

University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

12-2021

In the balance: perceptions of work-family balance for women in higher education.

Aubrey Radford Woolley
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>



Part of the [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), and the [Work, Economy and Organizations Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Woolley, Aubrey Radford, "In the balance: perceptions of work-family balance for women in higher education." (2021). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 3755.

Retrieved from <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd/3755>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

IN THE BALANCE: PERCEPTIONS OF WORK-FAMILY BALANCE FOR WOMEN
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

By
Aubrey Radford Woolley
B.S., University of Louisville, 2010
B.A., University of Louisville, 2010

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences of the
University of Louisville in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts in Sociology

Department of Sociology
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

December 2021

IN THE BALANCE: PERCEPTIONS OF WORK-FAMILY BALANCE FOR WOMEN
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

By

Aubrey Radford Woolley

B.S., University of Louisville, 2010

B.A., University of Louisville, 2010

A Thesis Approved on

December 08, 2021

By the following Thesis Committee:

Thesis Director

Hiromi Taniguchi, Ph.D.

Cynthia Negrey, Ph.D.

Karen Christopher, Ph.D.

Ann Herd, Ph.D.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my daughter,

Katharine Woolley Knight

May you come know a better world than the ones who have come before you, and
endeavor to make a better one for those who will come after you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the chair of my committee, Dr. Hiromi Taniguchi for her persistence, patience, and unfaltering support. I would also like to thank the committee members, Dr. Karen Christopher, Dr. Cynthia Negrey and Dr. Ann Herd for their commitment, understanding and unmeasurable assistance through out this process. I would also like to express my gratitude to Dr. Jonetta Weber, for her relentless support. Lastly, thank you to my husband, Brian Knight, for always understanding and listening.

ABSTRACT

IN THE BALANCE: PERCEPTIONS OF WORK, FAMILY AND BALANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Aubrey Radford Woolley

December 08, 2021

Striking a balance between paid work and family work is hard for many individuals. Previous research has focused on the availability and effectiveness of family friendly policies and demonstrated a need for continued research. I examine work-family balance among women working in higher education. My study asks what are the determinants for work-family balance? I draw on institutional data from the fall 2017 Campus Climate and Diversity Survey which in part focuses on work-family balance. My regression analysis shows that faculty have a lower perception of work-family balance than non-faculty. For both non-faculty and faculty, support from supervisor/chairperson and to a lesser extent from co-workers, has a positive effect on work-family balance. For both groups, having dependents has a negative effect on work-family balance, but this effect is much stronger for faculty. I discuss the lower perception of work-family balance among faculty in the tension between schedule control and unbounded work hours.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	4
Work, Family and Balance.....	4
Work.....	4
Higher Education.....	7
Family.....	9
Work-family Balance.....	11
Academia and work-family balance.....	16
CHAPTER 3: METHODS.....	21
Data and Sample.....	21
Variables.....	22
Dependent variable.....	22

Independent variable.....	22
Data Analysis Model.....	23
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	
Findings.....	24
Descriptive Statistics.....	24
Regression Analysis.....	25
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	
Implications.....	35
Limitations.....	35
REFERENCES.....	37
APPENDICES.....	43
Appendix A.....	43
CURRICULUM VITA.....	46

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Finding balance between the domains of work and family has been a focal point of both employees and employers alike for the past several decades, as has understanding the relationship between work and family for social researchers (Parkes and Langford, 2008). The needs of the home life and the work responsibilities to support those needs have remained consistent. The presence of dual earner families, regardless of parental status, questions the allocation of time and energy to both work and family and is salient to work-family balance research.

Women have steadily made strides in educational attainment, earning the majority of college degrees, and entering the paid workforce in greater numbers over the past 40 years, comprising nearly half of the current workforce, narrowing the employment gap between men and women (Bradley, 2000; NECS, 2018; BLS, 2019). Meanwhile, women have remained the homemakers, thus promoting discourse on work-family balance and need for research (Wang and Parker, 2020).

Acker (1990, 1992) argues that organizations become gendered in their structure as a result of the underlying assumptions of gender which are already present. Due to the underlying assumptions about masculinity and femininity gendered organizations influence work-family conflict through the reflection and replication of the same challenges faced by women at home as well as at work: employers' preferences for an

unencumbered worker, the sex segregation of jobs, and informal practices that benefit men.

Student enrollment in higher education steadily declined 1-2% per year from 1991-2017- totaling a 30% decline while the workforce in the same sector during the same period increased by 34% (NECS, 2019). Females comprise 55% of the total staff (including faculty) in degree-granting institutions that grant associate's or higher degrees and participate in Title IV federal financial aid programs. Additionally, women show the most growth in enrollment and graduation with a 38% increase during the 1991-2017 timeframe (NECS, 2019). Higher education is an industry in which the labor market is steadily increasing, in particular for women.

The structure of higher education and academia provide an opportunity to examine how two groups of working women perceive work-family balance. It is anticipated the inherent differences between the two groups, from the structure of their respective roles to pressures and demands, will produce a different perception on the measure. This research will aim to address the question: How do women working in higher education perceive their work family balance and what may or may not influence this perception? Where work-family balance research has historically focused on establishing a need to balance work and family responsibilities or the existence for employers to offer policies to help achieve said balance, the impact of culture and informal support on balance is central to this discussion. The research question: How do women working in higher education perceive their work family balance and what may or may not influence this perception? is necessary to ask since the advancement of so many women working in this industry. The literature demonstrates women working in higher

education face both similar and unique challenges as women in other sectors of the workforce, except the literature lacks clear research on how the unique aspects of higher education impacts the perception of work-family balance including the impact of a supportive culture and the presence of dependents. These guiding research questions are whether or not the variables of informal support, marriage or dependent status change the perception of work family balance for women working in higher education.

Research on work-family balance encompasses a duality of themes. On one end of the spectrum is work and the other family. Work takes the viewpoint of career, education for specialized training in hopes of a career, economic power and leverage in the workplace, advancement, and opportunity for advancement, all of which only begin to cover the expansive role 'work' takes in the finite amount of time in a day, week, month, year. The other half of the equation is family and other pursuits outside of work. This covers in very broad terms everything outside of work, children, spouses, homes, chores, leisure, the list could be endless, however family and life are also subject to a finite amount of time the same as work.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Work, Family and Balance

The literature on the three spheres of work, family, and balance has a few main concepts that help to contextualize and explore the relationship between work and family as they relate to women working in higher education. This includes the definition of gendered institutions, paid work and non-paid work, the competing demands between work and family, and the conflict of time as it relates to work and the impact on balance all within the scope of the unique structure of higher education. Central to this research on work-family balance is the discussion of the gendered institution of both work and family. The gendered institution of higher education is salient to the discussion on work-family balance in this research.

Work

Workplaces and families are both gendered institutions that draw from and reflect our gendered culture, ideologies, and distribution of power (Acker, 1992; Lorber, 1994). Padavic and Reskin (2002) argue that workplaces are gendered due to: (1) the assignment of tasks based on workers' sex, (2) the higher value placed on men's work than on women's work, and (3) employers' and workers' social constructions of gender on the job (p. 6). The unencumbered worker, who is "unfettered by care-giving responsibilities"

(Misra et al. 2012 p. 302) reflects the cultural beliefs about gender, masculinity, and femininity. Using this definition, both work and the workplace is a gendered institution where the social norms are reproduced (Acker 1990, 1992; Pitt-Catsouphes, Kossek and Sweet, 2006). Since the gendered social norms are reflected in the organizations, the organizations are not gender-neutral but rather gendered (Acker 1990, 1992; Risman and Davis, 2012).

The discussion on work with respect to work-family balance can include both paid and un-paid work. The institutions of work and family can be viewed as gendered as well as time. The “gendered time” (Sirianni and Negrey, 2000; Negrey, 2012) of work mirrors the larger reflection that if the work is gendered, then the organization is also gendered, thus resulting in gendered labor whether at home or workplace where women still perform the majority of domestic labor (Acker, 1992 and Bianchi et al. 2008).

Paid work is masculinized (Acker, 1990; Collinson and Hearn, 1994; Martin, 2003) and because masculinity holds greater value than femininity (Scott, 1986; Foster, 1999; Kelly, 1999), paid work is valued over domestic work. The intersection of unpaid work and paid work, which are in constant conflict, place women in an inherently disadvantaged position (Thompson, 2014; Noor, 2004; Posig and Kickul, 2004; Barnett and Gareis, 2000; Parkes and Langford, 2008; Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985; Coser, 1974 and Sullivan, 2014). First, in reviewing key aspects of paid work is the concept of the ideal worker. The long established “ideal worker” is male, unencumbered, and allowed to focus solely on paid work, without any interruptions (Wilk, 2016; Williams, 2004). The male ideal worker likely has a spouse/partner whose primary focus is centered on the very aspects of life which could interfere with their paid work. The ideal worker devotes

themselves to work with little outside interference. This idea is distinguished as a masculine reflection and supported by the belief that the unencumbered worker is optimal; this is an idea developed and reaffirmed over the 20th century, in spite of women (who are often not unencumbered) entering the paid workforce (Blair-Loy, 2003; Williams, 2000). According to Gina and Cabral-Cardoso (2008) “gender differences in organizations are reinforced by the dominant cultural system that associates women with domestic life and characterizes them as emotional, passionate and intuitive, while men are associated with public life and characterized as rational, analytical, productive, and insensitive to personal and life concerns” (p. 444) indicating the workplace is a microcosm of the larger society and its gendered beliefs (Fraser and Hodge, 2000).

Utilizing the view where the workplace is a gendered institution, particular organizations and women’s roles within those organizations also demonstrate the challenges faced by women. The “Occupational Ghettos” where women’s access to well-paid jobs, job networks and economic resources are reduced due to occupational sex segregation are one type of stereotype women face (Charles and Grusky, 2004; Korabik, Lero, Whitehead, and Whitehead, 2008). Maternal wall bias, is another stereotype where women are perceived to be less capable and less competent because of their gender. Maternal wall bias, in turn negatively impacts their ability to work and commit themselves fully to their role and to the organization exists for women regardless of parental status (Williams, 2004). Women working in university non-instructional staff roles may be subjected to the occupational ghettos more so than faculty because they hold a disproportionate number of lower paying clerical and support positions (AAUW, 2020;

Bichsel and McChesney, 2017). Both maternal wall bias and occupational ghettos present stereotypes women must contend with in the workplace.

The guiding research question for this study is how women working in higher education perceive work-family balance. Therefore, when examining the larger picture of the overall more generalized “workplace”, regardless of specific career, where do women fall within the conversation of perceived balance and what, if anything, influences their perception? Contextualizing the workplace as a gendered institution begins to frame the research within the paradigm of a gendered institution where the normative ideal worker presumptions are at play. This informs the research question through the idea that women are subjected to the environment in which the work and if the environment is inherently stereotyped, as demonstrated with maternal wall bias, women may face additional pressure to address the stereotype. The research question on perception of work-family balance includes the need to understand the workplace setting where underlying assumptions influence the perceptions.

Higher Education

Higher education highlights the organizational differences and disparities in jobs held by women. The organizational structure of higher education, while similar to any other organizational structure, is also unique in important ways that might affect work-family balance. Since this research is centered on the perceptions of individuals who are working in higher education, there are distinct qualities that must be initially established about higher education to help frame the context of the research.

One component of higher education is the organizational structure. There are “vertical” elements within the silos of the research institutes, individual schools, colleges,

and departments which are combined with the “horizontal” elements of the administration and central offices that regulate policies, central budgets, and funding. Regardless of the type of institution of higher education (private, public, large, small, liberal arts, research) all of these elements are present and possibly create tensions within institutions (Keeling, Underhile and Wall, 2007).

Lewis Coser (1974) defined a concept of “greedy institutions” in which he explored how various organizations or groups compete for attention of an individual within the constraints of limited resources, i.e. time and energy. Some examples of greedy institutions are education, economy, and family. The institution of higher education is not exempt from being one of the “greedy institutions” that Coser discusses as reflected through the requirements for faculty of education, publishing, and research as well as teaching requirements. When any one of the institutions requires more of an individual’s resources than can be accommodated, the institution can become greedier (Coser, 1974; Sullivan, 2014).

The type of employment a person holds within higher education, may control to which the extent the greedy institution impacts them. The distinct qualities higher education holds in contrast to other organizations includes the division of instructional and non-instructional staff. The administrative and support staff jobs within universities frequently resemble those found in companies outside of higher education (such as financial, clerical, human resource, and information technology etc.) and are not overly unique. Similar to organizations outside of higher education, women who are in roles of support staff are more likely subjected to the occupational ghettos, through the disproportionate number of women in clerical positional, lower paid positions and

lacking representation in higher paying administrative roles, thus lending the discussion to reflect something more about the work faculty do that may lead to a lack of perceived balance (AAUW, 2020; Bichsel and McChesney, 2017).

Family

The literature to this point has focused on paid market work. The domestic, often unpaid work may include, but is not limited to, childcare, elder care, household care/chores, disability care, etc. This type of unpaid work is considered to be female centered domestic work and subordinate to the market work (male) (Acker, 1990; Bielby and Bielby, 1988; Gina and Cabral-Cardoso, 2008; Hochschild, 1997; Mennino et al. (2005); Noor, 2002; Lewis et al., 2003; Posig and Kickul, 2004). The division of labor (including childcare) between men and women is still gendered. While it is noted that men and women generally perform (on average) the same amount of paid work, the unpaid work is still predominately done by women (Bianchi, Sayer, Milkie and Robinson, 2012). Change over the past several decades has occurred, leading men to take on additional childcare and household chores. In spite of men's increased participation in household chores, the gap remains with women performing roughly twice the amount of unpaid household work (Bianchi, 2011).

Gendered institutions are not mutually exclusive to the workplace; family and domestic life also reflect a gendered institution in which the roles at home are sex segregated. The gendered cultural norms surrounding sex segregated roles in the family that mothers- not fathers- experience, lend itself to the assumption that women place care before themselves, including their careers, can in turn hurt their careers and employment

prospects. This is not necessarily a choice that women make but rather the outcome of sex segregated roles and culture norms.

Children are not the only aspect of unpaid work responsibilities that women may face at home; motherhood and the social norms surrounding both having children and caring for them is salient in the discussion on work-family balance. One hypothesis, the ‘devotion to family schema,’ is the general assumption that women will place family first and is aligned with the long-held assumption that the distinction is based on biological sex (Lorber, 1994). The family devotion schema reaffirms the gendered division of labor in the family and home. “Intensive mothering” is the idea that women should be the primary caregivers to children and devote themselves and their time to child-rearing (Hays, 1996). Hays (1996) found the consistent ideology that women should ultimately place the needs of their children before themselves, due to the long-held belief in mothering and family devotion as the primary vocation for wives and mothers, whereas paid work is seen as a “choice” (Blair-Loy, 2003; Garey, 1999). Women are having to deny the ideal worker norm in order to support the family devotion schema (Blair-Loy, 2003; Charles and Grusky, 2004).

The presence of children in the family structure is not the only context in which women face the normalization of the gendered division of domestic labor. Due to the cultural normative expectations of motherhood women are disproportionately expected to place family demands before their career and in turn, impeding equity in either the workplace or home (Williams & Dempsey, 2014). Williams (2004) defined a type of gender bias women face as the “maternal wall” where mothers face discrimination in the workplace because of having children or the potential that they may have children.

Work-family Balance

The work and family research centers on the balance of competing demands and predominantly for women the division between paid work (i.e. careers) and nonpaid work (i.e. life, family, and everything outside of paid work). Research has operationalized balance as equal time, harmony, or equilibrium (Clarke, Koch, and Hill, 2004).

Grzywacz and Carlson (2007) define work-family balance as the “accomplishment of role-related expectations that are negotiated and shared between an individual and his or her role-related partners in the work and family domains” (p. 458).

The discussion on the relationship of work and non-work has heavily centered on time and the idea of “conflict” (Greenhaus and Powell 2006). The term “balance” can also be deemed in this same manner of addressing a woman’s competing devotions (Blair-Loy, 2003). The discussion on balance in context of work-family research lends itself to the idea that the two spheres of paid work and non-paid work (or family) are often incompatible due to the issue of time, and energy. Researchers in the area of work-family balance support the ideology that individuals have a finite amount of both energy and time and when obligations (whether family or work) are in competition imbalance will occur. The inability to achieve balance in both leads to inter-role conflict and role overload by the inability to maintain both spheres (Noor, 2004). Work-family balance is considered conflict because the two roles, work, and family, have competing demands that can’t be met due to time constraints (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985).

Imbalance happens where boundaries between work and home are not clearly defined and as such workers can experience both work-to-family and family-to-work conflict. Schieman et al. (2009) report that about 70% of both men and women report

some work to nonwork interference and that women report the highest levels of interference. Interference is reflective of the imbalance between the competing spheres or domains of work and family (Chang, McDonald, and Burton, 2010). Both conflict and interference are reciprocal concepts in that individuals experience the impact of demands in one life sphere encroaching into others (Greenhaus and Powell, 2006). Although the terminology surrounding work-family research has vacillated between the distinct phrases of “conflict”, “interference”, “spillover” and “balance” for the purpose of this research and discussion- the focus will remain on work-family balance.

Spillover is an additional concept that the literature addresses in the discussion on balance and the competing demands. When the individual’s primary role or member organization spillover into the other sphere, conflict and competition ensues between the two spheres (Thompson, 2014; Noor, 2004; Posig and Kickul, 2004; Barnet and Gareis, 2000; Parkes and Langford, 2008; Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985; Coser, 1974 and Sullivan, 2014). Spillover is operationalized as the effects of stress, tension, moods, emotions, or behaviors as they originate in either the family sphere or work sphere and move on to other spheres (Keene and Quadagno, 2004; Mennino, Rubin and Brayfield, 2005).

In contrast, if an individual enjoys their work, work environment and culture, they may also experience the positive spillover into the sphere beyond work. Although the literature heavily focuses on spillover as a negative experience, spillover can also be a positive experience, especially if there is good “fit” and strong role salience (Clarke, Koch, and Hill, 2004; Noor, 2004; Pitt-Catsouphes and Christensen, 2004). Individuals who experience positive work or family interactions also report satisfaction with their

work-family balance (James et al., 2015). The indicators of good fit are workplace autonomy, engagement and (for women) high levels of social support from co-workers and supervisors (Chambel, Lopes, Carvalho and Cesario, 2017). In addition to the literature on balance, conflict and spillover, work/family border theory also highlights the intersection between two domains. Campbell Clark (2000) posits that the two domains of paid work and non-paid work have permeable “borders” in which the individual moves between, navigating and negotiating both the emotional links as well as the social and behavioral aspects of the two domains (p. 749).

To help navigate between the two domains, literature shows employees need flexibility in their schedule to accommodate the need for balance. This has led employers looking to implement practices to progressively address the demands of what may draw an employee away from their work. Formal policies considered to be ‘family-friendly’ offered by some organizations are thought to increase an employee’s commitment to the organization. These ‘high-performance work practices’ have a positive impact on the worker’s ability to balance work and family and result in stronger commitment to the organization (Berg, Kalleberg and Applebaum, 2003). Many employers have tried to shift into schedule control or flexible scheduling, where the employee may alleviate some of the conflict of work-to-family (Jacobs and Gerson 2004; Schieman et. al 2009). Schedule control is when an employer allows the employee to perhaps modify the standard work hours or schedule to better accommodate the employees’ needs outside of the workplace through compressed work weeks or part-time work. Some employers offer policy to formally support and regulate the use of flexible scheduling, except, flexible work

policies also are generally not standardized across organizations and often not equitably available to all employees (Glass et al., 2016; Kelly and Moen, 2007).

The ideal worker is considered to be one that places no limits on the commitment to their job and work, including time limits and is in contrast to one that utilizes schedule control (Acker, 1990). When women request family leave or utilize schedule control, they are doing what women are expected to do: to limit work obligations in favor of family commitments. The unintended cultural implications associated with employees who opt for flexibility policies, which researchers call “flexibility stigma” (Acker, 1990; Allen, 2001; Cech and Blair-Loy, 2014; Chung and van der Lippe, 2018). Essentially, employees (with a focus on women- specifically mothers) who make requests within the scope of flexibility (according to the organizations policies) may face repercussions for violating the “ideal worker” norm. This penalty of the flexibility stigma is not solely applied to women who have children; the flexibility stigma can also apply to men, as well as those who are not parents (Cech and Blair-Loy, 2014). Everybody needs balance, regardless of parental or marital status, however some of the issues which arise that may impede balance such as caregiving responsibilities historically fall to women or are assumed to fall to women given the patriarchal social structure, which in turn creates the disadvantage based on the existing social structure and culture.

Culture plays a significant role in determining the adoption of family friendly policies and may supersede the policy by either encouraging or preventing use of such benefits, primarily when contending with the unbound demands for faculty (Allen, 2001). Policy in place to help workers address work-family balance may not be successful due to

the culture of the organization which may hinder the issue of work-family balance (Blair-Loy, Wharton, and Goodstein, 2011; Williams, Blair-Loy, and Berdahl, 2013).

Supervisor support is an important part of an organizational culture that provides work-family balance (Galinsky and Stein, 1990). Family friendly policies offered by employers, as researchers have seen, is not always an indication of employees' comfort in utilizing these policies. There is a fear of repercussion for employees, especially female employees, if they opt for family friendly policies (Blair-Loy, Wharton, and Goodstein, 2011; Williams, Blair-Loy, and Berdahl, 2013). An estimated 79% of employers in the US (according to a national survey) offer some form of flexible work arrangements, however only 10 to 20% of employees make use of the offered flexibility (Williams, Blair-Loy, and Berdahl, 2013; Williams and Dempsey, 2014). Therefore, although policies may be available and offered as a reflection of the workplace norm or as a part of a legal requirement, due to the culture of the workplace, the policies may not be effective (Sullivan, 2014). The challenges of the cultural normative inherent in paid work, when schedule control is utilized, is stigmatized for violation of the ideal worker framework (Acker, 1990; Cech and Blair-Loy, 2014; Chung and van der Lippe, 2018; Glass et al., 2016; Kelly and Moen, 2007).

Culture may also reflect the level of support from a supervisor which may in turn be influenced by organizational policy as well as hindered by organizational policy. Workplace culture, which is comprised of both formal policies and support from both colleagues and supervisors, may help in determining the ability for an individual to find balance (Warren and Johnson 1995; Galinsky et al. 1996; Thompson et al. 1999). Mennino, Rubin and Brayfield (2005) found that a supportive workplace, including a

supportive supervisor and a supportive environment lowers the negative spillover of work-to-family conflict. Additionally, informal attributes of supportive workplaces, which would include supportive coworkers and supervisors affect the negative spillover (Mennino, Rubin and Brayfield, 2005).

The underlying assumptions of the gendered workplace may impede the desire or ability for an individual to utilize the opportunities for the policies to help work-family balance. The workplace culture may inform the use of policies or impact the perceptions of work-family balance and this informs the research through providing the underlying assumptions women face.

Academia and work-family balance

Women working in higher education, regardless of caregiving responsibilities, may find difficulties in achieving balance because of the underlying assumptions which permeate society and the workplace. The research focuses on the institutions of higher education and how women who have one foot in each sphere (work and family) perceive their role in each as well as the balance.

The demands for faculty create an environment of unbounded work in which the boundaries between work and family often do not reflect a 9-5 job. Pressures faced by faculty can be seen through the demands required for their roles in order to achieve higher ranking positions and publication in the most prestigious journals. This pressure is difficult to quantify but reflected through the requirements that are needed to achieve advancement in their respective careers. Female faculty members are subjected to the

gendered institution of higher education where they have lower representation in higher paying roles. This is reflected where they are paid less than men at every faculty rank as well as experiencing a 20% pay gap within the leadership roles (AAUW, 2020). Women now make up more than half of the enrollment in colleges and universities as well as hold the majority of bachelor's degrees yet still lag in faculty representation. Women still only make a small percent of full professors and in turn have a higher representation as adjunct faculty and part-time lecturers (AAUW, 2020). Academia is not seen as a family friendly workplace for women who are professors, especially due to the requirements and constraints on seeking tenure. The tenure clock and the timeframe in which most women faculty are expected to achieve tenure coincide with childbearing age. The pressure to achieve these requirements lead to the blurring of the work and family boundaries.

A misconception which frequently presents itself in discussions and research of academia as it relates to work-family balance is the idea that faculty have absolute flexibility with their schedules and time due to having control of their schedules, unlike the majority of most professional or blue-collar workers (Gerten, 2011; Rafnsdóttir and Heijstra, 2013; Schieman et al., 2009). This is a misconception because faculty have requirements that do not allow for total schedule control such as teaching which does not always fall within a '9 to 5' workday.

The timelines of seeking tenure and having children overlap with one another and family friendly policies are not inherently designed to support the unique demands of faculty (Mason, Wolfinger and Goulden, 2013). Misra et al., (2012) note that "Universities are gendered organizations and gendered organizations tend to reflect assumptions of workers unfettered by care-giving responsibilities that are deeply

embedded in the logic of the organization” (p. 302). The literature and research support that women in academia have historically faced challenges in work-family balance, especially when they have children and universities operate as gendered organizations. Due to maternal wall bias, women with (or without) children are even less likely to achieve this status thus relegating them to “second tier” positions as adjunct instructors (Mason, Wolfinger and Goulden, 2013; Williams 2004). Sullivan (2014) noted that the particular timing seeking promotion and subsequently tenure for academics overlap with the typical years for ‘family-building’.

Considering that faculty do not hold positions that are as easily operationalized as support staff positions in terms of hours worked, schedules, and demands or requirements for performance measures, research should distinguish between faculty and staff experiences. Moreover, the overarching institution of higher education provides a unique setting to view work-family balance between academic and non-instructional staff. Literature strongly supports work-family balance as a gendered issue and universities can be viewed as gendered organizations where they reflect the assumptions and cultural norms of sex-segregated work. As previous research demonstrates, female faculty members are subjected to the same inequalities as women working in non-instructional roles, where the pressures and demands to meet the requirements of expected of faculty may point to a potential imbalance in work-family balance.

Informal support through supervisor or coworker support, where formal support through the form of policy may lack influence. Maternal wall bias is a form of discrimination women face and the informal support practices possibly aid the perception of work-family balance, especially where maternal wall bias is ‘triggered’ when women

request flexible work arrangements (Bornstein et al., 2012). Informal support through co-workers and supervisors is salient to the research of work-family balance, as informal support can shape and reshape the culture of an organization. In environments where employees perceive a high degree of informal support, the benefits the employer offered for work-family balance are more likely utilized as well as help to limit negative outcomes where work lack support (Allen, 2001; Behson, 2002; Thompson et al., 1999). The work structure of higher education provides insight into how informal support and schedule control as reflected by faculty, impacts the perception of work-family balance. With the assumption that faculty in higher education have some schedule control, faculty women in higher education still contend with household labor demands which in turn may affect time spent on work demands. Suitor et al. (2001) reported that female faculty spent 43 percent more time on domestic labor where their male counterparts spent 59 percent more time on research, thus highlighting the household responsibilities that women faculty face and the impact on time allocated to their careers. Even with schedule control, more so than other jobs (Bailyn, 2003; Jacobs and Winslow, 2004; Misra et al., 2012) academics tend to have increasingly longer work weeks than in previous years, with an average of more than 50 hours per week (Jacobs and Winslow, 2004). When considering the demands for academics of research, teaching and service (Bailyn, 2003) the increased hours spent on paid work leaves little time for unpaid domestic labor and may place women academics in conflict.

In order to gain insight on work-family balance perceptions in higher education, the following research questions guide this study. How do women working in higher education perceive their work-family balance? Is this reflected equally between

instructional (faculty) and non-instructional (staff) employees or do faculty have a lower perception of work-family balance? Additionally, does the culture of workplace support from either the supervisor (or department chair in the case of faculty) or co-workers impact an employee's feeling of work-family balance?

CHAPTER 3: METHODS

Data and Sample

To address the research question *How do women working in higher education perceive their work-family balance?* I used data from the Diversity/Inclusion, Work Environment and Work/Life Balance module of the Fall 2017 Campus Climate and Diversity Survey that was designed and administered online by the institutional research office of a large Midwestern metropolitan public research university. Its Work/Life Balance section includes 41 questions covering the topics of work-family balance, flexible work schedules, work balance and family care needs. The survey invitation was sent to 6919 university employees (2,545 faculty and 4,509 staff members), and 1,903 (27.5%) responded. Although the response rate is low, it is on par with the response rates from the Campus Climate and Diversity Survey from other years.

I focus on full-time female employees (728 of 1,903 respondents). I focus on full-timers because one of the core ideas of work-family balance is the conflict of time and the finite amount of time in a day or week. Individuals who are part-time would be difficult to include in the analysis since it is possible and probable that they would have other jobs. I feel this could impact their perception of work-family balance and thus would be challenging to make the comparison since the data does not account for work outside of the position at the university. After deleting cases with missing values, my

analysis sample consists of 683 respondents (171 faculty members and 512 staff members). Of the total 683 respondents to the survey, the majority of the responses came from those who are not faculty ($n=512$); however, faculty ($n=171$) were more likely to respond as having a perception of work-family balance as being out of balance than those who were not faculty.

Ethical Considerations

Since this is a secondary analysis of coded institutional data there is minimal risk to the subjects.

Variables

Dependent variable

The dependent variable is based on the respondents' perception of work-family/home life balance and measured with three categories: 1=out of balance, 2=balanced and 3=well balanced. The questionnaire also included a question asking respondents to assess the statement: *It is easy to balance the needs of work and family*- however it was decided not to use this question, since it had a large number of missing responses. The question used for the dependent variable was more inclusive in the wording allowing for a higher response rate.

Independent variables

The independent variables are employment type (1=faculty; 0=staff), dependent status (1=have dependents; 0=otherwise), marital status (1=married/partnered; 0=single),

and perceived support from supervisor/department chair, and perceived co-worker support. Supervisor support is measured with the statement: “My supervisor/department chair understands the importance of maintaining a balance between work life and home life.” Co-worker support is measured with the statement: “My colleagues understand the importance of maintaining a balance between work life and home life.” The respondents assessed these statements on a 5-point scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.”

Data Analysis Model

Ordered logistic regression is chosen because the dependent variable is ordinal. The ordered logit model consists of a set of $k-1$ (i.e., the number of categories minus one) equations. In my analysis of work-family balance, with a score of 1, 2 or 3 (see Dependent variables) each serves as a threshold to divide respondents into two groups, that is, one with scores exceeding the threshold score and the other with scores not exceeding the threshold whereas the threshold indicated the level of work life/home life balance. My analysis involves two equations: the first equation contrasting 1 with scores 2 and 3; the second equation contrasting scores 1 and 2 with 3. With the standard or proportional ordered logit model (McCullagh, 1980), all equations are assumed to have different intercepts and the same set of coefficients. A specification test indicates no serious violation of the parallel slope assumption. One of the advantages in the proportional odds assumption that the β is equal across logit equations, which allows for a more parsimonious model (Fullerton, 2009).

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Findings

Descriptive Statistics

Small proportions of non-faculty (17%) and faculty (11%) perceived their work and family life to be “well balanced,” a category for the higher level of work-family balance. The majority (57%) of non-faculty perceived work and family life to be “balanced,” and 26% felt that these spheres were “out of balance.” By comparison, similar proportions of faculty (45% and 43%) reported life in these spheres to “balanced” and “out of balance.”

The mean scores on support from supervisor/chairperson and co-worker are higher for non-faculty, but these group differences are quite small. Cohen’s *d*s (which captures the mean score difference) between non-faculty and faculty are about 0.1 and 0.2, respectively. Non-faculty and faculty are also similar in family status. 73% of non-faculty and 78% of faculty are married/partnered. About half of each group have dependents.

Table 1
Summary Statistics

Variable	Range	Non-faculty		Faculty	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Work-family: out-of-balance	0,1	.26	.44	.43	.50
Work-family: balanced	0,1	.57	.50	.45	.50
Work-family: well balanced	0,1	.17	.38	.12	.32
Supervisor/chair support	1,5	3.88	1.00	3.78	.96
Co-worker support	1,5	3.96	.78	3.79	.80
Married/partnered	0,1	.74	.44	.78	.42
Have a dependent/dependents	0,1	.48	.50	.53	.50
N			512		171

Regression Analysis

To reiterate, my study uses institutional data with a low response rate. Thus, although I provide standard errors in my regression tables below, these measures are akin to inferential statistics and have only limited values in my study.

I begin with a simple regression model with faculty status as an independent variable. The first and second columns in Table 2 show fractions of non-faculty and faculty respondents with scores 1, 2, and 3 based on simple tabulation, and the third and fourth columns show probabilities of scoring at each level based on ordinal logit model. The fractions from tabulation and the model are similar. However, the ordinal logit model

slightly reduces the group difference for the categories “out-of-balance” and “balanced,” while it increases the group difference for “well-balanced.”

Table 2

Fractions/Probabilities of Response Scores (in %)

	Simple tabulation		Ordinal logit model	
	Non-faculty	Faculty	Non-faculty	Faculty
Out-of-balance (score 1)	25.59	43.27	26.13	41.98
Balanced (2)	57.03	45.03	55.87	48.33
Well balanced (3)	17.38	11.70	17.99	9.69

The results of the ordinal logit regression are shown in Table 3. Faculty have a lower perception of work-family balance than non-faculty as is shown in the regression model. The odds of perceiving higher work-family balance are lower for faculty than non-faculty by 47% ($1 - e^{-.632} \times 100$).

Table 3

Ordered Logit Model of Work-Family Balance

Variable	Coefficient	SE	e ^b (Odds ratio)
Faculty	-.63	.18	.53
Supervisor/chair support	.73	.10	2.08
Co-worker support	.32	.12	1.38
Married/partnered	-.27	.18	.76

Have a dependent/dependents	-.54	.16	.58
Intercept 1/threshold 1 vs. 2 & 3	2.46	.47	
Intercept 2/threshold 1 & 2 vs. 3	5.39	.51	
LR $\chi^2(4)$		142.68	
Pseudo R ²		.11	

The ordered logit model shows for every unit increase of work-family support from the supervisor, there is an increase in the odds of perceiving more balance by 108% (in other words, the odds double) and for every unit increase of work-family support from a co-worker there is a 38% increase in the odds of perceiving a higher level of work-family balance. The predictor variable on co-worker support is statistically significant as is the predictor variable of supervisor support. Marital status and dependent status have negative effects on the perception of work-family balance. The latter effect is stronger. Respondents with dependents are less likely than those with no dependent to perceive work-family balance by 42 percent.

In additional analyses (not tabled), I estimated the model with the same set of predictors for non-faculty and faculty, separately. These analyses showed that the effects of marital status, and support from supervisor and co-workers were similar between the groups. One exception is the effect of having dependents, which is much stronger for faculty. Thus, an extended model considers the original predictors and a product of faculty status and dependent status. As shown in Table 4, the interaction variable has a negative effect, meaning that having dependents reduces work-family balance more for faculty than it does for non-faculty. Here, the direct effect of faculty status diminishes. The negative effect of faculty status on work-family balance reported earlier is thus likely

due to the extra hardship faculty face juggling their academic work and care for dependents, rather than being on faculty per se. Based on this extended model, probabilities of non-faculty and faculty with dependents perceiving work-family balance to be “out-of-balance” are 28% and 56%, respectively. (See Table 5 for marginal probabilities for all scores.)

Table 4

Ordered Logit Model with an Interaction Variable on Faculty and Dependent Status

Variable	Coefficient	SE	e ^b (Odds ratio)
Faculty	-.18	.26	.83
Supervisor/chair support	.72	.10	2.06
Co-worker support	.32	.12	1.38
Married/partnered	-.27	.18	.76
Have a dependent/dependents	-.33	.18	.72
Faculty*dependent/dependents	-.88	.36	.41
Intercept 1/threshold 1 vs. 2 & 3	2.52	.47	
Intercept 2/threshold 1 & 2 vs. 3	5.46	.51	
LR $\chi^2(4)$		148.65	
Pseudo R ²		.11	

Table 5

Predicted Probabilities for Workers with Dependents (by Faculty Status)

	Non-faculty	Faculty
Out-of-balance (score 1)	28.23	56.03
Balanced (2)	55.84	39.16
Well balanced (3)	15.93	4.81

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

My analysis shows that a sizable proportion of the respondent's report lack of work-family balance. Moreover, my regression analysis demonstrated that faculty were more likely to perceive lower work-family balance than those who were not faculty. When closely looking at how faculty responded to the feeling of work-family balance, there is an equal distribution of those who respond with a feeling of "out of balance" as "balanced" and even fewer who respond with a feeling of "well balanced" as compared to those who are not faculty. The literature on work-family balance discusses how women who are faculty in higher education face both the constraints of not having a set "9 to 5" schedule as well as the challenge of needing to achieve tenure during the same timeframe as their childbearing years. Although due to data limitation, it is impossible to see whether women faculty's perceived work/family balance differs before and after attaining tenure, future research can examine the effect of career stage to clarify work/family conflict experienced by women in academia.

Two of the variables, supervisor/chair support and co-worker support, that were included in the regression model were measures of how workplace culture impacts the respondent's perception of work-family balance. One of the trends the data reflects is the importance of workplace culture in terms of supervisor support and colleague support. The literature shows that 'informal' support, which is support from colleagues and supervisors, increases employee satisfaction, loyalty, and perception of work-family

balance (Roehling, Roehling & Moen 2001; Galinsky & Stein 1990; Warren & Johnson 1995; Goff et al. 1990). Additionally when a supervisor is supportive of an employees' work-family balance then in turn it is thought the level of work-family conflict is lower, and thus the work-family balance perception increased (Premeaux et al., 2007; Thomas & Ganster, 1995). The informal support provided by colleagues and supervisors contributes to the culture of the organization which Thompson Beauvais & Lyness (1999) describe as 'the shared assumptions, beliefs, and values regarding the extent to which an organization supports and values the integration of employees' work and family lives' (p. 392). The culture is shaped by the individuals that comprise the organization, and as such, the supervisors help to shape the culture for the employee's perception of work-family balance. My analysis of the data shows that although employees' co-worker support matters, the supervisor support is the strongest in the perception of work-family balance.

Gendered institutions reflect the distribution of power in the workplace as a microcosm of the distribution of power in society. The data demonstrates how the culture of the workplace reifies the cultural norms and in doing so reflects the challenges and opportunities present for women in the workplace. The reproduction of the power structure and social norms contextualize the workplace research, is supported in the data where the perception of balance for faculty is twice as likely as the perception of imbalance and similar proportions of non-faculty and faculty have dependents and partners (Pitt-Catsouphes, Kossek and Sweet, 2006 and Acker 1990, 1992). The literature demonstrates the gendered institutions as the reflection of the gendering of society (Acker 1990, 1992; Risman and Davis, 2012) where the cultural beliefs which are held on masculinity and femineity is reproduced in the image of the unencumbered

worker (Misra et al. 2012). Women working as faculty have not averted this structure solely based on having schedule control. Since culture reflects social norms this can be inherently challenging to change, and the research supports the idea that gendered institutions are not exempt from change. The informal support from supervisors and chairs help challenge the prevailing image of the unencumbered worker by adding additional layers of support.

The gendered institution is so entrenched in the social system; workplaces cannot be exempt from the reflection of how the ideologies are represented. The data reflects the gendered institutions where both faculty and staff who have similar proportions of dependents and partners were more likely to respond as having a perception of work-family balance as being out of balance. As a means to curb the perception of imbalance between work and family for female faculty, the informal support shows a method to challenging the gendered intuitions.

Higher education, as a gendered institution and greedy institution (Coser, 1974) is demanding of the limited resources of time and energy for faculty, where a standard “9-5” job is unheard. Academia is also historically a male centric career where the origins have long held been male dominance. The timeline set forth for achieving tenure is in conflict with women who may choose to have children, as these generally occur at the same point in life and a career (Mason, Wolfinger and Goulden, 2013). The combination of the tenure timeline with a historically male dominated field, makes for a potentially unfriendly and challenging workplace environment for women who are faculty. Although the variable on dependent status did reflect a lower perception of work-family balance, both faculty and non-faculty reported this respectively evenly, indicating that

this alone is not a unique challenge to faculty and in fact there is something more inherent with the structure of the work of an academic that impacts the perception of work-family balance. The data from the research demonstrates that while the family life does influence a lower perception of work-family balance by faculty, this is not the sole issue nor the most salient.

A theme that has emerged from the literature on work-family balance is the concept of both finite time, limited resources, and energy, in particular for women in academia. Mason et al. note that women in academia are in competition for limited resources, publications, tenure or tenure track positions, research grants and those “who work the longest hours will likely win the grants, publish in the top journals, and ultimately gain access to the highest-profile positions” (2012, p.72). Women in academia, specifically faculty, do not likely have the option to “scale back” on work or hours to keep up with the demands of parenthood as women working in other professions (Mason et al., 2013) which leads to why academia can be deemed unfavorable to women who are seeking tenure and trying to raise children, in contrast to counterparts who may have additional support systems. Academia in particular, is unique in how challenging it can be to either reduce hours, leave, and return or move within the labor market (Mason et al., 2013) which lends to some of the challenges for faculty who perceive lower work-life balance. The highly structured trajectory academics must navigate from graduate school to the labor market in academia does not allow for flexibility, which is one reason universities are considered all-consuming greedy institutions. Therefore, where schedule control may on the surface seem to be at the disposal of faculty, the data suggests that the rigidity of the path from graduate school to tenure and beyond is not conducive to

balance, especially in the perception of women academics. So, where the variable of dependent status was of equal influence in the perception of work-family balance for both faculty and non-faculty alike, the type of work and structure of the labor market for faculty poses several potential hurdles.

The finding of faculty doubling their odds of perceiving a higher level of work-family balance on the measure of perceived supervisor/chair support was not anticipated. The finding is unusual since it is likely a supervisor/chair does not have an enormous amount of influence in the issues the literature presents as potential causes of a perception of lower work-family balance. Additionally, as the literature clearly demonstrates, time and schedule control are distinct issues of an individual's perception of work-family balance. Given the literature, it would be expected the respondents with less schedule control, like staff, would have more work-family balance. The reverse occurred with this data where faculty, who likely have immense schedule control, also reported lower work-family balance. A few potential reasons, which would need to be measured by qualitative research, could include the immersive nature of research work, and as already discusses unbound work hours where boundaries between work and family often do not reflect a 9-5 job. Additional potential causes are reflected in the expanded results that show faculty with dependents show much lower perceptions of work-family balance.

Future research of the perceptions of work-family balance for women working in higher education should include qualitative research to help expand the discussion of some of the themes which emerged in this research. A qualitative research approach on specific behaviors such as psychosocial-oriented support that expand on the respondent's perspective of the extent on the impact of support measures. Perceptions of spousal

support or other family support factors which may account for any additional variance of perceived balance and spillover, which was difficult to measure with this particular data. Future institutional surveys can focus on faculty and non-faculty separately to capture the perception of work-family balance more adequately.

Implications

The implication of this research is that it highlights what is occurring within the institution with respect to how the female employees perceive their work-family balance. The data supports what the literature demonstrated, which is female faculty do have a different perception of work-family balance than non-instructional staff. The implication of the results is that the current and future policies that direct how the employees of the university that was researched are developed and applied cannot take a one-size-fits-all approach since there are distinct differences in the groups they apply. In short- the policies that govern non-instructional staff and faculty should not be structured on the “9 to 5” type of work that are generally held by the non-instructional staff. To better achieve equity as well as recruit and retain faculty, the issues highlighted in this research stemming from a perception of imbalance in work and family by faculty should be addressed and to do so further research is needed by the institution.

Limitations

This research is a single point in time, case study of secondary data. As such, the limitations to generalizability are significant. The results and findings should be limited to demonstrating what was occurring at the point in time the research was

conducted at one institution; faculty and staff at other universities may have different perceptions.

REFERENCES

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society, 4*(2), 139-158.
- Acker, J. (1992). From sex roles to gendered institutions. *Contemporary Sociology, 21*(5), 565-569.
- Allen, T. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: the role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58*(3), 414–435.
- Bailyn, L. (2003). Academic careers and gender equity: lessons learned from MIT. *Gender, Work and Organization, 10*(2), 137–153.
- Barnett, R. C., & Gareis, K. C. (2000). Reduced-hours job-role quality and life satisfaction among married women physicians with children. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24*(4), 358–364.
- Behson, S. J. (2002). Which dominates? the relative importance of work-family organizational support and general organizational context on employee outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*(1), 53–72.
- Berg, P., Kalleberg, A. L., & Appelbaum, E. (2003). Balancing work and family: the role of high-commitment environments. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society, 42*(2), 168–188.
- Bianchi, S. M., Robinson, J. P., Milkie, M., & Budig, M. (2008). Changing rhythms of American family life. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review, 61*(3), 426.
- Bianchi, S. (2011). Family change and time allocation in American families. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 638*(1), 21-44.
- Bianchi, S., Sayer, L., Milkie, M., & Robinson, J. (2012). Housework: Who did, does or will do it, and how much does it matter? *Social Forces, 91*(1), 55-63.
- Bichsel, J., & McChesney, J. (2017). The gender pay gap and the representation of women in higher education administrative positions: The century so far. research report. CUPA-HR. Available from: www.cupahr.org/surveys/briefs.aspx.
- Bielby, D., & Bielby, W. (1988). She Works Hard for the Money: Household Responsibilities and the Allocation of Work Effort. *American Journal of Sociology, 93*(5), 1031-1059.
- Blair-Loy, M. (2003). *Competing devotions: Career and family among women executives*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Blair-Loy, M., Wharton, A., & Goodstein, J. (2011). Exploring the relationship between mission statements and work-life practices in organizations. *Organization Studies*, 32(3), 427–450.
- Bornstein, S., Williams, J. C., & Painter, G. R. (2012). Discrimination against mothers is the strongest form of workplace gender discrimination: lessons from us caregiver discrimination law. *International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations*, 28(1), 45–62.
- Bradley, K. (2000). The incorporation of women into higher education paradoxical outcomes? *Sociology of Education*, 73(2000):1, S. 1-18.
- Cech, E., & Blair-Loy, M. (2014). Consequences of flexibility stigma among academic scientists and engineers. *Work and Occupations*, 41(1), 86-110.
- Chambel, M., Lopes, S., Carvalho, V., & Cesario, F. (2017). The work-to-life conflict mediation between job characteristics and well-being at work: Part-time vs full-time employees. *Career Development International*, 22(2), 142-164.
- Chang, A., McDonald, P., & Burton, P. (2010). Methodological choices in work-life balance research 1987 to 2006: A critical review. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(13), 2381-2413.
- Charles, M., & Grusky, D. (2004). *Occupational ghettos: The worldwide segregation of women and men* (Studies in social inequality). Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Chung, H., & Van, D. (2018). Flexible working, work-life balance, and gender equality: Introduction. *Social Indicators Research*.
- Campbell Clark, S. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747-770.
- Clarke, M., Koch, L., & Hill, E. (2004). The work-family interface: Differentiating balance and fit. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 33(2), 121-140.
- Coser, L. (1974). *Greedy institutions; patterns of undivided commitment*. New York: Free Press.
- Fast facts: Women working in Academia*. AAUW. (2020, March 27). Retrieved November 27, 2021, from <https://www.aauw.org/resources/article/fast-facts-academia/>.
- Fraser, J., & Hodge, M. (2000). Job satisfaction in higher education: Examining gender in professional work settings. *Sociological Inquiry*, 70(2), 172-178.

- Fullerton, A. (2009). A conceptual framework for ordered logistic regression models. *Smr/Sociological Methods & Research*, 38(2), 306–347.
- Galinsky, E., Bond, J. T., & Friedman, D. E. (1996). The role of employers in addressing the needs of employed parents. *Journal of Social Issues*, 52(3), 111–136.
- Galinsky, E., & Stein, P. J. (1990). The impact of human resource policies on employees: balancing work/family life. *Journal of Family Issues*, 11(4), 368–83.
- Garey, Anita. 1999. *Weaving work and motherhood*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Gerten, A. (2011). Moving beyond family-friendly policies for faculty mothers. *Affilia*, 26(1), 47–58.
- Gina, G., & Cabral-Cardoso, C. (2008). Work-family culture in academia: A gendered view of work-family conflict and coping strategies. *Gender in Management*, 23(6), 442-457.
- Glass, J., Simon, R., & Andersson, M. (2016). Parenthood and happiness: Effects of work-family reconciliation policies in 22 oecd countries. *Ajs; American Journal of Sociology*, 122(3), 886-929.
- Goff S., Mount M., Jamison R. (1990). Employer supported childcare: work/family conflict and absenteeism: A field study. *Personnel Psychology*, 43(4), 793–809.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76–88.
- Greenhaus, J., & Powell, G. (2003). When work and family collide: Deciding between competing role demands. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 90(2), 291-303.
- Hochschild, A. (1997). *The time bind: When work becomes home, and home becomes work* (1st ed.). New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Jacobs, J., & Gerson, K. (2004). *The time divide: Work, family, and gender inequality* (The family and public policy). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Keeling, R., Underhile, R., & Wall, A. (2007). Horizontal and vertical structures: The dynamics of organization in higher education. *Liberal Education*, 93(4), 22-31.
- Keene, J. R., & Quadagno, J. (2004). Predictors of perceived work-family balance: gender difference or gender similarity? *Sociological Perspectives*, 47(1), 1–23.

- Kelly, E., & Moen, P. (2007). Rethinking the clockwork of work: Why schedule control may pay off at work and at home. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 9(4), 487-506.
- Korabik, K., Lero, D., Whitehead, D., & Whitehead, D. (2008). *Handbook of work-family integration: Research, theory, and best practices* (1st ed.). Amsterdam: Elsevier/Academic Press.
- Lewis, S., Rapoport, R., & Gambles, R. (2003). Reflections on the integration of paid work and the rest of life. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(8), 824-841.
- Lorber, J. (1994). *Paradoxes of gender*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mason, M., Wolfinger, N., & Goulden, M. (2013). *Do babies matter? Gender and family in the ivory tower* (Families in focus). New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- McCullagh, P. (1980). Regression models for ordinal data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 42(2), 109-142.
- Mennino, S. F., Rubin, B. A., & Brayfield, A. (2005). Home-to-job and job-to-home spillover: the impact of company policies and workplace culture. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 46(1), 107-135.
- Misra, J., Lundquist, J. H., & Templer, A. (2012). Gender, work time, and care responsibilities among faculty. *Sociological Forum*, 27(2), 300-323.
- Negrey, C. (2012). *Work time: Conflict, control, and change* (Work & society series). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Noor, N. (2002). Work-family conflict, locus of control, and women's well-being: Tests of alternative pathways. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142(5), 645-662.
- Parkes, L. P., & Langford, P. H. (2008). Work-life balance or work-life alignment? A test of the importance of work-life balance for employee engagement and intention to stay in organizations. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 14(3), 267-284.
- Pitt-Catsouphes, M., Kossek, E., & Sweet, S. (2008). *The work and family handbook: Multi-disciplinary perspectives, methods, and approaches*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Posig, M., & Kickul, J. (2004). Work-role expectations and work family conflict: Gender differences in emotional exhaustion. *Women in Management Review*, 19(7), 373-386.
- Premeaux, S. F., Adkins, C. L., & Mossholder, K. W. (2007). Balancing work and family: a field study of multi-dimensional, multi-role work-family conflict. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28(6), 705-727.

- Rafnsdottir, G., & Heijstra, T. (2013). Balancing work-family life in academia: The power of time. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 20(3), 283-296.
- Risman, B., & Davis, G. (2013). From sex roles to gender structure. *Current Sociology*, 61(5-6), 733-755.
- Scott, S., Paul, G., & Melissa, A. (2009). When work interferes with life: Work-nonwork interference and the influence of work-related demands and resources. *American Sociological Review*, 74(6), 966-988.
- Schieman, S., Milkie, M. A., & Glavin, P. (2009). When work interferes with life: work-nonwork interference and the influence of work-related demands and resources. *American Sociological Review*, 74(6), 966-988.
- Sirianni, C., & Negrey, C. (2000). Working time as gendered time. *Feminist Economics*, 6(1), 59-76.
- Sullivan, T. A. (2014). Greedy institutions, overwork, and work-life balance. *Sociological Inquiry*, 84(1), 1-15.
- Suitor, J. J., Mecom, D., & Feld, I. S. (2001). Gender, household labor, and scholarly productivity among university professors. *Gender Issues*, 19(4), 50-67.
- Thomas, L. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 6-15.
- Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). When work-family benefits are not enough: the influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54(3), 392-415.
- Thompson, C. A., Jahn, E. W., Kopelman, R. E., & Prottas, D. J. (2004). Perceived organizational family support: a longitudinal and multilevel analysis. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 16(4), 545-565.
- Warren, J. A., & Johnson, P. J. (1995). The impact of workplace support on work-family role strain. *Family Relations*, 44(2), 163-169.
- Wang, W., & Parker, K. (2020). *Modern parenthood: Roles of Moms and Dads Converge as They Balance Work and Family*. Pew Research Center's Social & Demographic Trends Project. Pew Research Center, Washington, D.C.
<https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2013/03/14/modern-parenthood-roles-of-moms-and-dads-converge-as-they-balance-work-and-family/>.
- Wilk, K. E. (2016). Work-life balance and ideal worker expectations for administrators. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2016(176), 37-51.

Williams, J. (2004). Hitting the maternal wall. *Academe*, 90(6), 16–20.

Williams, J. (2000). *Unbending gender: Why family and work conflict and what to do about it*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, J., Blair-Loy, M., & Berdahl, J. L. (2013). Cultural schemas, social class, and the flexibility stigma. *Journal of Social Issues*, 69(2), 209–234.

Williams, J. & Dempsey, R. (2014). *What Works for Women at Work: Four Patterns Working Women Need to Know*. NYU Press.

APPENDICIES

Appendix A

Questions
1. It is easy to balance the needs of work and family.
2. There are adequate childcare facilities on campus and in the surrounding area
3. My supervisor or chair is understanding of family situations that require me to put my work on hold (such as illnesses, emergencies, death).
4. The university's policies and procedures help me to balance work life and home life
Please describe your current feeling of balance between your work life and your home life.
1. Miss something at work due to home life concerns/responsibilities
2. Miss something at home due to work life concerns/responsibilities
1. The environment at The university supports a balance between work life and home life
2. My supervisor/department chair understands the importance of maintaining a balance between work life and home life
3. My colleagues understand the importance of maintaining a balance between work life and home life
4. Opportunities for work/home balance are equally available to all employees
5. I rarely, if ever, have to make hard decisions between work and home obligations
6. Supporting a work/home life balance should be a priority for the university
1. The pace of the work at university enables me to do a good job
2. The amount of work I'm asked to do is reasonable
3. The university has reasonable expectations of its employees
4. My job does not cause unreasonable amounts of stress in my life
5. My department has the staff necessary to get the job done

6. Tasks are appropriately redistributed when a staff member is away on family or medical leave so that the workload doesn't overburden one person
7. I have the resources I need to do my job well
1. How often do you find yourself working: During your lunch hour
2. How often do you find yourself working: At work before your usual work hours
3. How often do you find yourself working: At work after your usual work hours
4. How often do you find yourself working: At home before your usual work hours
5. How often do you find yourself working: At home after your usual work hours
6. How often do you find yourself working: During vacation
1. I currently work a flexible schedule
2. I would like to work a flexible schedule
3. A flexible schedule should be available to all employees
4. A flexible schedule is available to all employees
5. I would have a better balance of work/home with a flexible schedule
6. I would be more efficient at my job with a flexible schedule
7. I would take advantage of a flexible schedule if offered to me
If the University were to institute a telecommunication policy (i.e. working remotely from home, making use of the internet, email, and telephone), how likely would you be to take advantage of it?
1. Childcare for infant/toddler
2. Childcare for preschooler
3. After school care for school-aged child
4. In-home adult care
5. Respite care (temporary institutional care of a dependent elderly, ill, or handicapped person, providing relief for their usual caregivers)
6. Assistance for elderly or disabled relative (local)
7. Assistance for elderly or disabled relative (long distance)
What is your current gender identity?
Which best describes your ethnic background?

How long have you worked at the university?
How much longer do you anticipate working at the university?
What is the highest level of education you have completed?
Which of the following best describes your family status?
What is your primary role at the university?
If applicable, what is your secondary role at the university?

CURRICULUM VITA

Aubrey R. Woolley

8541 Corydon Ridge Rd. • Lanesville IN 47136 • 502-523-4583 •
aubrey.woolley@louisville.edu

Education: University of Louisville

B.S. Sport Administration May 2010

B.A. Spanish December 2010

M.A. Sociology *Anticipated December 2021*

Related Academic Experience:

Intro to Sociology, Intro to Sociology Research Methods, Intro to Sociology Statistics, Social Theory, Diversity and Inequality, Sociology of Leisure, Sociology of Sport

Academic Awards and Achievements:

- University of Louisville Dean's List; Spring 2007- Spring 2010
- University of Louisville International Center Scholar, 2010
- Mary Craik Scholar Recipient, University of Louisville 2010
- Commonwealth Scholar, University of Louisville 2009, 2010
- Modern Languages Fund Recipient University of Louisville, 2009
- World Scholar Recipient University of Louisville, 2009
- Lewis Educational Endowment Fund Recipient, University of Louisville 2008, 2010
- University of Louisville Athletic Director Honor Roll, 2005-2008
- University of Louisville Red and Black Scholar, 2005-2008

Highlights:

- Proficient with PeopleSoft, Tableau and Microsoft Excel applications
- Highly analytical, data drive professional
- More than 10 years of experience working in Higher Education
- Active volunteer member within the Louisville community and volunteer experience abroad

Related Professional Experience:

University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

Business Operations Business Analyst Sr. August 2018-Present

- Provide reporting across all Business Operations services (HR, Finance, CSQI) and platforms (PeopleSoft HR, Zendesk, Tableau, Excel)
- Query and interpret large datasets from a variety of sources
- Assist in the development of key performance indicators (KPIs) across units within Business Operations through providing data and analysis of historical or current trends
- Provide comprehensive data management across Business Operations units, coordinating with Managers, Directors and Executive Director
- Promote continuous improvement through the systematic review of delivered reports to aide key partners in forecasting data trends to help direct their business needs as well as highlight areas of opportunity
- Deliver a high level of data interpretation with ability to analyze and disseminate information to key partners within Business Operations
- Support the communications and outreach efforts of each unit through providing clean, concise and direct reports in a variety of formats
- Expertise in using PeopleSoft HR, Excel and Tableau for data mining, querying and data visualization
- Highly effective written and oral communication skills
- Develop and maintain process manuals for all reporting
- Calculate and adjust employee's service dates through either the New Employee Orientation roster or one-off requests from either HR, Department or HR

University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

Business Operations HR Functional Specialist Sr. July 2016-August 2018

- Executed independent review and analysis over HR functional processes to transactions and to develop reporting, assessment and recommendations with respect to continuous
- Managed onboarding process of new hires for students and temporary staff through Business Operation portal
- Provided transactional review, guidance and support of HR functional initiatives
- Assisted HR Functional Director with data research, perform audits, interpret and apply university policies as related verify data discrepancies
- Calculated and perform service date adjustments for employees
- Performed audits to gather historical data for employees records
- Created and generate PeopleSoft queries and data for the purposes of audits and business operations transactions
- Entered data to PeopleSoft
- Committee member for the Annual Faculty and Staff Recognition Awards Ceremony

University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

Salary Administration Coordinator January 2013- May 2017

- Manage the tuition remission benefit for eligible employees and their dependents
- Process verification of all tuition remission eligibility for employees and dependents
- Provide guidance to departments and employees regarding policies, procedures, and completion of proper forms for salary transactions
- Serve as the HR Building Emergency Coordinator as well as the HR representative on the UofL Emergency Planning Work Group
- Conduct research, perform audits, interpret and apply university policies as related to tuition remission, salary transactions, verify data discrepancies and perform service date adjustments

- Assist salary administration manager with salary transactions
- Perform audits to gather historical data for employees records
- Generate queries and data for the purposes of audits
- Regularly make service date calculations and adjustments for employees
- Committee member for the Annual Faculty and Staff Recognition Awards Ceremony

University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

Human Resources Assistant, Federal Work Study Supervisor September 2011- December 2012

- Provide clerical support to the Human Resources Administration unit
- Knowledgeable of various established University of Louisville policy and procedure
- Manage daily operation of the front desk for HR and all conference rooms
- Supervise two work-study students for HR administration
- Receive, sort and redistribute all incoming time-sensitive mail for the office of the VPHR and assist with database management of JDFs, PIQs and Performance Appraisals
- Assist salary administration with the management of Supplemental Pay and X-Pay forms
- Decipher questions and issues from walk-ins and through the phone, prior to referring them to the departments
- Utilize through working knowledge of general HR functions to quickly solve problems and answer questions with an emphasis on providing exceptional customer service
- Assist with the receiving of new faculty and staff for new employee orientation

Work Experience:

Louisville Bats Baseball Club, Louisville, KY

Administrative Assistant

March 2011- September 2011

Louisville Lightning Soccer Team, Louisville, KY

Marketing, Administration, and Game Day Operations Intern

December 2009- May 2010

Fútbol por la Vida, San José, Costa Rica

Assistant to the Coordinator of Recreation and Sports

October 2009- December 2009, July 2010

Louisville I.D.E.A.L.S., Louisville, KY

Outreach Coordinator

August 2010- December 2010

University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

Athletic Department

May 2009- July 2009

Churchill Downs Inc. Louisville, KY

Twin Spires Club Assistant

October 2008- July 2009

University of Louisville, Louisville, KY

Advancement Offices

January 2008-August 2008