constant flipping compartmentalizing</td>
<td>childcare</td>
<td>challenge to publish</td>
<td>discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural expectation to stay home</td>
<td>cost of childcare</td>
<td>collaboration</td>
<td>child before Ph.D.</td>
<td>discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>division of labor</td>
<td>culturally-based expectations of women</td>
<td>compartmentalize</td>
<td>colleagues understand</td>
<td>equitable division of labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectation for staying home with young children</td>
<td>discrimination pushes women out</td>
<td>cultural expectation to stay home</td>
<td>cultural, religious expectations</td>
<td>expectations for children being home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectations for role as mother</td>
<td>dual career challenge</td>
<td>expectation for elderly caregiving</td>
<td>discrimination</td>
<td>expectations for faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family burden shifts over time</td>
<td>expectation for elderly caregiving</td>
<td>division of labor</td>
<td>discrimination</td>
<td>expectations for role as mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family childcare when working</td>
<td>expectation for grandchildren</td>
<td>division of labor</td>
<td>division of labor</td>
<td>family based expectations for role as mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geographic change for work</td>
<td>expectation for role as daughter</td>
<td>expectations differ by discipline</td>
<td>expectations for attire as woman in academia</td>
<td>family based expectations for women's work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geographic distance from discipline</td>
<td>expectations for publishing</td>
<td>expectations for college vs. work</td>
<td>expectations for children</td>
<td>family-based expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guilt about sick children</td>
<td>family doesn't understand professorship</td>
<td>expectations for elderly care</td>
<td>expectations for college</td>
<td>fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how to say no</td>
<td>family far away</td>
<td>expectations for elderly care</td>
<td>expectations for college</td>
<td>femininity in academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intense mothering</td>
<td>feeling behind</td>
<td>family childcare</td>
<td>expectations for grandchildren</td>
<td>hazing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentorship</td>
<td>geographic proximity of mentors</td>
<td>financial background</td>
<td>expectations for role as wife</td>
<td>housekeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentorship</td>
<td>intense mothering (or responsibilities of care?)</td>
<td>free family childcare</td>
<td>expectations for role as wife</td>
<td>husband caregiver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix H: Pattern Matching Codes to Propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Pattern Matching (CF &amp; Propositions)</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>but um my family is in California, so I don't have like immediate</td>
<td>Proximity of family</td>
<td>geographic distance of family</td>
<td>challenges</td>
<td>challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family here and so the family pressures may be aren't as significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for me as they may be for others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But um, I do think there are tensions in all those areas that you</td>
<td>Research tension</td>
<td>expectations for research</td>
<td>tension</td>
<td>challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentioned between sort of what expectations are for faculty,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>especially at Penn State where there's a strong research component.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What, and of course this is just my impression, but that uh we see</td>
<td>women as teachers</td>
<td>teacher vs. faculty</td>
<td>tension</td>
<td>socio-culturally based expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a lot of women, yeah we being American culture I guess. Of seeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a lot of women as teachers especially of younger children, and that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seems somewhat a more acceptable role in society. I mean, you don't</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see a lot of female professors portrayed in television or movies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But you see a lot of elementary school teachers. Um, women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elementary school teachers and high school teachers in the media,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for example, and I think a lot of folks don't understand in academia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that it's not just teaching but also research that's involved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that's um, I think there are still areas where women are</td>
<td>expectations for women as researchers</td>
<td>women's labor</td>
<td>tension</td>
<td>socio-culturally based expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not perceived as being researchers, um, people. Even though women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make up a large majority of Ph.D.s these days a lot of people I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>think still don't expect that, I guess?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was very interested and my immediate family had no problems with</td>
<td>supportive family</td>
<td>supportive family</td>
<td>strategy</td>
<td>how negotiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had a roommate in college who, um, her parents, eh, wanted her...</td>
<td>peers had tension</td>
<td>observed tension in others</td>
<td>tension</td>
<td>socio-culturally based expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she wanted to do research also, but her parents wanted her to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what they considered a more traditional position like uh being a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pharmacist or doctor or something, but not an academic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But so, and, I, the typical day I do spend a lot of time at the</td>
<td>works weekends</td>
<td>weekend work</td>
<td>strategy</td>
<td>how negotiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>office, so I'd say... there's a lot of flexibility but I say that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually come in about 9 and leave about 5 or 6 so that's a typical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work day but then I'm usually also working on the weekends. Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessarily, um, on campus, but at home and since I'm at a y a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know commonwealth campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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