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ABSTRACT

CHIPPING AWAY AT THE GENDERED WALL: IMPLICATIONS FOR BEING A WOMAN SOCIOLOGIST

Rebecca Fogerty Grove
Old Dominion University and Norfolk State University, 2002
Director: Dr. Elizabeth Monk-Turner

The purpose of this study was to investigate what factors may determine productivity among sociology professors and factors that affect promotions and hiring. In today’s academic institutions, the gender barrier is considered nonexistent; however, the actual existence of the gender barrier is often apparent in departmental hiring decisions and university tenure policies. With knowledge of current, often subtle, biased standards, the gender barrier can begin to be dismantled to offer true equality for all potential and current professors. The data was collected in 2001, during the fall academic semester from departments of sociology (n=218). This thesis looks at the impact of departmental hierarchy, individual productivity level and demographic factors on professors’ academic position and productivity. The research found that there are some differences in article productivity between males and females and also differences in productivity based on years of experience and what type of institution in which one is working. The research also found that women with children produce more books than women without children, and that gender differences in hours teaching, hours preparing for classes and hours spent working outside of the class were not significant related.
This thesis is dedicated to ME!
May this experience not cloud
my memories of graduate school.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The face of the university has been changing rapidly, as the demographics of the student body across the country diversify. Faculty characteristics are also changing as more women and minorities are completing doctorate degrees. However, while the proportion of women doctorates is climbing, faculty ranks, especially at the full professor and administrative level, are still dominated by white males. According to Nettles, Perna and Bradburn (2000) for the Department of Education, males occupy 63.7% of these higher level positions in degree-granting institutions in the 50 states and District of Columbia. Women are over-represented in public 2-year institutions, where women represent 49.9% of faculty positions. There is some debate as to why women are over-represented in the lower level positions; some researchers attribute it to productivity differences and human capital investment, other researchers have attributed gender-bias and discrimination as explanations for the differences in women's position in the academy.

In this thesis, I investigate how productivity differs among full-time sociology professors and if the difference is shaped by demographic and/or academic related factors. The focus on sociology departments in this study is based on the assumption that the field is more liberal and progressive than other academic departments. Many of the basic issues that sociology attempts to explain are the social constructions of gender, race and class. Another assumption this study is based on is that sociologists are most aware of issues of sex and racial discrimination, and therefore would be conscious of ensuring that their

The format of this thesis follows the current style requirements of the American Sociological Review.
departments are sensitive to many of the issues for minority academics. By combining the issues of productivity and types of institutions in this study, I hope to provide a clearer picture of gender differences in academia. This research is also intended to address an area that has been overlooked in past studies, comparing productivity and teaching loads between different types of institutions at the Ph.D. level.

Quantitative data were collected using a mail questionnaire designed to solicit information pertaining to respondents’ professional status, demographic data and experiences in the academy. The sample comes from sociology professors whose departments were listed in the *U.S. News- Best Graduate Schools* (2001) and the *ASA Index of Graduate Programs* (1999). A random sample was selected from five departments in each of the two categories, totaling 218 total respondents.

Since the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and Title IX in 1972, academic research has focused on the differences between male and female scholars and toward factors such as the wage gap, the glass ceiling effect, the double-bind, tokenism and the situation of women in traditional male fields like mathematics and engineering (for example, Lieberman 1981). Research has also examined gender differences at universities and colleges by department, and gender differences in positions and productivity (see Davis and Astin 1990). These studies have been mostly inconclusive, with some studies showing that male and female academics are virtually equal in pay and productivity levels, and others showing drastic differences.

Some researchers have found that women sociologists tend to be less productive (defined as number of publications) than men (Valian 1998; Noordenbos 1990; Chrisler 1998). Others have found no significant differences in productivity between men and
women in the social sciences (Davis and Astin 1990; Glazer-Raymo 1999). There are also
differences in the time spent on research versus teaching between men and women
academics, with women spending less than half of their time on research and more time on
teaching preparation than their male colleagues (Davis and Astin 1990; Lieberman 1981;
Kauffman and Perry 1989; Glazer-Raymo 1999). Similarly, differences are found in men
and women’s academic placement, with women concentrated in lower ranks and less
prestigious institutions (Benokratis 1998; Nettles et al. 2000). Findings from previous
studies also indicate that sex alone may not be a good predictor of productivity, and factors
such as age, education and work activities influence productivity levels differently for men
and women (Kulis and Miller-Loess 1992).

There are many complex factors that may affect one’s academic performance and
academic rewards, and there are various theoretical frameworks that can be used to explain
these findings. For many researchers, human capital theory helps to explain the
differences in productivity, positions, salary and work experiences. This model concludes
that differences men and women face in the labor market are the result of individual
choices in obtaining education and skill. Some “examples of human capital investments
include expenditures on formal education, on-the-job training, job search and geographic
migration” (Blau and Ferber 1986:184). The presumption is that women have less human
capital than men because there is less incentive for a woman to spend time and money to
learn new skills or acquire an advanced credential (Bergmann 1986). This is based on the
notion that women work for pay for fewer years than men and have more disrupted work
lives than men. Thus it does not pay for women to make the types of investments to make
them more profitable because the investments rapidly deteriorate during periods of work
interruptions (Blau and Ferber 1986). But the concentration of women faculty in lower positions cannot be explained merely by their own inadequacies. Men with Ph.D.s have advanced more quickly and with fewer problems than their female colleagues, so something beyond the factors explained by the human capital model must be involved. The unequal treatment of women may be a result of something larger and more subtle.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

The university institution was built on the standards and beliefs of men to give its students and teachers an opportunity to participate in society intellectually and in the public sphere (Woll 2000). Early on, “it was suggested that women were to be wives and mothers first and allowed to attend universities to make them better at domestic work” (Woll 2000:7). Although admitted as students, women were excluded from teaching in universities until 1880. Women, at that time, were mostly hired as “junior faculty,” which meant increased teaching loads, little time to conduct scholarly research, and positions in lesser-known universities. Other laws were passed in the early 1960’s to protect against various types of discrimination, but there were loopholes that failed to protect women at educational institutions (Kiernan 2001). Title IX, a federal law passed in 1972, prohibits discrimination in educational programs that receive federal funding.

Women in the university are still affected by sexual stereotyping, a subtle bias that begins in early life and persists even among the most enlightened (Valian 1998). Women may make-up more than half of all students, but comprise less than one-third of faculty. Affirmative action legislation has helped to correct the low numbers of women and minorities, but women are still generally assigned to subordinate positions (Thornton 1989). Early studies of “women academics show how deeply embedded the cultural myths are that define women’s personal and professional lives” (Glazer-Raymo 1999:20). Glazer-Raymo (1999) explains that one of the most persistent myths in
academia is that women prefer teaching and service to research and scholarship. She also hypothesizes that women have an inferior status in academic rank, salary and working conditions, due to their noncompetitive nature and lack of interest in status and prestige.

One of the most striking features of higher education in the United States is the high number of women students compared to the low number of women faculty. While the number of women with doctorates has steadily increased in the last twenty years, the proportion of women who have been offered tenure-track faculty positions has decreased and the data support a claim of discrimination against women (Harper, Baldwin, Gansneder and Chronister 2001). In 1993, almost 55% of bachelor’s degrees were earned by women and 38% of all Ph.D.s were awarded to women. In contrast, 48% of lecturers and instructors were women, women assistant professors made up 40%, and only 17% of women were full professors (Benokraitis 1998). National data also reveal that women faculty are more likely to be at community colleges than at four-year colleges and universities, and that women faculty are more likely to be in non-tenure-track positions as instructors or adjunct professors than are men faculty (Quina, Colter and Romenesko 1998; Farley 1982; Nettles et al 2000).

Other studies of women academics have suggested that women professors are more likely than men to list teaching as their main activity, and that women spend more hours in the classroom than men (Chrisler 1998). Davis and Astin (1990) suggest that women spend more time teaching because they are more likely to be working at the community college level. But, Kulis and Miller-Loess (1992) explain, it is less credible to view these inequalities as the result of human capital factors when men and women
are earning their degrees at roughly the same rate. Other studies also conclude that formal and informal policies and practices affect women differently than men (Quina et al. 1998; Chrisler 1998; Rubin 1977).

Women, in general, face hurdles in their careers that men do not experience. Research by Engstrom and Ferri (2000) found that men and women, in general, often have dissimilar experiences within the same occupation. They explain that women, compared to men, report lower confidence in dealing with the politics of their profession and in their own abilities and aspirations. Also, women who work tend to experience more work-family conflicts than do men. Seventy percent of working women have children between the ages of six and seventeen, and most working mothers are heavily burdened by family responsibilities (Hewlett 1991). Statistics of who does housework has shown little change over the years. A woman may be participating in the outside labor market but is also still carrying the burden of working inside the home as well.

The sexual division of labor also appears in the labor market as women work at “women’s jobs.” According to Hartmann (1981),

The sexual division of labor reappears in the labor market, where women work at women’s jobs. As these jobs are low-status and low-paying patriarchal relations remain intact, though their material base shifts somewhat from the family to the wage differential, from family-based to industrially based patriarchy. The wage differential, then, will become increasingly necessary in perpetuating patriarchy. It will aid in defining women’s work as secondary to men’s and at the same time it necessitates women’s actual continued economic dependence on men. (326)

While it is not known if these figures apply equally to women academics, it is clear that they, like most working women, are most likely experiencing a sexual division of labor both in the workplace and at home.
The university has been described as primarily a male institution; consequently, being socialized into the feminine gender and being female is a socially constructed liability (Overall 1998). Since stereotypes of women are based on images of compliance, cultivating the image of a strong, independent productive woman scholar is particularly problematic (Anonymous 1999). Various feminists have made efforts to examine how the patriarchal university system slows the progress of its women faculty. Many “professional women face a paradox, [in that] they often have to deny their gender in order to gain professional recognition” (Woll 2000:6). Female academics who embody masculine characteristics may earn more limited power, but will still struggle with establishing authority in research, publication and teaching regardless of years of experience or academic rank.

The growing body of research on gender stratification in academe has produced mixed results. Many studies have analyzed gender differences in productivity (Davis and Astin 1990; Noordenbos 1990; Valian 1998; Chrisler 1998), organizational size and hierarchy (Kulis and Miller-Loess 1992; Doyle and Hind 1998), and achieving tenure. The studies, explained in further detail later, have produced inconclusive results, with some showing that male and female academics are virtually equal and others showing drastic differences.

THEORECTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Women scholars have been restricted and negated for centuries and being both a teacher and scholar is still creating role conflict for women (Chrisler 1998). According to Overall (1998), it is imperative to investigate social rather than biological factors,
because there is so much evidence concerning the cultural production of gender. Other sociologists see socialization and role theories as presenting a model that is overtly deterministic. They emphasize active work in reproducing gender by contextualizing practices that are interactional and ongoing, "where cultural typifications of gender are enacted, performed, experimented with and even transformed" (Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley 2000:319). Two themes useful in analyzing gender inequality are that:

First, men and women are situated in society not only differently but also unequally. Specifically, women get less of the material resources, social status, power and opportunities for self-actualization than do men who share their social location. Second, this inequality rests from the organization of society. Additionally, all inequality theories assume that both men and women will respond fairly easily and naturally to more egalitarian social structures and situations. They affirm that it is possible to change the situation. (Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley 2000:320)

There have been attempts to apply Marxist analysis to the oppression of women because no other theory exists with anything like the explanatory power of the Marxist theory of class oppression (Rubin 1977). Marxists argue that feminism is less important than class conflict, and "the power of Marxism with respect to capital has obscured its limitations with respect to sexism" (Hartmann 1981:320). The map of society for Marxists portrays humans as workers, peasants or capitalists; and their gender is insignificant. Most Marxist analysis of women has focused on women's oppression in connection to production. Early Marxists saw the draw of women into the labor force as a sign of the destruction of the sexual division of labor. Contemporary Marxists see that "all aspects of our lives are seen to reproduce the capitalist system and we are all workers in the system" (Hartmann 1981:321). Marxist feminists focus on housework and its importance in its relationship to capital. Marxist analysis of women, however,
gives us little to no clues about why women are subordinate to men in and out of the family (Hartmann 1981).

Harriet Taylor and John Stuart Mills proposed that the oppression of women is a mild form of a primitive slavery (Zeitlin 1997). Sexual inequality is deeply rooted and universally accepted. Its existence is often explained by claiming that the persistence of an institution proved that it was a proper adaptation of human nature and for the general good. Taylor and Mills argued that it is highly unlikely that women will organize themselves to rebel against the power of men, since the position of women is not like other subjected classes. Women have more demands than mere service; their masters' demand not only obedience but also love and affection.

Taylor and Mills argued that women are brought up to believe that the virtues of the feminine character, meekness, submissiveness and resignation of self-will, believing that it is their duty to live for others and have no aspirations of their own (Zeitlin 1997). Being attractive to men was the main focus of feminine education and character, and these virtues enabled men to hold women in subjection. This legal and social subordination of women was justified by proposing that “it is women’s nature which makes them ineligible to participate in the world outside the home” (Zeitlin 1997:132).

In the nineteenth century, women proved that they were capable of fulfilling any social function that men were capable of, despite the subjection they experienced. According to the Taylor and Mills, it was unjust to deny women basic rights, such as honor and distinction and the right to choose their occupation; it’s not only unjust to the women, but also to all those who might have benefited from their services. Mills writes, that original and important thoughts occur:
by hundreds of every woman of intellect; but, they are mostly lost, for want of a husband or friend who has the other knowledge which can enable him to estimate them properly and bring them before the world: and even when they are brought before it, they generally appear as his ideas. (Zeitlin 1997:134)

Similarly, “the Mills also underscored the great benefit to be derived from granting women the free use of their capacities and opening them to all social functions and occupation” (Zeitlin 1997:134). In conclusion, they note that there is nothing to be lost and everything to be gained from eradicating sexual inequality.

A more contemporary theory that attempts to explain sex differences in earnings and occupations is the human capital model. This model rests on the premise that men and women make voluntary choices that affect their “investments” in “human capital.” Men and women may come into the labor market with different experiences and qualifications from different choices in educational attainment, past job experience, on the job training and other productivity characteristics (Blau and Ferber 1986). It has been argued that since many women participate in the work force for fewer years than men, women have less incentive to spend the time and money to learn a skill or earn the credentials, and that the investment in human capital is what causes the differences in pay and occupations in relationship to men. This argument overlooks the fact that women have spent as much time as men have in school when given the opportunity (Bergmann 1986).

The issue that arises may not be the result of individual voluntary choices, but instead the result of societal discrimination. There are multitudes of influence that may cause women to make decisions that negatively influence their status in the labor market (Blau and Ferber 1986). It would appear then, to Blau and Ferber (1986), “that those who are reasonably content with the status quo of gender differences in economic
outcomes tend to speak mainly of voluntary choices whereas those who decry sex inequality in pay and occupations are more likely to focus on societal discrimination" (183).

DISCRIMINATION & SEXISM IN THE ACADEMY

Traditionally, women have been oppressed because of their ability to reproduce and their exclusion from the public sphere (Langer 1996). Sexism and discrimination against women seem to be the only socially acceptable form of bias that remains in society. Many administrators and policy makers assert that universities have always been gender-blind. Their response to women who are awarded tenure and promotion less often and at less prestigious institutions is often to blame the women themselves. They argue that women academics prefer teaching to research, don’t publish much, took time off to raise children and are less serious about their careers than men academics (Lieberman 1981).

It is well acknowledged that women are more heavily concentrated in the lower ranks of instructor and have had difficulty securing positions in the higher prestigious (and higher paying) universities. Women spend more time teaching than men (58% of their time vs. 46% of men’s time) and much less time engaging in research (16% of the time vs. 27%) (Glazer-Raymo 1999). However, the spread in the numbers may be attributed to the fact that women are more likely to teach in community colleges where there is a greater emphasis on teaching than on research.

Some studies have also concluded that “income disparities between men and women faculty members are substantial” (Bienen, Ostriker, Ostriker 1977:372). In their
classic study Bienen and colleagues (1977) conclude that:

sex is a better predictor of rank than factors of number of years since completion of education, number of years employed or number of books published. And when women are statistically matched with men on the variables that determine rewards, they fall below men in rank and salary. (374)

The low position of women in academic institutions can not merely be explained by their own inadequacy as professors. The unequal treatment of women may be a result of subtle sex discrimination, which is less obvious and less visible to many in society. Subtle sex discrimination may go unnoticed because men and women alike have internalized the behavior as natural and acceptable (Benokraitis 1998:5). This subtle discrimination is especially sticky at the institutional level because the awareness of this type is very low and the visibility of discriminatory acts is practically invisible. Women professors also have noted problems of being harassed, excluded and defined by male inscriptions; women may have gained access and are allowed to contribute to the curriculum, but there is still a strong gender hierarchy as women in universities are controlled by male-centered rules, regulations and protocol (Woll 2000). There is a fine line that many women academics may find difficult to walk. Compliant behavior in academia is often rewarded, and refusing service makes it easier for the woman academic to be labeled "difficult" (Anonymous 1999). Often lower ranking professors are volunteered for service, and junior faculty can be volunteered for thankless tasks destined to keep them from research.

One assumption has been that equal access to education will result in a decrease in salary disparities, yet it is obvious that male faculty fare far better than female faculty at all ranks and the salary gap increases dramatically as the rank increases. In general, a "Bachelor's degree contributes to $28,000 of men's salary but only $9,000 to women's,
and a degree from a prestigious school contributes $11,500 to men’s salaries but subtracts $2,400 from women’s” (Valian 1998:20). The message is clear, not only that subtle sex discrimination exists, but also that women’s achievements and qualifications are worth less than men’s are. Women in all academic scientific disciplines combined earn a median income of $48,400 compared with men’s median income of $61,500 (Valian 1998:19). According to a study by Nettles et al. (2000) for the U.S. Department of Education, male full-time faculty averaged $10,000 higher than female faculty. Though the authors acknowledge that male-female differences in salary may be associated with different human capital and structural characteristics, when comparing male and female faculty with similar characteristics, female full-time faculty still had lower average base salaries (Nettles et al. 2000). Glazer-Raymo (1999) found that women faculty may share similar values with male colleagues in research and scholarship but women earned, on average, $27,000 less than their male colleagues did. After more than three decades of struggling for gender equality, women’s progress is still slow and slight. Education and experience differences may be able to explain part of the pay and rank disparity, but gender will almost always explain another part.

MAKING TENURE

Tenure is a key component to a successful career in academia, and tenure is another process in the academic world that is considered to be gendered. Many “women faculty experience their own tenure process as profoundly gendered” (Anonymous 1999:3). More men than women hold tenured positions among full-time faculty (66%
versus 42%) and a higher percentage of women are working in institutions with no
tenure system or are not on a tenure track (Nettles et al. 2000).

Standards for tenure are generally vague and unclear. Because the criteria for
tenure are subjective, women can easily be subtly discriminated against. According to a
study by Gibbons (1992), women may not fare well during the tenure process because
“they are isolated, lacking the alliances with older male colleagues, and [facing]
entrenched attitudes that women are less committed to research due to family
responsibilities” (1386). The double standard reemerges with the inconsistencies with
which departments and individuals apply the standards (Anonymous 1999). There are
three criteria for which tenure is judged: “research, teaching and service; however they
are not equally weighted” (Park 1996: 47). The emphasis for which tenure is judged is
on research, and this emphasis is a primary cause of stress for female faculty. Pre-tenure
academics often work overtime hours, trying to fit in enough hours of teaching, research
and other academic support duties.

Junior women faculty face many problems in their bid to gain tenure. Advice
from senior women faculty to new professors is to recognize the gendered nature of the
tenure process (Anonymous 1999). However, this advice is usually taken to mean that
the tenure-seeker is in control of her own success. Denial of tenure, which carries a
huge stigma, also perpetuates the perception of control because often the woman will
blame herself. There is also danger in women refusing to see themselves as victims of
discrimination in the gendered process of tenure, because “victim” is seen as a degraded
status (Anonymous 1999). Women are also at a disadvantage “to achieve tenure because
the childbearing years coincide with the tenure-track years” (Drago and Williams 2000:46).

Balancing work and family is one of the top concerns of women academics, according to Wilson (2002). Campus policies toward family have changed, and a lot more could be done if colleges and universities would follow the “Statement of Principles on Family Responsibilities and Academic Work,” adopted by the American Association of University Professors in November 2001 (Williams 2002). This new policy has recommended that parents should be allowed to stop the tenure clock for up to one year if the professor is the primary or coequal caregiver of the new child. Before this recommendation, “an academic appointment with no possibility of tenure has been the ultimate “mommy track” (Drago and Williams 2000:47), and the new policy helps administrators to “abandon the stereotype that the ideal academic is someone who commands immunity from child care” (Williams 2002:1). Williams (2002) goes further, explaining that:

If implemented correctly, the AAUP policy could be a first step toward broader policies that covers not only child care, but also other family responsibilities such as the care of aging parents and seriously ill partners. The statements of principles is an important first step in acknowledging that...serious academics may also have serious familial responsibilities. (3)

Past research shows that from the first moment women set foot on a career path they are required to meet a higher standard than their male counterparts to obtain tenure or positions in the academy. The continual problems of discrimination are mostly related to fair employment issues and hostile work environments that are the result of old-boy networks (Bienen et al 1977:371). The issue with rectifying discrimination is that it has been left to those who have been in charge in the past. The “silence about a
poor, hostile workplace environment reinforces the mistaken belief that all is well in the post-feminist era and equal employment opportunity efforts are unnecessary or that things are getting better” (Anonymous 1999:92). Sigmund Freud asked, “What do women want?” and Langer (1996) suggests that:

some women, at least, want to be allowed to take care of themselves and their loved ones and still follow their dreams. Women want to be appreciated and rewarded in the workplace and in society in the same ways that men are - with equal pay, fair rates of promotion and equal access to power. All people want to be judged by objective criteria; they want standards that are fair and unbiased. (147)

PRODUCTIVITY, HIERARCHY & POSITION

There is a wide body of literature about women in academia, most of it concentrated around the issue of productivity, defined as number of articles and books published. Women sociologists in Valian’s (1998) research from 1987 to 1990 were somewhat less productive (defined as quantity of articles) than men, but even as productivity was considered, women sociologists held lower ranks than comparable men. Comprehensive research by Davis and Astin (1990) of highly productive academics in the social sciences found no significant gender differences; women did not have lower research performance, the quantity of women’s work was found to be equal to that of men in article publications and higher in chapter publications. Their objective was to demonstrate that a woman’s ability to attain the same status levels as a man are determined by factors and conditions beyond gender.

Davis and Astin (1990) conducted two surveys over five years on women, productivity and reputational standing in the academy. They concluded that sex alone is not a very good predictor of productivity, and that it may be subtle forms of discrimination and gender-specific personal obligations that negatively affect their
discrimination and gender-specific personal obligations that negatively affect their professional life. Some additional differences between productivity in faculty include age, education and work activities. There are significant gender differences in the time spent on research versus teaching; women spend less than half of their time on research and scholarly writing and more time on teaching preparation (Davis and Astin 1990).

Sex differences in productivity and family status have also been studied. Noordenbos (1990) found that married women publish slightly more than married men and married women publish more than single women. Davis and Astin (1990) found that being married positively affects academic productivity, and at all academic ranks, married women published more than single women. Gibbons (1992) found that women with children are more productive than women without children.

Davis and Astin's (1990) research also uncovered some gender differences related to tenure and productivity. They found that highly productive academics tend to be tenured regardless of gender. But, women academics are more evenly distributed across the assistant and associate professor levels while men are more concentrated among the full professor level. They also suggest that productivity differences might be related to gender differences in tenure status because men tend to be tenured more frequently and reach full professorship more easily. Interestingly, the authors found that following tenure, women's productivity level is slightly higher than that of men. So the only problem women may have with the tenure process is their overall productivity. Research has found that “women's lower productivity is both a cause and effect of their lower status...[which] reinforces their chances to collaborate and win grants, which reinforces the perception that women are less productive” (Gibbons 1992:1387).
Chrisler (1998) attempts to compare productivity between men and women faculty members by counting published items, a measure of quantity rather than quality, and found that publication rates tend to increase with rank. She explains that her study is inconclusive because problems arise when the quantity of published items are counted without taking into consideration quality. Another aspect that Chrisler’s research uncovered was that resources are necessary for productivity. Differences also lie in the definition of resources for productivity. Her study found that women identify family support as the most important resource, while men cited the resource of research assistants as the most important. Additionally, Kauffman and Perry (1989) concluded that women often carry heavy teaching loads and have limited access to research facilities and resources (1989). Limited access also results in a lower publishing rate that may limit future employment opportunities.

Finally, it has been argued that “women’s productivity suffers from their commitment to teaching and service and from the more acute work and family/community conflicts” (Olsen, Maple and Stage 1995: 268). The current obsession with publication in deciding tenure and academic worth suggests that the emerging profile of women in academia is that they are less likely to receive recognition and rewards based on scholarly productivity. Incorrect assumptions about how women function as researchers may be most damaging to their professional growth and development in the academic setting and help perpetuate discrimination and insensitivity.

Another factor related to gender differences in academia could be organizational size. Large institutions have more formalized procedures that promote equity but may
actually discourage women because they tend to be research orientated (Kulis and Miller-Loess 1992). Kulis and Miller-Loess’s (1992) study also found that the proportion of female faculty is inversely related to prestige and selectivity in colleges, but not in universities. Women faculty have typically been located outside of formal prestige networks and women faculty remain less well represented in the formal prestigious institutions. Stack (1994) examined the relationship between gender and publishing productivity in the social sciences by analyzing the number of citations, articles and books published. The study concluded that, when departmental prestige is controlled for, there are not significant productivity differences between men and women.

THE DOUBLE BIND IN ACADEMICS

The differences between men and women in pay, promotion and tenure and position have not only been explained by women not being socialized to be career-orientated but also that women do not have the time or energy, due to their “second-shift,” to pursue successful career paths. Despite the gains of women’s equality in the workplace, women still are largely responsible for child-rearing and household responsibilities. This assumption of conflicting career and family demands affects mothers more than fathers. While both male and female faculty members may spend up to 50 hours a week or more at work, women spend about 30 extra hours a week on home responsibilities, compared to 7 extra hours for men (Young and Wright 2001). Many female professors struggle to juggle faculty life and motherhood, and feeling the pressure to succeed at both. A study by Young and Wright (2001) indicates that female
professors find difficulties in managing a wide range of academic and parental responsibilities. They suggest that “an understanding of how the roles of mother and professor interact in the context of an academic institution is critical to the development of a culture that would enhance a woman’s ability to satisfy both roles” (Young and Wright 2001: 555). Scholars within the social science disciplines had deemed academe an unfriendly place for professors “trying to cope with childbirth and other family responsibilities” (Wilson 2002:1). Clearly, the ideal professional worker in academe, as well as the general labor market, is someone that works for 40 hours with no career interruptions, taking no time off for family responsibilities.

It has been noted that many institutions have implemented policies that provide for child-leave, “the three most common types of policies are parental leave, reduced workloads for new parents and temporary stoppage of the tenure clock” (Drago and Williams 2000:46). Because most academics get understandably anxious about the outlook of extending their probationary period by stopping the tenure clock, some researchers have proposed a half-time tenure track policy. Drago and Williams (2000) propose that a tenure-track faculty member with care giving responsibilities (not just for children) could request to be placed on half-time status from one to twelve years. Workload, benefits and advancements would be reduced proportionally and the tenure clock would run at half speed. While the policy would not solve every problem, it would be another choice for professors who can’t work the long hours required before tenure. Families with the option of having both parents work part-time hours without the penalties accompanied with traditional part-time academic work would benefit many members. Mothers would not have to sacrifice their careers for their family and fathers
would be assured steady career advancement while participating in their kids’ lives more fully.

The current system of academia is inconsistent with our shifting ideals of gender equality. It is time for an evolution in the choices people have in structuring their professional careers. Time has come to “stop measuring commitment by the ability of an academic to have a spouse ready, willing and able to should the bulk of child care during the most time-consuming years of child-rearing” (Drago and Williams 2000:49).

CONCLUSION

Not only do women faculty average lower salaries than male faculty by about $10,000; women faculty are also less likely to be tenured (only 42% v. 66%) or to be full professors (15% v. 39%) than men (Nettles et al. 2000). Additionally, women are more likely to work in 2-year institutions as opposed to men, and spend less time on research and more time teaching than men (Nettles et al. 2000). As many studies have shown, the more prestigious the university, the fewer the women faculty, especially in highly tenured ranks. Policy analysts forecast that at the present rate of change, it will take between 50-90 years for women to reach numerical equality with men (Glazer-Raymo 1999).

The inequality in status between women and men academics will not disappear on its own. Neither can it be smoothed by the acquisition of more and better work skills nor by normal economic tides (Valian 1998). One of the keys to dismantling the inequality lies in everyone understanding how gender schemas hurt women in their professions. According to Valian (1998), if current gender schemas persist, then women
will not get positive evaluations for the work that it merits, and their progress will continue to be painfully slow.

Sexism in education needs to be resisted and interrupted by all faculty members, regardless of gender. Overall (1998) suggests that steps to dismantle it include: "avoidance of sexist and unnecessarily gendered language; the rejection of role stereotyping; the repudiation of sexist remarks and jokes; the prevention of sexual harassment and assault; and the insistence upon complete respect for all members of the academic community" (81). The academic institution can be a good place to work for women, and many researchers feel that it's worth struggling to improve the treatment and status of women in the institution.

HYPOTHESES

H1: Women at ranked Ph.D. level are as productive as the men.

Research by Davis and Astin (1990) found that highly productive academics in the social sciences (defined as research-focused and nationally ranked universities) had no significant gender differences in productivity levels. Women at the ranked Ph.D. level are also more likely to have tenure, and tenured academic women's productivity level is slightly higher than that of men that do not have tenure.

H2: Women with children are more productive than women without children.

Gibbons (1992) found that women with children are more productive than women without children.

H3: Women that are married are more productive than single women.
Noordenbos (1990) found that married women publish more than single women. Davis and Astin (1990) found that being married positively affects academic productivity, and at all academic ranks, married women published more than single women.

H4: Women teach more classes and spend more time preparing for classes than men.

Glazer-Raymo (1990) found that women spend more time teaching than men do, and less time engaging in research. Additionally, Davis and Astin (1990) found that women spend less than half of their time on writing and research and more time on teaching preparation. Park (1996) found that teaching duties fall disproportionately to women and women spend more time preparing for teaching.

H5: Women professors spend more time meeting students, attending meetings and preparing for class than men.

Research has suggested that women spend more hours working out of the classroom than men (Chrisler 1998), and that women spend more time than men advising their students (Park 1996). Also, the stereotype of women academics is that of caregiver and nurturer, so spending more hours helping students and colleagues is often expected and not particularly rewarded (Woll 2000). Park (1996) also found that female faculty are more likely than their male counterparts to engage in more and different types of service activities.

H6: Men professors are more likely to have tenure than female professors. Women are more likely to be in non tenure-track positions or have positions as assistant professors than men faculty (Quina et al. 1998; Farley 1982; Nettles et al. 2000; Harper et al. 2001; Valian 1998).
CHAPTER III
METHODODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology used to investigate the relationship between gender and academic institution, rank and productivity. The chapter has six sections including: description of the survey instrument, description of the sample and data collection, measurements of variables, explanations of the statistical procedures and a discussion of the limitations of the research.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

A self-administered mail-back survey designed to access sociology professors’ opinions and attitudes regarding academic issues and productivity was distributed to individuals in ten departments of Sociology. The questionnaire solicited information pertaining to respondents’ professional status and experiences in the academy and basic demographic data. Specifically, the questionnaire was divided into four parts: 1) demographic information, 2) productivity (number of articles and books published), 3) hierarchy (current academic rank), and 4) representation (type of institution). The survey can be found in Appendix A.

SAMPLE & DATA COLLECTION

The sample comes from two categories of schools in sociology, five ranked Ph.D. programs and five unranked Ph.D. programs from a population of all Ph.D. departments in the U.S., resulting in ten sociology departments totaling 218 full-time
professors. A random sample was obtained from the ranked Ph.D. programs from the 2001 *U.S. News- Best Graduate Programs in Sociology* listing. Each university on the list was numbered, 1-65, and then divided into six ranked categories- top 11, 12-22, 23-33, 34-44, 45-55, 56-65. Within each stratified group, one department was selected; thus six schools were selected from the list. From the six departments, five were then randomly selected to obtain the sample of ranked Ph.D. departments. A random sample for the unranked Ph.D. departments was obtained from the 1999 *ASA Index of Graduate Programs*. The schools that were not on the ranked list or were not out of the country were numbered 1-62, and five of these numbers were randomly selected to obtain the sample of unranked Ph.D. departments. A list of the sample departments can be found in Appendix C.

Department address and professors’ status from the ten universities and colleges were obtained from the *ASA Guide to Programs in Sociology*. Full-time professors were crosschecked through each department’s current (2001) website. A total of 218 full-time Sociology professors from the ranked Ph.D. departments and unranked Ph.D. departments make up the sample.

Questionnaires were administered between October 17-December 10, 2001. Respondents were notified that their participation was voluntary and were assured of confidentiality. The project and survey instrument were approved in September 2001 by the Human Subjects Review Board in the College of Arts and Science at Old Dominion University.

The first mailing occurred on October 17-20, 2001 and contained a cover letter, survey and stamped return envelope. Three weeks after this mailing, November 7-9, an
e-mail message was sent to offer a friendly reminder for those who had not yet responded along with instructions of how to contact the researcher for a replacement survey. See Appendix B for cover letter and reminder. A mailing with a replacement survey was sent to those that responded to the e-mail. A final reminder was sent December 31-January 4 via e-mail along with an attachment of the survey.

The mailing resulted in a sample of 85, which represented 39% of the total number of respondents. Some respondents were excluded because they were part-time or adjunct instructors, they did not complete a significant amount of the survey, or they did not have Ph.Ds.

MEASUREMENT OF VARIABLES

The questionnaire was designed to extract information to measure the following dependent and independent variables.

1) Academic productivity

Academic productivity was measured by asking respondents the number of books and articles published at each academic rank. The numbers were then added together to create a “total article” and “total book” category for the statistical analysis. The article productivity variable used in the regression models was total articles over the career to date.

2) Family status and demographics

Status was measured by asking about marital status, number and ages of children, relationship to children, and time spent with children. The variables were recoded for us in the statistical analysis as: “have children” (no=0 yes=1) and “marital status” (0=single
1=married). The race variable was recoded from its five categories into “white” (1) and “other” (0). Gender was measured as female (0) and male (1). Years of experience was calculated by subtracting the current year (2002) by the year of Ph.D. received.

3) Academic environment

Academic environment included questions in the survey that attempted to gauge general feelings of the respondent in the academic environment like feeling welcomed and supported, time spent preparing for classes per week, number of classes taught each school year, and time spent outside of class engaging in academic duties per week. The reported number of classes taught, time spent preparing for class and time spent engaging in academic duties were used in the analysis. The other variables used in the analysis were: tenure- (not tenured=0 tenured=1), feeling welcomed in the department (not feeling welcomed=0 feeling welcomed =1) and institution type (0=unranked 1=ranked). Years of experience in academia was computed by subtracting the current year (2002) by the year of the respondent’s Ph.D. Experience squared was also computed because experience may not have a linear effect and a squared term may account for the curvilinear nature of the expected relationship.

CODING & ANALYSIS OF DATA

All questionnaires were coded and analyzed using SPSS, a computer statistical program for the social sciences. T-tests and chi-square analysis were used to test for gender differences in productivity, years of experience and time spent inside and outside of the classroom and institution type differences in productivity. OLS regression and logistic regression were used to test the relationships between gender and factors such as
having children, being married, years of experience, having tenure, race, feeling welcomed in the department and type of institution.

STUDY LIMITATIONS

There are some limitations with the data set: truthfulness of the self-reported data, relatively small sample size, the structure of the survey questions (only one open-ended question) and the absence of adjunct/instructors and 2-year college and liberal arts college respondents.

First, with self-reported data the respondents may not be truthful in their answers. Questions about family situations and work environment may be private and difficult to address in the answers provided. Second, out of all of the Ph.D. sociology programs in the U.S., ten were chosen for the sample. From these ten departments, there were 218 full-time professors. Further limitations may stem from the structure of the survey questions. Finally, the sample did not represent faculty members in community colleges or who are part-time instructors or adjuncts. The literature suggests that a large percentage of women faculty members are concentrated at the community college level or as instructors and adjunct faculty. The liberal arts college professors were originally included in the research sample, but due to a low response rate (n=6) they were cut from the final sample.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the data analysis for the effects of gender and type of academic institution on productivity, classroom time and family status. I first review the descriptive statistics that gives a picture of the sample, and then describe the bivariate and multivariate statistics used to test the hypotheses. The data comes from a self-returned survey of 85 full-time sociology professors at ten randomly selected colleges and universities.

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

The following presents the basic demographic characteristics of the sample. All of the respondents are full-time, tenure-track professors in sociology. Fifty-three percent of the population are from ranked Ph.D. departments, 47% are from unranked Ph.D. departments. The majority of the professors are full professors (40%), followed by associate professors (32%) and then assistant professors (27%). More respondents are male than female (63.5% vs. 36.5%). Most of the respondents are Caucasian (85%), and 5% are Hispanic, 5% are Black, 4% are Asian and 1% are American-Indian. The ages of the respondents vary from 25 years to 75 years old, 22% are under 40, 57% are between 40-59 and 22% are over 60. The respondents are predominately married (77%) or cohabiting (13%), and most have children (73%).

Forty percent have been in their current position for five years or less, 26% have been in their positions for six to fifteen years and another 26% have been in their
positions for sixteen to thirty years. Professors in their position for 31 years or more made up 5% of the sample. A majority of respondents have worked at another institution (54%), have received academic off-loads to engage in research (71%) and have received grant money for research (86%). Most feel encouraged by their university or college (79%), 86% feel supported by their chair (6% were the chair) and 86% feel welcomed in their department. The respondents mostly identified themselves as feminists (77%) and 12% felt it was a problem being a feminist in their department. Most of the respondents have been in academia for 6-15 years or 16-30 years (35% and 31% respectively), with 18% in academia for less than 5 years and 16% for 31 years or more.

Of the male respondents, 50% are full professors, 24% associate professors and 26% are assistant professors. Most male respondents feel welcomed in their sociology department (93%), have children (83%) and are married (87%). Fifty percent of the male respondents are from the ranked Ph.D. institutions and 72% have tenure currently. The male respondents are predominately white (85%, 6% Hispanic, 4% Asian and 4% Black), 48% have been in academia for 20 years or less and 37% are under 50 years old (see table 1 for means and standard deviation).

Female respondents were mostly associate professors (45%), 29% are assistant professors and 23% are full professors. Slightly fewer female professors felt welcomed in their department (19% feel unwelcomed and 7% feel neutral), have children (55%) and are married (58%) compared to the male professors in the survey. Fifty-eight percent of the female respondents are from the ranked Ph.D. institutions and 61% currently have tenure. They are predominately white (81%, followed by 7% Black, 3%
each Hispanic, Asian and Native American). Of the female respondents, 80% have been in academia for twenty or fewer years and 72% are 50 years old or younger (see table 1 for means and standard deviation).

Table 1. Sample Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables for Men</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel Supported</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Children</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Tenure</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Academia</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.52</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52.61</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables for Women</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.Deviation</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel Supported</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Children</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Tenure</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Academia</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44.62</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF HYPOTHESES

For hypothesis one, males had a mean of 5.18 books and 32.79 articles while females had a mean of 2.82 books and 15.50 articles; the means for both articles and books differ significantly. Males at the ranked Ph.D. level are more productive than females of the same level in both books (t=-2.139, p<.05) and articles (t=-2.457, p<.05). This does not support hypothesis one that there is no gender difference in productivity.

The results of the test of hypothesis two, indicates that women with children and women without children show some differences in productivity. Women with children had a mean of 27.22 articles and while women without children had a mean of 15.43 articles; these differences are not significant (t=1.596, p>.05). However, the means do differ significantly for book productivity (t=2.736, p<.05). Women with children had a mean of 3.89 books and women without children had a mean of 1.83 books.

An independent samples t-test for hypothesis three shows that married women had a mean of 26.38 articles and 3.74 books, unmarried women had a mean of 28 articles and 3.5 books, and the means of each did not differ significantly from each other (t=.111, p>.05 for articles and t=-.295, p>.05 for books).

Analysis for hypothesis four indicates that hours spent preparing for classes and number of classes taught do not differ significantly between men and women. Female professors teaching undergraduate classes spent a mean of 12.77 hours preparing and men spend 9.75 hours (t=1.55, p>.05). Female professors taught a mean of 3.13 undergraduate classes and male professors taught a mean of 2.62 undergraduate classes (t=1.73, p>.05). Female professors taught a mean of 1.15 classes at the graduate level,
and male professors taught a mean of 1.87 graduate classes ($t=-1.54$, $p>.05$). Female professors spent an average of 9.45 hours prepping for their graduate classes compared to male professors who had an average of 8.65 hours prepping ($t=.495$, $p>.05$).

An independent samples t-test of hypothesis five shows that the females had a mean of working 14.87 hours in academic support, which was not significantly different from males with a mean of working 18.80 hours ($t=-1.348$, $p>.05$).

Hypothesis six analysis shows that male professors are not more likely to be tenured than female professors are (chi-square$=1.383$, $p=.240$) and there is a weak association between the gender and tenure variables.

At the bivariate level, most of the hypotheses were unsupported. Hypothesis two, "women with children are more productive than women without children", showed significant differences in book productivity but not in article productivity. Other factors are examined in further analyses.

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

Regression analysis was used to assess the influence of other variables on productivity. The variables that are significantly related to book productivity for the whole population is institution type (ranked or unranked Ph.D.) and years of experience. Professors that work at unranked Ph.D. institutions publish 3.5 fewer books than professors at ranked Ph.D. institutions do. Every year of experience results in .68 more books. The model explains about 42% of the variations in book productivity (Table 2). Significant predictor variables for article productivity are
Table 2. Regressions of Factors on Book Productivity- Whole Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Parameter Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-6.21846</td>
<td>2.71691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>3.53375*</td>
<td>1.05812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Ph.D.</td>
<td>-0.00087</td>
<td>0.02857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.32353</td>
<td>1.21830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcomed in Dept.</td>
<td>0.37501</td>
<td>1.38040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Tenure</td>
<td>-3.82639</td>
<td>2.53497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-0.25445</td>
<td>1.30035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0.81823</td>
<td>1.24437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Children</td>
<td>1.69541</td>
<td>1.23039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>0.67947*</td>
<td>0.30713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience2</td>
<td>-0.01072</td>
<td>0.00592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at .05 level
R-square= .4222
institution type and number of years experience. Professors at the ranked Ph.D. level publish 13 more articles and for every year of academic experience article productivity increases by 2.3. The model explains about 52% of the variation in article productivity (Table 3).

When only male professors are analyzed in regards to article productivity, there is one significant predictor variable, institution type (Table 4). Male professors from ranked Ph.D. institutions publish nearly 13 more articles than male professors from unranked Ph.D. institutions. The model explains about 57% of male professors’ article productivity. Article productivity for women professors are not only influenced by institution type but also the number of years experience squared (Table 5). Women at the ranked Ph.D. level will publish about 17 more articles than women at the unranked Ph.D. level. The model explains 84% of female professors’ article productivity.

Regression analysis of professors by institution type shows that there are different variables that significant in predicting article productivity. At the ranked Ph.D. level, analysis indicates that years of experience is the only significant variable, each year of experience results in an increase of 4 articles. This model explains 59% of ranked Ph.D. professors’ article productivity (Table 6). At the unranked Ph.D. level, feeling supported and welcomed in the department results in 13 more article publications than those feeling unsupported and unwelcome by their department (Table 7). This model explains 61% of unranked Ph.D. professors’ article productivity.
Table 3. Regressions of Factors on Article Productivity- Whole Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Parameter Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-19.03838</td>
<td>9.26780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>12.99587*</td>
<td>4.07103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Ph.D.</td>
<td>0.14238</td>
<td>0.12485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>2.72260</td>
<td>4.70431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome in Dept.</td>
<td>3.79920</td>
<td>6.00687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Tenure</td>
<td>-4.14825</td>
<td>7.67827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>4.23011</td>
<td>5.36802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-8.34728</td>
<td>5.45896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Children</td>
<td>5.59512</td>
<td>5.83430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>2.37712*</td>
<td>0.97720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience2</td>
<td>-0.03363</td>
<td>0.02008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at .05 level

R square = .5173
Table 4. Regressions of Factors on Article Productivity- Men Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Parameter Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-42.66224</td>
<td>15.73286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>14.80096*</td>
<td>5.49898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Ph.D.</td>
<td>0.22397</td>
<td>0.15332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome in Dept.</td>
<td>13.49398</td>
<td>10.05497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Tenure</td>
<td>0.15148</td>
<td>12.67895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>5.78470</td>
<td>7.86128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>1.68613</td>
<td>7.97128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Children</td>
<td>7.48266</td>
<td>8.08336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>2.73939*</td>
<td>1.55790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience2</td>
<td>-0.04606</td>
<td>0.02954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at .05 level
R square= .5714
Table 5. Regressions of Factors on Article Productivity- Women Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Parameter Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-14.52278</td>
<td>8.50488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>17.30794*</td>
<td>0.00043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Ph.D.</td>
<td>-0.16762</td>
<td>0.15114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome in Dept.</td>
<td>1.69774</td>
<td>4.96802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Tenure</td>
<td>2.69799</td>
<td>6.22803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-4.02725</td>
<td>4.90474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-8.43637</td>
<td>5.06468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Children</td>
<td>-4.47242</td>
<td>5.06468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>-1.43949</td>
<td>1.16194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience2</td>
<td>0.08782*</td>
<td>0.03452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at .05 level

R square = .8424
Table 6. Regressions of Factors on Article Productivity- Ranked Ph.D.s Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Parameter Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-19.03838</td>
<td>9.26780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>2.72260</td>
<td>4.70431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Ph.D.</td>
<td>0.14238</td>
<td>0.12485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome in Dept.</td>
<td>3.79920</td>
<td>6.00687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Tenure</td>
<td>-4.14825</td>
<td>7.67827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>4.23011</td>
<td>5.36802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-8.34728</td>
<td>5.45896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Children</td>
<td>5.59512</td>
<td>5.83430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>2.37712*</td>
<td>0.97750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience2</td>
<td>-0.03363</td>
<td>0.03452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at .05 level
R square = .5173
Table 7. Regressions of Factors on Article Productivity- UnRanked Ph.D.s Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Parameter Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-21.26789</td>
<td>7.69058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>2.54345</td>
<td>3.89783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank of Ph.D.</td>
<td>-0.04854</td>
<td>0.10578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome in Dept.</td>
<td>13.28054*</td>
<td>4.80550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Tenure</td>
<td>6.87264</td>
<td>5.77100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>7.83503</td>
<td>4.42143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-1.56081</td>
<td>4.67219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Children</td>
<td>4.68739</td>
<td>4.53531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>1.09202</td>
<td>0.81068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience2</td>
<td>-0.01803</td>
<td>0.01803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at .05 level

R square = .6046
Based on previous research on the gendered nature of academia, some differences in productivity, tenure and expectations were expected. As the analysis shows, one out of the five hypotheses were supported. T-test analysis shows that book and article productivity for women with children is slightly higher than women without children. As shown in past research, women with children are more productive than women without, "but the perception that having children reduces a woman's productivity still persists" (Gibbons 1992: 1387). Secondary t-test analysis also shows that there are significant differences in article productivity between professors at the ranked and unranked Ph.D. level. Professors from the ranked Ph.D. institutions have a mean of 25.9 articles compared to the 14.7 articles from professors at the unranked Ph.D. institutions. T-test analysis also showed significant differences in years of experience between male and female professors. Female professors had a mean of 11.8 years of experience, while male professors had a mean of 20.5 years.

In a test of bivariate correlation, gender was shown to correlate with years experience (.373), marital status (.329), having children (.309) and feeling welcomed (-.314). This indicates that male professors have more experience and are more likely to be married and have children than women professors, and female professors are more likely to feel unwelcomed in their department than men.

Multivariate analysis showed that, overwhelmingly, the most important variable in productivity is institution type and years of experience. The productivity variable was first
defined and tested as total number of articles by adding numbers of articles at each ranking level. In some extended analyses, the variable was re-defined and tested by dividing the number of articles by years of experience to account for the time aspect of productivity. The later definition and tests resulted in no new significant factors so the original definition and test of article productivity stands.

For men and women, the most significant factor in article productivity was institution type with sociologists at the ranked Ph.D. level publishing more than sociologists at the unranked Ph.D. level. This was expected as the ranked Ph.D. level schools are seen as pioneers in research, and thus have a higher expectation of submitting scholarly works for publication. Besides teaching at the Ph.D. institutions, research and publications are significant responsibilities not taken lightly. It was also expected that years of experience would be significant for both men and women, since it represents time. Article publication may become like second nature to seasoned academics. A newly awarded Ph.D. may not have as many opportunities to submit papers to academic journals and may spend more time adapting to the new set of guidelines for publishing in journals. With experience and time in the field also comes more free time to research and write. New academics may be teaching new courses or spend more time adjusting to university policies. Academics with more experience may be teaching the same course throughout the years and spend less time preparing for classes, thus having more time to spend on their research.

By separating the respondents just by the institution type, a slightly different picture develops. For sociologists at the ranked Ph.D. programs, years of experience was the only significant factor, showing increases in article productivity for every year of
experience. As discussed above, the more years of experience an academic has, the more likely they are to have more time to dedicate to research and publication. At the unranked Ph.D. level, the only significant factor in article productivity is feeling welcomed and supported in the department. The data does not suggest why this factor was the only significant variable in article productivity. Perhaps, at the unranked level there is less grant money and research time to publish, and more focus on teaching and classroom support duties. Feeling supported by the department may result in more sharing of research allocations- co-writing, editing, data sharing, etc. An unwelcome feeling in the department may result in a lonely and isolated research process that takes much more time and energy. The relationship of productivity and feeling welcomed may have an opposite causal direction, so that professors who publish more in the unranked Ph.D. departments feel more welcomed than professors who publish less.

The literature suggests that women are more affected by the overall environment of the department, and that women feel excluded from the university environment. In this study, it was discovered that both men and women's productivity at the unranked level are affected by the departmental environment, so rather than it being a gender difference, it appears to be an institution difference. Since no previous study has investigated how feeling welcomed in a department affects productivity, there is little to go on. Gender may still be playing a role in the institutional differences of productivity and feeling welcomed, as it has been noted in this thesis and in other research, that women are more likely to be hired in less prestigious university networks. But in this sample, more women are represented in the ranked Ph.D. institutions than in non-ranked Ph.D. institutions (58% to
42%). Additionally, at the unranked Ph.D. level, more men than women felt unwelcome in the department, while at the ranked Ph.D. level, more women than men felt unwelcome.

Aside from productivity differences, the gendered nature of academia seems to be less evident. Women and men in this sample spend similar amounts of time teaching classes, preparing for classes and performing academic support. However, the evidence of productivity differences in gender is troubling because of the weight productivity carries in tenure decisions. It can be concluded that men and women are making gains toward academic egalitarianism, but that some of the old assumptions hold true. Chipping away at the gendered wall is a long and complicated process because it needs to account for all of the other factors involved, like marital status, children, institution differences in resources and money and teaching loads.

LIMITATIONS

The lack of support for the hypotheses in the present study may be due to various factors. First, the sample was from professors’ self-returned questionnaires and further research would require a larger, more representative pool of respondents from various types of institutions. The returned questionnaires that were tabulated may be biased if the positions that historically women are more likely to be in are under-represented. Second, in regards to productivity, the numbers of published items may not be accurately represented and have skewed the data. Book chapters, reviews and co-authored publications were not specifically asked for, so some respondents may have included them as their number of publications. Additionally, this study did not measure if overall productivity is affected by period of time at the current institution or by current rank.
Feeling welcomed in the department was a factor that was determined to be significant in article productivity, but it is unclear how or what determines feeling welcomed. Other survey items should be correlated for this variable (like research money, time off for research, feeling supported by the chair, etc), and “feeling welcomed” should be defined so the respondents are working with the same feelings.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research should focus more on specific factors regarding differences in productivity and tenure. Respondents should be asked if factors such as marital status, children, feeling a part of the department affect their productivity and tenure status and how they affect them. The body of literature shows some distinct differences between male and female academics, so future research should investigate each population separately, comparing the experiences of men to men before comparing them to women. In addition to a larger sample size pooled from difference types of institutions, if time permits, follow-up questions should be used to gain a more accurate picture of the results.

Further research should also pull away from the current discussions of differences because of gender and focus on differences because of other factors. Gender may not be the only lens in which to examine the differences in productivity and tenure, and there could be more focus on race, class, sexuality, age and departmental environment as factors shaping an academic’s experience.
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APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT
Directions: For each of the following questions, please fill in the blanks with your response or circle the number to the left of the appropriate response, you may circle more than one response. If you are uncomfortable answering a question, feel free to skip it.

01. Gender: 

02. Date of Birth: 

03. How do you describe yourself?
   a. American Indian or Alaskan Native 
   b. Black or African-American 
   c. Asian, Asian-American, Pacific Islander 
   d. Hispanic or Latin American 
   e. White (non-Hispanic) 
   6. Other ____________________________

03. You are currently....
   a. Single    b. Cohabiting    c. Married, age(s) when married _____________

04. Have you been widowed?
   a. No    b. Yes, how many times? , at what age(s)? _____________

05. Have you been divorced?
   a. No    b. Yes, how many times? , at what age(s)? ______________

06. Do you have children?
   a. No (go to question #7) 
   b. Yes (check all that apply)
      1. Biological ______
      2. Step ______
      3. Adopted ______
   6a. Number of Children: ________________________________

   6b. Ages of Children: __________________________________

   6c. Which of the following best describes how you feel: Having kids has...
      a. Helped my career
      b. Hindered my career
      c. Not affected my career

   6d. Who is (was, if children are adults now) the primary caregiver of your children?
      a. I am                      b. My partner
      c. Both of us equally       d. Nanny/Helper/Day Care
      e. Other ____________________________ (please specify)

   6e. Approximately how many hours during the typical workweek do you spend with your children? ______________

   6f. Do you feel you have enough time to spend with your kids? a. Yes    b. No
You may need your vita to answer the next couple of questions

07. From where did you receive your Ph.D.? 

7a. What year did you receive your Ph.D.? 

08. Number of articles published as a full professor? 

8a. Number of articles published as an associate professor? 

8b. Number of articles published as an assistant professor? 

8c. Number of articles published as an instructor/adjunct? 

09. Number of books published as a full professor? 

9a. Number of books published as an associate professor? 

9b. Number of books published as an assistant professor? 

9c. Number of books published as an instructor/adjunct? 

10. Length of time in current position: 

11. Are you tenured? 

a. Yes (go to question 12)  
b. No 

11a. Do you expect to get tenure at this university? 

a. Yes  
b. No, why not? 

12. Current rank? 

a. Assistant Professor  
b. Associate Professor  
c. Full Professor 

13. Have you ever put your family life on hold for your academic career? 

a. Yes  
b. No 

14. Have you worked at any other academic institutions? 

a. No (go to #15)  
b. Yes 

14a. When (from-to)? 

14b. What was your position? 

14c. Where? 

14d. Why did you leave? 

15. Why did you choose your current geographical location? 

a. grew up in the area  
b. lived in the area  
c. partner from the area  
d. current job  
e. partner's current job  
f. other (specify) 

16. How many new undergraduate class preparations have you had in the past academic year? 

16a. How many undergraduate courses do you teach in a school year? 

16b. Approximately how many hours do you spend per week preparing for your undergraduate courses? 

17. How many new graduate class preparations have you had in the past academic year? ____________
   17a. How many graduate courses do you teach in a school year? ____________
   17b. Approximately how many hours per week do you spend per week preparing for your graduate courses? ________________

18. Approximately how many hours per week do you spend working outside of the classroom (helping students, attending committees, meetings, etc)? ________________

19. Do you feel that you are academically encouraged by your college/university?
   a. Yes  b. No

20. Have you ever received a teaching off-load in order to focus on research?
   a. Yes  b. No
   20a. Have you received an off-load on a regular basis? a. yes  b. no

21. Have you ever received financial support for doing research?
   a. Yes  b. No
   21a. What is the largest amount of grant money you have received? ______

22. How many conferences/scholarly meetings do you attend a year? ____________
   22a. How much travel money did you get last year, from your department, to attend professional meetings? ____________

23. Do you feel your department chair supports you professionally?
   a. Yes  b. No

24. Do you feel welcome and a full part of your Sociology department?
   a. Yes  b. No

25. Briefly describe your definition of a feminist. ____________________________

26. By your definition, are you a feminist? a. Yes  b. No

27. Do you feel it is problematic to be a feminist in your department? a. Yes  b. No

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire, please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope.
APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER AND REMINDER
Dear Professor:

I am conducting a survey of college Sociology professors for my Master's thesis in Applied Sociology at Old Dominion University. The purpose of my research is to learn about hierarchy and gender representation in Sociology departments at various universities and colleges. Your department has been selected at random to participate in this survey, and every full-time professor in your department will receive the same survey.

Enclosed you will find a copy of the questionnaire. The questionnaire should take about 5 minutes to complete, and I hope that you will take the time to complete it and send it back in the enclosed envelope. Your confidentiality is promised under the academic ethic standards of Old Dominion University. The questionnaire has an identification number that connects your individual questionnaire with data about you from your department (year of degree, place of degree, academic rank, areas of specialization, etc). Your name will not be revealed or associated with your response, nor will anyone outside the project be allowed to see your response. Your name and data will be stored separately, and I will maintain the only master list.

I appreciate your willingness to help in my research effort toward my master's degree. I look forward to receiving your reply.

Sincerely yours,

Rebecca F. Grove
MA candidate in Applied Sociology,
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA
fogrove@msn.com
November 12, 2001
Dear Professor,

A few weeks ago a questionnaire asking you about your experiences in academia was mailed to you.

If you have already completed and returned it to me, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because it has been sent to only a small sample of full-time professors, it is extremely important that your be included in the study.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or if it has been misplaced, please simply “reply” to this message and I will mail another one to you immediately.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Fogerty Grove
2nd Year M.A. Candidate
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, VA
APPENDIX C

SAMPLE DEPARTMENTS
 Ranked Ph.D. Programs
  University of Chicago
  Johns Hopkins University
  University of California-San Diego
  University of Florida
  University of Kansas

 Unranked Ph.D. Programs
  Kent State University
  University of Kentucky-Lexington
  Temple University
  Western Michigan University
  University of New Mexico
VITA

Rebecca Fogerty Grove

Old Dominion University, Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice, Norfolk, VA 23529  (757) 683-3791

Education:
M.A. Applied Sociology, May 2002; Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA
B.A. Sociology, May 1999; Elon College, Elon College, NC

Experience:
Teaching Assistant, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA, August 2000-May 2002.

Real Estate Assistant, Gerry Sesser, Inc, VA Beach, VA, August 2000-May 2002.

Retail Assistant, Casa Luna Imports, VA Beach, VA, April 2001-February 2002.

Assistant Manager, Pier 1 Imports, VA Beach, VA and Falls Church, VA, August 1999-August 2000.

Activities and Awards:
Recipient of Graduate Tuition Grant, 2000-2002.
Graduate Student Representative, 2000-2001.