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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Research in counselor education has tended to focus on counseling students or clients (Hazler & Carney, 1993) rather than on the actual practitioners of the profession, counselor educators. While attention to the experiences of counselor educators in the literature appears to be increasing, there is a continuing need to better understand factors that may impact women and men faculty member’s experience of the work environment.

Changes in counseling philosophy, mission statement, accreditation standards, and the philosophical thrust of leadership organizations such as American Counseling Association (ACA) have resulted in changes in the organizational direction and job function of counselor education programs (Hosie, 1990; Myers, 1991; Vacc, 1990; Witmer & Young, 1996). It seems logical that these changes affect the daily work experiences of counselor educators. Inherent in the average workday of counselor educators are various potential job stressors and multiple work roles (Niles et al., 2001). If counseling is truly the “impossible profession” due to the myriad responsibilities fulfilled by counselors (Bockrath, 1999), it seems likely that the work of counselor educators may be somewhat “more impossible.”

Counselor educators provide a multi-faceted function in the counseling profession; modeling, mentoring, and molding future generations of counselors semester after semester. Counselor educators are charged both with understanding and demonstrating the fundamental concepts of counseling familiar to counselors and with a host of other duties above and beyond the nature of counseling itself (Dorn, 1992; Niles et al., 2001; Sowa & May, 1994). In addition to these important functions, faculty in counselor education must also meet the requirements of teaching, service, and research at a great many universities.
It stands to reason that counselor educators have an immeasurable influence on the future of counselor education programs in particular, and the counseling profession in general. Counselor education faculty provide the impetus of the counseling field, and thus it is important to know more about their work experiences and factors that may be related to these experiences. Better understanding of the potential interrelationship between work and personal factors that affect individual’s perceptions of the work environment is needed because of the implications for the profession, for students and clients, and for society (Witmer & Young, 1996).

Statement of the Problem

This exploratory study was designed to examine factors related to the work experiences of faculty in counselor education. Changes in the workplace of the 20th century, challenges to institutions of higher education, and gradually increasing attention to faculty members as the medium for the improvement of higher education highlight the relative dearth of information about counselor educators in the literature pertaining to the counseling profession. Little is known about the work experiences of faculty in counselor education, though some studies have attempted to examine specific aspects of these populations. An exhaustive search of the literature yielded few studies regarding counselor educators’ experiences of their work; and these studies tended to focus on narrow aspects of work in counselor education. This study reviewed work environment factors and life factors potentially related to the worklives of counselor educators and compared potential differences in these dimensions across multiple demographic variables.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined to convey their unique meaning to the research study:
Developmental/Growth Model The terms “developmental” and “growth” are often considered to be synonymous as indicated by the Crose & Nicholas (1992) definition of a belief system “based on the premise that people can change and grow in positive ways” (p. 151).

Gender Discrimination For the purposes of this study, gender discrimination will be defined as negative or differential treatment of individuals on the basis of gender.

Holism The earliest definition of holism from Smuts (1926) construes holism as a sense that a living entity is more than the sum of its parts, as well as the connotation of systemic interaction between all parts of the system in which changes in any part may affect changes in other parts.

Life Factors For the purposes of this study, life factors will be broadly defined as any items or categories related to demographic and personal dimensions of life (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, marital/partnership status, and parenting, etc.).

Sexual Harassment Paludi and Barickman (1991) defined sexual harassment as unwanted verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature that denies, limits, or provides differential treatment to individuals.

Work Adler (1927/1954) defined the work life task as any effort individuals make both to sustain themselves or to contribute to the sustenance of others. Witmer and Sweeney (1992) note that work serves economic, psychological, and social functions.

Work Factors For the purposes of this study, work factors will be broadly defined as any items or categories specifically related to the academic work environment itself (e.g., faculty rank, tenure, salary, sexual harassment, mentoring, and scholarly activities, etc.).
Overview of the Study

This study is discussed and presented in the following five chapters. In Chapter I, variables related to the study of counselor education faculty were identified and defined, and research relating to the study of faculty worklives was briefly introduced. The statement of the problem, research questions, definition of terms and overview of the study were described. In Chapter II a review of the literature on work, faculty in higher education, trends in counselor education, and the need for suitable research concerning counselor education faculty is presented. In Chapter III, the methodology to be used in the study is explained including the instrumentation, participants, procedures, and method of data analysis. The results of the survey are presented in Chapter IV. In Chapter V, the results are discussed, and implications for future research are considered.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Alfred Adler (1927/1957) identified work, society, and love as three major life tasks individuals must confront, but considered work to be the most important in the maintenance of life. Adler defined work as any effort individuals make both to sustain themselves or to contribute to the sustenance of others and of society. He believed that the importance of work to individuals and to society could not be underestimated, because work is necessary for sustenance, can be a source of personal identity and self-worth, and contributes to the good of others.

Work is considered a critical life task because successful negotiation of this task is essential for individuals to obtain a sense of usefulness, self-worth, and competence in addition to life and job satisfaction (Connolly, 2000; Dollarhide, 1997; Dreikurs, 1953; Savicki & Cooley, 1982). One study calculated that individuals spend approximately 30% of their waking lives at work (Conrad, 1987), making it an evident dimension of life that may affect individual’s experiences and attitudes toward life. The ability to work is associated with myriad of economic, psychological, and social benefits (Adler, 1927/1957; Witmer & Sweeney, 1992). Benefits of work for the individual include intrinsic and extrinsic rewards.

Rewards of Work

Peterson and Gonzalez (2000) noted that work has multiple definitions based on both internal factors and external factors. Internal factors are those psychological dimensions related to the individual’s desire to work for the sake of felt benefits; that is, working for the sake of working. Internal factors related to work include a constellation of individual attributes and qualities, such as attitudes, values, motivation, locus of control, and a sense of worth (Furnham,
As Connolly (2000) noted, work that is meaningful and rewarding leads to improved overall mental and physical wellness and life satisfaction.

External, or extrinsic, factors are those dimensions related to the benefits one receives from the act of doing work (Peterson & Gonzalez, 2000). These factors include economic benefits gained by working and the ability to meet one’s basic needs such as food, shelter, and physical safety (Herr & Cramer, 1988; McCortney & Engels, 2003). Both internal and external factors may have a significant impact on individual perceptions of work.

Perceptions of Work

Drew and Kiecolt-Glaser (1998) noted that perceptions, beliefs, and cognitions are linked to physiological responses to the world, thereby mediating or exacerbating individual stress and associated behaviors. There is a corresponding recognition of the effect of individual perception toward work and performance in the workplace (Connolly, 2000), as well as the ramifications of work on life satisfaction (Brown, 1995; Dorn, 1992; Myers et al., 2000). In this sense, work dimensions and life dimensions may have reciprocal effects on one another. Individual, subjective evaluations of the quality of life experiences not only shape attitudes but also behaviors (Hermon & Hazler, 1999; Mudrack, 1997; Savolaine & Granello, 2002), which may in turn affect work experiences. Additionally, negative work-related experiences may affect functioning in non-work related dimensions.

Work-life Interrelationship

The concept of holism is a useful construct with which to understand the relationship between work and life. Holism as defined by Smuts (1926) construes a whole as being more than the sum of its parts, with an inherent implication that changes in any part may also affect changes in other parts. In his earliest works Adler (1927/1957) noted the interrelationship between the life
tasks of work, love, and friendship and emphasized holism in understanding individual functioning. In their studies of holistic wellness, Myers et al. (2000) also noted that changes in any life dimension may effect changes in other areas of functioning. For example, negative experiences associated with work may negatively influence individual’s ability to meaningfully participate in social relationships. Thus the concept of preventative holistic “wellness” has increasingly become included in the employment sector as a method of improving employee productivity and reducing absenteeism (Connolly, 2000). Several studies indicated the necessity of organizational wellness as pertains to the effect on worker wellness (Dorn, 1992; O’Halloran & Linton, 2000; Sackney et al., 2000). Dorn noted that over time, work experiences may affect overall adjustment- a clear call for improved attention to career in the lives of individuals.

Individuals who report being satisfied with their work experiences experience fewer physical and psychological illnesses (Begley & Czajka, 1993; Connolly, 2000). Leinbaugh et al. (2003) noted that satisfaction in work was related to perceived quality of life. Witmer and Sweeney (1992) also reported that satisfaction in work is positively associated with increased longevity. Myers et al. (2000) also noted that workers who enjoy their work and who feel included and important tend to be satisfied with their work experiences, which can in turn have an effect on life satisfaction. Persons who experience their work as a calling, such as counselors and counselor educators, tend to experience the highest work satisfaction (Parr & Bradley, 1996; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997).

Dreikurs (1953) regarded the inability or unwillingness to fulfill the work task as a symptom of serious illness. Dorn (1992) noted the effect of negative career-related circumstances on physical, emotional, and spiritual functioning. Dorn believed that unhappy workers may tend to separate their career-related lives from their non-career-related lives, with the belief that this will
help them to better cope with negative workplace circumstances. Studies on dissatisfaction of workers reveal that individuals who are the most dissatisfied tend to disidentify with the workplace and with colleagues, find little meaning in their jobs, feel little chance of advancement, and may value extrinsic benefits of work (e.g., earned monies) rather than intrinsic rewards (Connolly, 2000; Peterson & Gonzalez, 2000). Job dissatisfaction has also been negatively correlated with productivity and also with poorer physical and psychological health (Begley & Czajka, 1993). In an era of changing paradigms of work and career instability for many people, increased attention to the myriad effects of the work task is increasingly important.

Contemporary Workplace

The nature of the workplace and society’s attitude toward work has changed dramatically over time. The last two decades have been an era of changing job descriptions, downsizing, changes in the global economy, and increasing numbers of women and ethnic minorities entering the workplace (Peterson & Gonzalez, 2000). The work environment of the past, in which an individual could work for a company for thirty years and expect a gold watch upon retirement, is largely a thing of the past (Connolly, 2000; Finkelstein, 2003; McCortney & Engels, 2003).

In part due to the changing nature of work, organizations have attempted to identify issues that may affect employee performance and increase productivity (Connolly, 2000; Sackney et al., 2003). For example, Seldin (1991) noted that employee wellness programs, including employee assistance programs (EAPs), can reduce absenteeism and improve job performance. While the increased prevalence of EAPs suggests employers’ recognition that employee experiences in the workplace may enhance or detract from overall health, these programs tend to emphasize physical health rather than psychological wellbeing (Connolly,
2000). Additionally, there is some evidence to suggest that job type may affect employee perceptions of personal wellbeing in multiple life dimensions (Peterson & Gonzalez, 2000; Sackney et al., 2003). Changes in paradigms of work merit increased attention to factors that may impact individual’s experiences in the work environment.

Education and Work

Education and learning are inextricably linked to work, especially in light of changes in the global economy (Finkelstein, 2003; Peterson & Gonzalez, 2000). Events of the 20th century, including good economy, industrial and technological progress, the advent of the generation of “baby boomers,” and increased emphasis on education may have implied higher education as a kind of birthright for many people in this society (Kanter & Mirvis, 1989; Kennedy, 1997). Kennedy noted that though in the early days of higher education a college degree was intended to produce more thoughtful, mature, and well-rounded individuals, a college degree has increasingly come to represent economic improvement and the ability to compete effectively in the workplace. Arguably, institutions of higher education in contemporary society face more challenges than ever before.

The work of faculty members, seen in light of changes in society, begins to take on a new significance against the backdrop of higher education. Kennedy (1997) stated that, “The very heart of the institution’s academic duty to society is the work of its faculty…. It can truthfully be asserted that they are the institution” (italics in original, p. 15). Due to the contemporary trends and challenges affecting institutions of higher education in the United States, it is increasingly important to better understand the worklives of faculty in higher education.
Academic Workplace

Trends in Higher Education

Over the past several decades, academia has undergone a sea change including increased pressure on colleges and universities, increasing costs and tighter budgets, and increased demand by the public to justify the purpose of higher education (Finkelstein, 2003; Johnsrud, 2002; Kennedy, 1997). Higher education has changed from an environment intended simply to nurture well-rounded adults into an almost mandatory requirement for those seeking to compete in the workplace; a college degree may often be seen as a “calling card” necessary for simply qualifying to apply for work. Thus, as Kennedy noted, institutions of higher education are increasingly required to validate the purpose, methods, and expenses for their existence. These trends lead inevitably to significant changes in the academic workplace for educators (Austin, 2002; Finkelstein, 2003; Monahan & Greene, 1987).

The face of the faculty workforce in higher education is also changing. In 1958 Congress passed the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) resulting in greater public access to advanced degrees in higher education (Kennedy, 1997). According to Kennedy, faculty size grew at a rate of approximately 7% per year during the 1960s, followed by the end of this growth period in the early 1970s. This rapid growth resulted in a majority demographic of young, white male professors in higher education.

In 1986 amendments to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act abolished the mandatory retirement age of 65 for members of college and university faculties, effective in 1994 (Kennedy, 1997). This “uncapping” of retirement rates and additional statutory amendments in 1978 raised the national retirement age to 70. In practical terms this has resulted in the “aging” of faculty as represented by the contemporary trend of a nearly two-thirds
majority of white Male tenured faculty in higher education (Johnsrud, 2002). In her 1999 report, Sorcinelli found that faculty in higher education were 81% male, and 89% white.

The American Association of University Professors’ (AAUP) (2003a) annual survey supported the contention in the literature that increasing numbers of faculty members are young, white, female, and seeking tenure. For the 2002-2003 year, the AAUP surveyed 1,454 universities representing 1,732 campuses participating in the survey, roughly half of the 4-year universities across the United States (Kennedy, 1997). This survey reported that compared with the previous year’s survey, the percentage of women among full professors rose from 21.4% to 22.3%, earning an average of about 88.8% of the amount male full-professor faculty earned; the percentage of female associate professors rose from 37.3 to 37.9%, earning an average of 93.1% compared to the earnings of male associate-professor faculty; and the percentage of female assistant faculty decreased slightly from 46.1 to 45.9, earning 92.4% of what male assistant-professor faculty earned during the same time period. These figures tend to suggest that female faculty are moving slowly up through faculty rank, but still earning less than their male counterparts. Caution was noted regarding these figures, however, because the sample of universities changes somewhat from year to year.

Challenges still faced by higher education include the underrepresentation of women and racial and ethnic minority faculty (AAUP, 2003a), salary inequities (AAUP, 2003a; Leatherman, 1991; Smart, 1991), issues of the continuation of tenure (Finkelstein, 2003; Kennedy, 1997), increased use of technology (Austin, 2002; Finkelstein, 2003; Sorcinelli, 1999), and the reduced number of available faculty positions for a growing number of candidates in higher education (Boice, 1991; Kennedy, 1997). Each of these changes may effect the worklives of faculty members.
Nature of the Academic Workplace

Johnsrud (2002) noted that faculty have traditionally been reluctant to study themselves. She reported that studies on faculty members, of which she found only two prior to 1990, began to slowly increase over the last decade, perhaps as a result of paradigm shifts in the higher education workplace. In a review of the contemporary literature pertaining to the worklives of faculty and administrative support staff in higher education, Johnsrud found 36 articles. This literature review suggested that the quality of worklife for faculty members had steadily deteriorated over time due to pressures affecting institutions of higher education such as the disaffection of the public with higher education, rising costs and strained budgets, which in turn affected salaries and working conditions for educators.

Many studies on academic worklife have focused on perceived quality of worklife for faculty and the methods by which it is measured (Johnsrud, 2002). In her review of the literature of work experiences of higher education faculty members, Johnsrud noted emphasis in three general areas: quality of worklife as perceived by educators, attitudinal measures targeting experiences such as stress and morale, and associated behavioral outcomes predictive of faculty success or retention. This literature review demonstrated that though faculty in higher education have begun to study themselves, taken together the resultant data is at best inconclusive.

Ongoing efforts to describe the academic workplace have focused on various aspects of the work of faculty members. Johnsrud (2002) conceptualized the worklife of faculty members as being characterized by an array of factors, including individual and organizational characteristics. Themes commonly addressed in the existing literature include: role conflict related to work requirements such as teaching, service, and research (Monahan & Greene, 1987; Olsen & Near, 1994), stress and job satisfaction (Dey, 1994; Lindholm, 2003; Yates, 2000), the
need for balance between work and life factors (Sorcinelli, 1994), new faculty development (Austin, 2002; Boice, 1991), and the effects of women and racial/ethnic minority underrepresentation (Sorcinelli & Near, 1989).

Teaching, Service, and Research

Work requirements of faculty members are often equally unclear to both new faculty and to the public. Kennedy (2000) commented that expectations of faculty members are “relatively uncodified; in a sense, universities are societies without rules….deeply mysterious to those outside” (p. vii). Kennedy noted that faculty members typically learn their duties “on the job”, that is, when they receive the first appointment.

Typical stated requirements of faculty include the categories of teaching, service, and research. Warnke et al. (1999) noted that different institutions value these three basic requirements of the job differently. The theme of perceived conflict between these three requirements and subsequent stress for faculty members is recurrent throughout the literature (Johnsrud, 2002; Kennedy, 1997; Olsen & Near, 1994, Sax et al., 2002; Sorcinelli, 2002). There are some concerns that research is overshadowing teaching in importance for many universities, particularly research universities (Finkelstein, 2003; Sorcinelli, 2002). Additionally, the omnipresent dictum “publish or perish” can result in confusion for junior faculty who find their time filled by teaching and service requirements, with little time left for research and writing (Whitt, 1991).

Unstated requirements of faculty are more ubiquitous and difficult for faculty to adhere to (Corcoran & Clark, 1984). Unstated requirements by their very nature are difficult for faculty members, particularly those new to the job, to define and may have negative effects on tenure and promotion prospects (Kennedy, 1997; Rice et al., 2000; Sorcinelli, 2002). As Rice et al.
reported, a typical concern for faculty members is uncertainty as to the requirements of achieving tenure. Whitt (1991) noted that new faculty members are largely left alone to figure out what they are supposed to do, having been unprepared in graduate school to accommodate their new work roles. As Austin (2002) suggested, the role of graduate students in doctoral programs, even for those students who work as teaching assistants, may be poor preparation for on-the-job expectations of faculty members.

**Stress and Job Satisfaction**

It is widely acknowledged in the existing literature that there is a recognizable interrelationship between faculty perceptions, the work environment in academia, and faculty member behaviors (Johnsrud, 2002; Lindholm, 2003; Monahan & Greene, 1987; Sackney et al., 2000). Thus, faculty perceptions of workload, time commitment, and expectations of seeking tenure can conceivably lead to increased stress, demoralization, and burnout (Olsen & Near, 1994; Rice et al., 2000; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989). Alternatively, it appears that accurate perceptions of the work environment for faculty may mediate some of the side effects of stress (Austin, 2002). Job satisfaction in academia may thus be affected by perception of work factors, and the accuracy of that perception.

A number of stressors may contribute to faculty member’s satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their work. Dey’s (1994) study of 35,500 faculty members nationwide reported that stressors included time pressures and the difficulty of balancing work and homelife, especially for female faculty. A qualitative study of 36 faculty members by Lindholm (2003) noted that for many faculty members part of stress at work was a result of the perceived “disconnected” life of professional educators (p. 130); for these faculty, satisfaction was highest when respondents perceived a sense of “fit” between themselves and their departments. Palmer (1998) echoed an
omnipresent sense of “fragmentation” from colleagues in higher education, especially for women and minorities.

**Balance Between Work and Life Factors**

Faculty struggle to balance multiple responsibilities between work and personal lives (Dey; 1994; Johnsrud, 2002; Lindholm, 2003; Olsen & Near, 1994). A common theme mentioned by faculty in various studies is the difficulty of balancing work requirements against family life (Olsen & Near, 1994), especially for women (Dey, 1994; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989). Dey investigated factors contributing to faculty stress resulting from a perceived lack of balance between various conflicting responsibilities, such as balancing teaching requirements and research, balancing time for teaching and writing to achieve tenure, and time pressures between work and home. In this study, stress predictably increased when individuals failed to achieve balance between teaching and research obligations, time commitments, and between work and home.

A significant contributor to work-related stress and satisfaction was identified by Near and Sorcinelli (1986) and Sorcinelli and Near (1989). These studies suggested significant “spillover” between life and work for faculty members. In Sorcinelli and Near’s study, the concept of spillover was defined as being characterized by the extent to which “experiences and/or feelings associated with work directly color or ‘spill over’ to life outside of work and vice versa,” suggesting a reciprocal relationship between work factors and life factors (p. 61). Sorcinelli and Near argued that spillover for faculty is higher than that shown for other occupations in the general population. That study indicated that faculty members are individuals who have studied a long time to enter their chosen career field and tend to have a strong emotional identification with it; who have more to lose if they “fail”; who tend to read the
literature related to their fields in order to stay “caught up”; who work odd hours and flexible schedules; and who socialize primarily with other faculty. In a follow-up of the 1989 study, Olsen and Near (1994) reported that the “seamless web” of work and life for faculty members also contributes to high levels of role conflict and overload.

For women educators, balancing work and home life may be especially difficult (AAUP, 2003b). According to the AAUP’s study on balancing family and academic work, the average age of attaining the Ph.D. for women is 33 and the average age of tenure is age 40, coinciding with prime childbearing years (Sax et al., 2002). The AAUP contended that women are more likely than men to be forced to make a choice between family and career. In the Sorcinelli and Near (1989) study women faculty were more likely to report negative spillover between home and work than men faculty.

Some research suggests that male and female faculty may experience their jobs differently. Sorcinelli and Near’s (1989) study of 112 faculty members noted that for men there was a high correlation between job satisfaction and life satisfaction. Grant (1995) also found that there was a significant difference between the perception of stress by gender among college educators; female educators reported much higher levels of stress associated with juggling multiple roles between work and family than did male educators. These studies may also be affected by the overrepresentation of women in the junior faculty ranks, in the sense that not only do women tend to be more responsible for balancing family and home obligations (AAUP, 2003b) but they may also be starting academic careers and seeking tenure at the same time (Sax et al., 2002).
New Faculty Development

The academic workplace appears to be particularly stressful for new faculty members. New faculty “face an environment characterized by stress, pressure, and uncertainty” (Austin, 2002, p. 94). Austin’s qualitative study consisted of 79 PhD-seeking students who aspired to become faculty members in higher education upon graduation. Austin contended that the work of graduate students is often structured more to fit departmental needs resulting from tight budgets rather than to socialize doctoral students to the work environment and requirements of faculty they will one day become. According to this study, one of the major concerns of graduate students was their perception of the overwork and poor balance between personal and worklife of their professors and advisors.

Rice et al. (2000) conducted a qualitative study of 350 new faculty members in higher education and found that new faculty were most concerned about three factors related to their jobs: 1) the lack of a comprehensible tenure system, 2) absence of a perceived collegial “community” on campus, and 3) the lack of integration between work and personal life. Similarly, Olsen and Near (1994) noted the significant pressure experienced by new faculty members as they attempt to quickly master all aspects of the job. New faculty are often expected to “hit the ground running” but tend to be uncertain as to where and how (Whitt, 1991).

It appears that though graduate students and new faculty are generally poorly socialized to their work environment and accompanying expectations (Austin, 2002; Whitt, 1991), new faculty members do adjust to the work role over time, though slowly (Boice, 1991). Olsen and Near (1994) concluded that there is a shift in values and demands over the course of an academic career which may potentially lead to increased comfort with work and thus job satisfaction, typically following the third year of appointment. Studies of senior faculty members, like that of
Sorcinelli (1999) suggested that senior faculty are much more comfortable with their work and personal lives than junior faculty.

The potential implications of poor work role familiarity, job stress, and spillover between home and worklives for junior faculty in the early years of appointment are numerous. Grant (1995) found that junior faculty members were more affected by various job stressors than senior faculty; older professors perceived less stress associated with their work. Similarly, Sorcinelli and Near (1989) reported that assistant faculty experienced more negative spillover than did associate or full professors. Not only may repercussions occur in quality of teaching and writing productivity in the early years (Boice, 1991), and affect later career progress (Whitt, 1991), but some new faculty may decide to leave the professoriate altogether (Rice et al., 2000). These difficulties may have even more far-reaching implications for women and ethnic minority faculty, who comprise the smallest percentage of faculty members (Dey, 1994; Johnsrud, 2002).

**Gender Issues**

Women faculty members currently comprise approximately one third of faculty nationwide (Sax et al., 2002), and though they are entering the ranks of higher education faculty in increasing numbers, they are still an underrepresented group on college and university campuses (Johnsrud & Des Charlais, 1994; Menges & Exum, 1983). According to several studies, women faculty in academia face significant difficulties in terms of tenure and promotion (Finkel et al., 1994; Johnsrud & Des Charlais, 1994; Menges & Exum, 1983; Smart, 1991).

Studies indicate that women and men faculty experience the work environment in qualitatively different ways (Finkel et al., 1994; Johnsrud & Des Charlais, 1994; Menges & Exum, 1983) and that women faculty organize their work and life priorities differently than men (Sax et al., 2002). Sorcinelli and Near (1989) found a high correlation between job and life
satisfaction for male faculty members, whereas women have been identified as being less satisfied with their jobs (Connolly, 2000). Some studies suggested that women faculty choose to devote time to both their academic careers and to mothering, thus potentially hindering the promotion process (Finkel et al., 1994). Others suggested that women faculty are subjected to sexist conditions both societally and in academia, and may be viewed as less capable than their male counterparts in academia (Menges & Exum, 1983). Sax et al. (2002) noted a myth in academia that women are more likely to devote time to teaching, advising, and service, and less time to research. Whatever the reasons, women face substantial difficulties in pursuit of promotion and job tenure, and tend to be promoted and tenured more slowly than white male faculty (Johnsrud & Des Charlais, 1994).

Gender inequities exist in society and in academia. Given the fact that higher education has been and continues to be dominated by white males (Johnsrud, 2002; Kennedy, 1997), the potential for marginalization of women in the academic workplace has gained attention in the literature. Power differentials between women and men, perhaps exacerbated by the overrepresentation of female faculty in junior faculty ranks (Finkel et al., 1994; Perna, 2001) may increase the chance of sexual harassment (Dey et al., 1996; Paludi & Barickman, 1991). Though there has been increased attention to the sexual harassment experiences of both male and female students in higher education and studies estimate that between 30-40% of female graduate and undergraduate students have experienced sexual harassment from professors (Leitich, 1999), there is an extremely small pool of existing literature on sexual harassment of faculty in academia (Dey). At present there is very little exact data concerning the prevalence of sexual harassment among higher education faculty.
If academic life is often characterized by stress and a sense of isolation from colleagues, the implications are particularly far-reaching for women and minority educators (Palmer, 1998), who are relative newcomers to the profession (Johnsrud & Des Charlais, 1994). Two studies by Boice (1993) and Whitt (1991) reported that women and minority faculty experienced greater stress more often, and that this stress was longer-lasting than for majority group white male faculty, with evident implications for retention and promotion of women and minorities.

Diversity Issues

Research on minority faculty members’ experience of the academic work environment is sparse (Johnsrud & Des Charlais, 1994). Similar to female faculty, minority faculty members are significantly underrepresented in higher education (Johnsrud & Des Charlais, 1994; Menges & Exum, 1983; Perna, 2001; Tillman, 2001). Within the academic culture, minority faculty members face pressures related to work factors, such as tenure and promotion, in addition to feelings of nonacceptance by members of the majority culture. Johnsrud and Des Charlais speculated that minority faculty may believe that their colleagues assume they were hired for affirmative action purposes rather than for their qualifications as educators. Menges & Exum concluded that in general, minority faculty members are, like women faculty, promoted and tenured more slowly than their white counterparts, and are more likely to leave an appointment before achieving tenure.

Necessity of Mentoring

The challenges faced by new faculty, women, and ethnic or racial minorities reflect a clear call for improved mentoring in higher education. The nature of the academic work environment, especially the practice of mentoring for fostering success of new faculty members, has a definite effect on the work behaviors of faculty members (Lindholm, 2003). The mentoring
process can begin as early as the years of graduate study in order to prepare graduate students for future roles as faculty members (Austin, 2002), and is therefore crucial for graduate students as well as faculty. Additionally, mentoring relationships may help to reduce new faculty member’s perceived sense of isolation in the workplace, thereby ameliorating stress associated with the workplace (Lindholm, 2003).

Work and Counselor Education

The profession of counseling has long acknowledged the importance of work in the lives of individuals (Dollarhide, 1997). Dollarhide suggested a need for counselors to develop renewed attention to the significance of work in life for individuals and to encourage deeper meaning in both work and life arenas. As Myers (1992) noted, counseling theory is historically based on a preventive, growth and development model of human potential, and thus the profession is already uniquely poised to assist individuals in examining the interrelationship between work and life factors (Peterson & Gonzalez, 2000). Super (1990) stated that life equals work and work equals life, thus supporting the assertion that, as a profession devoted to development over the human lifespan, counselors need to further consider the salience of the work task.

In spite of the close ties of the counseling profession with career development, however, relatively little research has been conducted on counselor educators (Leinbaugh, et al., 2003; Parr & Bradley, 1996; Sackney et al., 2000). Knowledge about counselor educators and the nature of their work must largely be extrapolized from existing literature on other occupations, primarily other faculty in higher education (Leinbaugh et al., 2003; Monohan & Greene, 1987; Patterson et al., 1987; Sackney et al., 2000). Very little is known about the actual perception and experience of work-related factors for faculty in counselor education. In this sense, like the work of most
faculty in higher education, the actual work experiences of counselor educators may be deemed as a rather “secret profession”- rarely recognized, little understood by outside individuals, and seldom researched (Kennedy, 1997).

Because of the relative dearth of information about faculty in counselor education, authors have relied on research in higher education as one means of attempting to identify issues that may affect faculty in counselor education departments and programs (Parr & Bradley, 1996). There is little conclusive data regarding current trends in counselor education, and less on factors affecting the work experiences of faculty (Leinbaugh et al., 2003; Parr & Bradley, 1996; Witmer & Young, 1996).

Trends in Counselor Education

The 1990s heralded increased attention to the nature and direction of trends in counselor education (Maples & Altekruse, 1993; Maples & Macari, 1998; Rogers et al., 1998). These studies indicated that trends occurring in counselor education tended to parallel some of the trends in higher education, such as the “aging” of tenured faculty, increased numbers of female faculty hires and a commitment to hiring racial and ethnic minority faculty. However, trends specific to counselor education appear to include ongoing professional identity issues, less gender diversity among entering graduate students, and increasing numbers of doctoral graduates choosing careers outside the professoriate. Most notably, it is difficult to determine whether these trends are ongoing because the existing literature was predominantly conducted in the early- to mid-90s.

Aging of Faculty

Similar to patterns noted in higher education, many NDEA-trained faculty in counselor education are reaching the age of retirement (Altekruse, 1990; Austin, 2002; Patterson et al.,
Monahan and Greene (1987) suggested that faculty members in higher education are retiring as part of significant changes in the academic workplace, and found early retirement predictors to include both intrinsic and extrinsic predictors: decreases in salary, larger class sizes, and less satisfaction with teaching. However, in Patterson et al.’s (1987) study, faculty in the college of education who were “plateaued” in their careers by virtue of having tenure and full professorship rated no different than assistant or associate professors in terms of their productivity or job satisfaction. It is currently unknown how the potential retirement of NDEA-trained faculty may affect the future of counselor education, though studies suggest a strong need for attention to hiring processes of counselor education programs (Magnuson et al., 2001; Maples & Altekruse, 1993; Maples & Macari, 1998; Rogers et al., 1998).

**Hiring Issues**

Altekruse (1990) identified an urgent need for new “recruits” in the professoriate of counselor education. Maples and Altekruse (1993), in their review of faculty position vacancies across the United States, concluded that the profession faced a diminishing supply of qualified counselor educators in relation to projections of the future demand for faculty members. They noted that in addition to the large numbers of NDEA-trained counselor education faculty facing retirement over the following decade, graduating doctoral students had an increase in a variety of potentially lucrative career opportunities outside of academia, perhaps making counselor education a somewhat less attractive career choice.

Maples and Macari’s (1998) follow-up study of trends occurring in counselor education appeared to confirm Maples and Altekruse’s (1993) predictions. This study reexamined conclusions from the 1993 review and noted fewer applicants overall for 79 faculty positions. Programs surveyed also reported fewer applicants who actually met posted qualifications for
faculty vacancies. Sixty-two percent of new-hires in this study were women; 81% were white, and almost half of applicants were new graduates of counselor education doctoral programs. Thus, these trends appeared to support the contention in the literature regarding overrepresentation of female faculty in the junior ranks, and of male faculty in senior ranks. This study also suggested that the number of ethnically diverse counselor educators was slowly increasing over time. Additionally, the hiring rate of school counselor educators, nearly twice the rate of the next most sought-after specialty, indicated an escalating emphasis on school counseling.

Zimpfer and DeTrude (1990) also noted changing proportions of male and female graduates from doctoral programs and the increased attraction of newly-minted PhDs to jobs outside counselor education. They found that approximately one-half of these graduates aspired to self-employment in private practice, a dramatic increase over the previous two decades. Like Maples and Altekruse (1993), they concluded that this trend was likely to create supply problems for counselor preparation faculty positions. Zimpfer (1996) repeated the study five years later and confirmed trends identified in the earlier study, noting increasing numbers of graduates planning to work in private practice or business settings, a sharp increase in salary for those graduates, and less interest in work in higher education. Zimpfer concluded that the supply of graduates choosing to work in counselor preparation programs would continue to decline, and suggested that doctoral-level preparation programs consider implementation of practitioner-oriented doctorates in the future.

Rogers et al. (1998) conducted a similar review of academic hiring projections in 84 accredited counseling psychology and counselor education programs and found similar trends of increased interest in applied, clinical employment for graduates. They speculated that the
decrease in graduate students interested in the professoriate might be related to aggregate trends in academe, such as loss of job security and benefits, lower pay, and retrenchments. The study compared the hiring practices of counselor education and counseling psychology programs, and ranked their preferences on requirements of potential candidates. Though counselor education programs appropriately ranked the counselor education PhD first in preference for hiring requirements and counseling psychology ranked the counseling psychology PhD first, counselor education programs also hired PhD graduates with degrees in counseling psychology, ranked fourth in preference. There was not a similar response in the preferences of hiring practices of counseling psychology programs; for these programs, the doctorate in counselor education was ranked 10th of possible preference categories. Rogers et al. concluded that this implication represented a potential advantage in employment flexibility for graduates holding the counseling psychology degree rather than the counselor education degree.

Another trend is the development of various specialty areas in counselor education programs, such as marriage and family counseling (Hosie, 1990). As counselor education programs increased the variety of available specializations in the 1990s, (Hollis & Dodson, 2000; Hosie, 1990; Maples & Altekruse, 1993) more career opportunities for graduates of counseling programs were available in a greater variety of fields, such as hospitals, business, and industry. Zimper and DeTrude (1990) and Witmer and Loesch (1990) noted corresponding increases in the career opportunities for counselor education doctoral graduates, with the result that fewer PhD graduates appeared to be choosing to enter the professoriate. Maples and Altekruse (1993) hypothesized that many graduates preferred to avoid the pressures inherent in faculty life, especially research and publication. This speculation appeared to be supported by Zimpfer’s
(1996) discovery that fewer doctoral-level graduates of counselor preparation programs engaged in publication and presentation activity.

Rogers et al. (1998) speculated that these trends in hiring and employment might be related to the overlap and nebulous distinctions between counseling psychology and counselor education programs, underscoring approximately fifty years of professional identity issues for counselor education (Ginter, 2002). An ongoing challenge for counselor education since its inception has centered around attempts to define counselor education as separate from counseling psychology (Hosie, 1990; Poidevant & Loesch, 1991).

Professional Identity Issues

The debate regarding the professional identity of counselor education has continued with seemingly little progress in differentiating counselor education from counseling psychology degrees, resulting in potential confusion for the public and for clients (Hosie, 1990; Kolbert & Brendel, 1997; Swickert, 1997). Counselor educators themselves appear to be uncertain about the distinction; Thomas (1991) stated that, “the differences between counselor education and counseling psychology are really only political and semantic; they are not substantive” (p. 204). Hanna and Bemak (1997) also wondered if perhaps “there is too little difference to make a difference” (p. 337).

The call for a strong professional identity of counselor educators has been fervent (Altekruse, 1990), but it appears that similarities in job function and in philosophy are so similar as to make distinction from counseling psychology programs extremely difficult if not impossible (Hanna & Bemak, 1997; Witmer & Loesch, 1990). Suggestions for remediation of this problem have included an increased emphasis on research in counselor education programs (Hanna & Bemak), increased emphasis on teaching, service, and research in counselor education
doctoral programs (Hosie, 1990), emphasis on the educational component of counseling (Vacc, 1990), emphasis on holistic wellness (Myers, 1991), and emphasis on mental health (Fong, 1990). Poidevant and Loesch (1991) noted few distinctions in terms of actual job function between PhD graduates of counselor education and counseling psychology. One method of better understanding the professional identity of counselor education might be better understanding the career-related experiences of counselor educators and students (Parr & Bradley, 1996).

Working in Counselor Education

It seems likely that counselor educators bear the brunt of balancing a multitude of daily tasks, some of which are specific to the profession, such as responsibility to clients, to ethics, to the profession, to students; and perhaps least often noted or recognized, to job responsibilities similar to most faculty in higher education, including tenure and promotion, teaching, research, and service activities (Leinbaugh et al., 2003; Niles et al., 2001). Given the paucity of research into the actual work experiences of counselor educators, however, very little is actually known about their experiences in the work environment. Existing literature in counselor education has typically emphasized broad categories related to counseling practitioners or supervision, or both. Literature specifically related to counselor educators has emphasized professional identity of the counseling profession (Hanna & Bemak, 1997; Vacc, 1990; Witmer & Loesch, 1990), the socialization process of new faculty members (Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2001; Sorcinelli, 1994) and the experiences of women and ethnic minority faculty (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Bruce, 1995; Holcomb-McCoy & Bradley, 2003; Stevens-Smith, 1995; Young & Chamley, 1990). An exhaustive search of the literature revealed that the majority of the articles pertaining to factors affecting work in counselor education have been written in the past 14 years, which may suggest increasing attention to career issues in the lives of counselor educators.
**Job Requirements**

Faculty members in counselor education face the same basic job requirements of faculty members in higher education, but they are also responsible for the personal and professional growth of students (ACA, 1995). Witmer and Young (1996) also enjoined counselor educators to be more aware of their own obligation to personal and professional growth. Ramsey et al. (2002) noted that because counselor educator’s work requirements are so diverse, it is difficult to quantify their scholarly contributions in terms of teaching, service, and research.

Several studies have attempted to identify components of scholarly productivity for faculty members in counselor education. Niles et al. (2001) conducted a qualitative review of 14 faculty members recognized as leaders in the profession to identify the strategies they used for success as educators. In general, these faculty members suggested that several factors made their work most successful, including: membership in leadership organizations, collaboration with other counselor educators, and balancing obligations between work and personal activities. Respondents suggested that engaging in research and service activities related to their teaching made it easier to balance work requirements. However, some of the same respondents also reported that they themselves sacrificed personal time in favor of scholarly activities. It is interesting to note that of the 20 persons originally identified and contacted for this study, almost one-third declined participation due to “professional obligations.” Though this study presents the experiences of experienced counselor educators, it may be that the factors identified by respondents do not reflect those of persons who have less experience or leadership opportunities in the profession.

Other studies of have examined the impact of several work and personal factors on scholarly productivity, such as gender and tenure rank. Roland and Fontanesi-Seime (1996)
found increasing rates of publication in refereed journals by women counselor educators, as indicated by 80% of their respondents. Similarly, though Ramsey et al. (2002) did not compare productivity rates between gender and tenure rank, they found that overall women and men counselor educators had similar rates of scholarly activity, though women tended to conduct more conference presentations and men tended to publish more articles. Predictably, in this study persons seeking tenure were more professionally active than those not seeking tenure. Both Ramsey et al. (2002) and Roland and Fontanesi-Seime (1996) recommended increased mentoring of new faculty members to assist them in scholarly productivity.

Job Stress and Satisfaction

Many factors may contribute to the scholarly productivity of counselor educators and to their experiences in the work environment, and the interrelationship between work and personal factors appears to be gaining consideration in the literature on counselor educators. Much of the existing literature emphasizes the work experiences of counselor educators in leadership organizations such as the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES), or those who are widely recognized as leaders in the profession. Though these studies are certainly valuable, convenience samples of readily identifiable groups of counselor educators may not necessarily reflect the experiences of persons who are unable or unwilling to engage in leadership-related activities.

It has been noted that individuals working in service professions, such as counseling, are particularly vulnerable to the negative effects of stress (Sowa & May, 1994) and subsequent burnout (Savicki & Cooley, 1982). Magnuson et al. (2002) conducted a qualitative investigation of the methods by which faculty members avoided burnout, using Pines and Aronson’s (1988) definition: “a state of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion caused by longterm
involvement in situations that are emotionally demanding….most often caused by a combination of very high expectations and chronic situational stresses” (p. 9, as cited in Magnuson et al., 2002). The study yielded four main strategies used by counselor educators in mediating the effects of stress on the job echoing those found by Niles et al. (2001): 1) engaging in professional activities, 2) attending conferences, 3) networking with colleagues and students, and 4) engaging in a variety of stimulating activities, both at work and in their personal lives. This study suggested that faculty members who were purposeful in balancing personal time against work requirements experienced stress in the workplace but did not experience symptoms commonly associated with burnout, such as isolation from colleagues, demoralization, and compromised physical health. This study must be viewed with caution, however, due to the low sample size (N=10) and the selection of participants with a minimum of 15 years of post-academic professional experience and recognized leadership status in the counseling field. It may be that counselor educators who have less “on the job” experience and recognition or who are still seeking tenure experience the workplace differently.

Savicki and Cooley (1982) attempted to identify environmental, or external determinants of stress in the workplace for counselors and counselor educators. They listed seven factors: 1) job intensity, 2) perceived control of the work environment, 3) experience of social supports and feedback, 4) organizational structure, 5) quality of leadership, and 6) degree of negativity/uncooperativeness encountered with others. These factors indicated that the quality of the work environment has a significant impact on the experiences of faculty.

Parr and Bradley (1996) investigated the career satisfaction of a random sample of 167 ACES members. The vast majority of this sample (89.2%) experienced their work as in the “slightly satisfied” to “very satisfied” range. About half of this sample (49.7%) also experienced
their work in the “moderately stressed” to “extremely stressed.” Curiously, the authors concluded that counselor educators were neither particularly stressed nor burned out in their jobs, but rather experienced their work as fulfilling. However, because approximately half of the sample identified their work as moderately to extremely stressful, a logical conclusion is that counselor educators may experience both fulfillment and significant stress in their work.

In a similar study, Leinbaugh et al. (2003) attempted to identify factors affecting counselor educators’ experiences of wellbeing. This study involved 230 counselor educator members of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) from across the United States, a majority (60.8%) of whom were tenured faculty. The authors believed that understanding faculty perceptions of the work environment was key in being able to retain faculty members. This study revealed three factors significantly associated with counselor educators’ perceptions of their work environment: 1) Organizational Control, 2) Internal Control and Rewards, and 3) Time and Effort Management. Taken together, these results suggested that faculty members’ quality of the work environment was most improved when they felt a sense of personal control over their own work obligations as well as the quality of life for their families, felt a sense of contribution to the profession, and experienced a balance between home and work responsibilities. Factors that did not contribute to a sense of well-being for participants included Bias and Promotion/Tenure/Salary categories. Overall, faculty members in this study seemed to experience their work and their lives as positive. However, the fact that this sample comprised ACES members, was primarily white (89%) and tenured (60.8%) might have affected results. Though this sample is a reasonable representation of the profession, it may be that individuals from minority groups or those seeking tenure experience dimensions of work and life differently. Additionally, membership in ACES may indicate greater commitment to and identification with
the counselor education profession, as opposed to faculty members who are not members of leadership groups.

New Faculty Development

Increasing expectations of new faculty in counselor education (Warnke et al., 1999) and problems with recruitment and retention (Sorcinelli, 1994) highlight the need for improved awareness of new faculty development. Heppner & Johnston (1994) argued that though many, if not most, counseling programs have a developmental orientation, there is a deplorable lack of emphasis on faculty development, particularly for new faculty. Similarly, Hill (2004) echoed the need for systemic change in the socialization process of pretenured faculty in counselor education. The need to attract and retain quality faculty members (Leinbaugh et al. 2003; Maples & Altekruse, 1993) is increasingly evident in the literature.

Because of the rising demand for qualified new faculty members, Sorcinelli (1994) contended that it is more important than ever to understand the work experiences of new faculty in counselor education. As Sorcinelli noted, the potential for both great challenges and rewards in the first years of appointment are great. Myriad adjustment issues may affect new faculty as they learn the requirements of their jobs and strive toward tenure (Magnuson, 2002). Of particular importance is the noticeable impact of work-related stressors on new faculty in the literature.

In their study of new faculty in higher education, Olsen and Sorcinelli (1992) reported that though nearly all newcomers to the professoriate initially report high satisfaction with their jobs, the work environment is also a source of significant stress. This longitudinal study reported that new faculty may not sustain their initial enthusiasm for their work over time, potentially resulting in a constellation of negative consequences, such as poorer physical health, lack of
balance between work and home life, decreased satisfaction with work, poorer productivity, and greater difficulty achieving tenure and promotion. In this study, faculty members were particularly motivated by extrinsic rewards such as salary, rather than intrinsic rewards such as personal satisfaction.

Sorcinelli (1994) reported a parallel between work-related themes affecting new faculty in both higher education and in counselor education. Major themes affecting new faculty in counseling programs included: lack of balance between work and personal life, time constraints, especially between teaching and research responsibilities, and lack of mentoring opportunities. Sorcinelli also noted additional obstacles related to isolation and lack of perceived collegiality for pretenure women and ethnic minorities.

Magnuson et al. (2001) conducted a survey of 49 new counselor educators regarding their experiences of the job search. In this survey, the demographic profile of a typical new professor was a white female, lending support to Maples and Macari’s (1998) assertion that nationwide, new faculty members are predominantly white and female. In this study, 72.9% of new faculty had publication experience during their doctoral study; 91.8% had teaching experience; and the sample had ample clinical experience; 71% in counseling agencies, 37% in private practice, and 49% on college or university campuses. Researchers concluded that though respondents appeared to be amply prepared for the job market, many had made decisions regarding employment based on location or pragmatic considerations such as, “they were the first to make an offer” (p. 25). Though many respondents reported having both positive and negative experiences related to the job search, six respondents reported either fearing or experiencing discrimination due to age, pregnancy, gender, or ethnicity.
Magnuson (2002) followed up on the 2001 study with a longitudinal study of the original respondents’ experiences during their first year of employment. This study targeted correlations between respondent’s experiences of job satisfaction, level of stress, and sense of connectedness over the first year. Though no findings reached statistical significance, Magnuson reported that mean ratings of experienced stress over the year increased slightly, whereas mean ratings for satisfaction and connectedness decreased slightly. Respondents reported both a seemingly paradoxical enthusiasm for their jobs and great stress and uncertainty, especially in balancing work and personal life factors. Thirteen percent of respondents reported regarding their first year as unsatisfactory and cited reasons of isolation and loneliness, perceived lack of support, and low salaries. Respondents reported experiencing adequate mentoring as being very helpful during their first year adjustment.

The need for mentoring of new faculty, especially of women and minority faculty members, is clear (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Bruce, 1995; Heppner & Johnston, 1994). Brinson & Kottler (1993) noted that protégés tended to be more satisfied in work and more successful in achieving promotions. For women and ethnic or racial minorities, who are entering the profession of counselor education in increasing numbers, mentoring opportunities are essential to ensure socialization, satisfaction, and productivity in the workplace (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Heppner & Johnston, 1994; Roland & Fontanesi-Seime, 1996).

**Gender Issues**

Counseling education programs do not operate in a vacuum (Hoffman, 1996). Issues that affect women in society and in the workplace may also operate in counseling programs, and yet gender equity is an area conspicuously missing from the literature concerning counselor educators. There is little existing research on the work experiences of female counselor
educators, and even less on specific issues that potentially affect women counselor educators, such as salary inequity, sexual harassment, and the effects of childbearing on career. Because the majority of new faculty in counselor education are women (Bruce, 1995; Maples & Macari, 1998; Sorcinelli, 1994), increasing attention to gender issues is significant.

Several studies have focused on gender issues training for counseling students (Daniluk & Stein, 1995; Dupuy & Ritchie, 1994; Good & Heppner, 1995; Hoffman, 1996; Seem & Johnson, 1998; Stevens-Smith, 1995), but an exhaustive search of the literature yielded no articles related specifically to the work experiences of women counselor educators per se. Articles that did mention work-related experiences of women tended to focus on productivity (Roland & Fontanesi-Seime, 1996) or career satisfaction for both genders (Leinbaugh et al., 2003; Parr & Bradley, 1996). Stevens-Smith (1995) argued that because worldviews and behaviors may be affected by gender, it is necessary to develop a clearer understanding of women’s experiences as effects counseling and counselor education.

Demographic data shows that higher education has been, and largely continues to be, dominated by males despite increasing numbers of female faculty members, especially in counselor education (Hotelling, 1991; Stevens-Smith, 1995). As in higher education, female counselor education faculty are overrepresented at junior faculty ranks (Maples & Macari, 1998; Zimpfer & DeTrude, 1990). One study by Rogers et al. (1998) concluded that there may currently be a disadvantage of being a majority group male going through the hiring process in counselor education. Rogers et al. reported in their 1998 study that women were ranked as highly in hiring preferences as ethnic or racial minorities. However, it seems reasonable that the trends of NDEA-trained faculty retirement, along with the dramatic increase in junior women faculty, may have the effect in the near future of increased emphasis on hiring male graduates. Magnuson
et al. (2001) reported that though more women are currently entering the professoriate, men are still promoted more easily, resulting in hierarchical programs of predominantly male faculty, junior female faculty, and a majority of female students in graduate programs.

Hierarchical composition of counseling programs may result in power differentials between women and men, and thus increase the chances of gender discrimination or sexual harassment (Brodsky, 1980; Hoffman, 1995; Hotelling, 1991; Pearson & Piazza, 1997). Though Miller and Larrabee (1995) studied the sexual harassment experiences of female counselor educators, this research focused on respondent’s experiences during their years of graduate study rather than current experiences. An exhaustive review of the literature using EBSCOHost revealed no studies regarding current sexual harassment experiences of women or men counselor education faculty.

Though little information regarding the impact of gender on the work experiences of counselor educators is available, it is nonetheless important to consider gender issues in the context of counselor education. Gender issues courses appear to be offered more frequently for issues affecting both men and women in counseling. In one study, Dupuy & Ritchie (1994) noted a positive correlation between having a gender issues course available and accreditation by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). CACREP accreditation requires attention to gender as well as diversity issues in counseling programs (CACREP, 1993).

Diversity Issues

The possibility of power imbalances in counselor education programs experienced by minority faculty members may be similar to that experienced by women, due to underrepresentation of racial and ethnic minority professors (Brinson & Kottler, 1993).
Magnuson et al. (2001) noted an absence of ethnic diversity within the ranks of counselor education, though efforts are being made to recruit and retain minority faculty members. Atkinson (1983) reported that minority faculty members are more likely to be untenured and employed part-time as compared to faculty members.

In one study, Young and Chamley (1990) compared nationwide hiring rates of ethnic and racial minorities in 66 counselor education programs. As compared to the general population, Hispanic faculty members were underrepresented by a factor of 3.0; Asian Americans and African American faculty members were underrepresented by a factor of 1.5. This study echoed Atkinson’s (1983) report that minority faculty members were also underrepresented among tenured faculty. Similarly, a study of 26 CACREP accredited programs reflected a paradoxical emphasis on hiring and retaining minority faculty members, but lower frequencies of retention of them (Holcomb-McCoy & Bradley, 2003). Though Young and Chamley speculated that the underrepresentation of minority faculty members might be due to a dearth of talented ethnic and racial minority applicants, Holcomb-McCoy and Bradley reflected that hiring and retention might be better addressed by considering enhanced mentoring opportunities for minority faculty members.

Lack of mentoring may effect the promotion and tenure process of minority faculty members (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Sorcinelli, 1994). Holcomb-McCoy and Bradley (2003) noted that minority faculty members may often have no choice but to be mentored by majority faculty members, or to rely on their own resources. According to Brinson and Kottler, these issues are likely to be even more difficult for women minority faculty members, because they face dual difficulties related to minority status as well as gender. Additionally, the early
grooming and socialization process for increasing diversity among faculty can begin early, during the years of graduate study (Magnuson et al., 2001; Warnke et al., 1999).

**Rationale for the Study of Counselor Educators**

Vacc (1990) stated that counselor education must be devoted to self-regulation and subsequent change as an independent profession, with evident implications for better understanding of work experiences of counselor educators. Research indicates that work is an important part of life, and that individual experiences of work may be impacted by a wide variety of factors in all life dimensions. As implied by Adler’s Work life task, occupation and individual’s perceptions of it are an important part of overall functioning (Dorn, 1992). Research increasingly demonstrates a reciprocal influence between work and life factors: life factors may effect worker’s experience of the work environment, and experiences of work may effect individual’s sense of satisfaction/meaningfulness in life (Leinbaugh, 2003; Myers et al., 2000; Parr & Bradley,1996).

Because of its foundations in human development and vocational counseling, counselor education is particularly well suited for a closer examination of experiences related to work in the profession (Myers, 1992; Peterson & Gonzalez, 2000). For faculty members in counselor education, the work and academic environment is multifaceted and fraught with challenges and stressors (Magnuson et al., 2000). Given the limited and rather fragmented scope of information about work experiences of faculty in counselor education, most of which was conducted in the 1990’s, it is necessary to gain a broader perspective of factors related to faculty member’s experiences of the work environment. The objective of this exploratory study was to garner more information regarding work and personal factors that may impact faculty experiences in the work environment of counselor education.
Purpose of the Study

This exploratory study was intended to examine work variables, life variables, and the interrelationship between these variables which may potentially impact the work experiences of counselor education faculty. There is little existing research exploring the work environment as experienced by faculty members in counselor education, and similarly, little research concerning what life variables that may be related to work experiences. The objective of this study was to examine what dimensions of life and work may effect counselor education faculty members’ experiences of the work environment, and to use those results to suggest directions for further research of the work experiences of counselor educators.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The literature reviewed in Chapter II highlights the importance of examining the
worklives of counselor educators. Work is a significant dimension of life, with the potential to
affect physical health, personal wellbeing, and psychological health (Adler, 1927/1957; Begley
& Czajka, 1993; Myers et al., 2000). Necessary changes in the response of higher education to
the rigors of the global economy and the needs of the workforce have affected the worklives of
faculty members in unprecedented ways over the last few decades. The changing nature of work,
paradigm shifts in higher education, and the significance of work as related to counseling and
counselor education as a profession lead to the conclusion that there is a need to better
understand factors that affect experiences of the work environment for counselor education
faculty. However, to date there is a paucity of research investigating the extent to which personal
and work variables influence counselor educators’ experience of their work environment.

The objective of this study was to examine dimensions of work experiences in counselor
education and to what extent both life and occupational factors may potentially influence that
work. Little conclusive research has focused on faculty in counselor education, and to date
research in this field has tended to focus primarily on the clinical development of counseling
students, rather than factors related to the career development and work experiences of counselor
educators. The study was developed for the purpose of attempting to identify and compare
possible patterns related to work themes of counselor educators as indicated by demographic
data, categorical responses to survey questions, and emergent themes of qualitative responses to
open-ended questions. A critical evaluation of survey responses and qualitative themes in
suggesting directions for future research of counselor education faculty member’s experiences of the work environment.

In this chapter, the methodology used to conduct an investigation of the worklives of counselor education faculty is presented. The research questions, participants, instrumentation, procedures, and methods of data analysis are described.

*Research Questions*

Questions in the survey were broadly designed to explore various dimensions of the work experiences of counselor educators. The study attempted to examine the following broad research questions:

1. What demographic factors impact the work experiences of counselor educators?
2. Are these factors inter-related?
3. What factors enhance the work atmosphere for counselor educators?
4. What factors detract from work atmosphere for counselor educators?

*Research Hypotheses*

Based on the literature review, the following hypotheses were developed in an effort to identify patterns related to the research questions:

1. Experience of the work environment will be significantly different for males and females, as indicated by comparisons between demographic data and quality-of-work responses (regardless of tenure or non-tenure track)
2. Persons seeking tenure will indicate less positive experiences in the work environment than tenured faculty members, as measured by comparisons of demographic data and quality-of-work item responses
3. Older faculty members will demonstrate more positive experiences of the work environment than younger faculty members, as measured by comparisons between demographic data and quality-of-work item responses

4. Partnered (i.e., married, long-term or committed relationship) faculty members will indicate more positive experiences of the work environment than unpartnered (i.e., single, divorced, widowed) faculty members, as measured by comparisons between demographic data and quality-of-work responses

Participants

The population of interest in this study included counselor education faculty members. The proposal was submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects of the University of North Texas. One hundred and eighty counseling programs across the United States were randomly selected using the Hollis and Dodson (2000) text. Researcher randomly selected 90 CACREP accredited programs and 90 non-CACREP accredited programs, attempting to target at least one CACREP-accredited program and one non-CACREP-accredited program for each of the fifty states. Each mailing used the same counseling programs as originally randomly selected. For each mailing, seven surveys were sent to a program liaison in each counseling program. The purpose of the study was briefly described in a letter to the liaison who was asked to distribute one survey to each member of the targeted population (i.e., faculty women or faculty men) in that counseling program. Permission was granted in the letter to make additional copies of the survey for distribution if there are more than seven potential respondents for the identified sample population. Participants in the study included 175 women counselor educators and 153 men counselor educators who responded to the survey.
## Demographic Information

### Table 1

Demographic Description of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Committed</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childless</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Tenure Track</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACREP accreditation******</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not accredited</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percents are based on the number of participants who identified age (n=171 women; n=152 men)
**Percents are based on the number of participants who identified ethnicity (n=172 women; n=145 men)
***Percents are based on the number of participants who identified sexual orientation (n=172 women; n=151 men)
****Percents are based on the number of participants who identified relationship status (n=171 women; n=153 men)
*****Percents are based on the number of participants who identified faculty rank (n=174 women; n=153 men)
******Percents are based on the number of participants who identified tenure status (n=175 women; n=152 men)
*******Percents are based on the number of participants who identified CACREP accreditation (n=170 women; n=150 men)

Table 1 lists the demographic data of the sample. Of the 328 respondents, 53% (n=175) were female and 47% (n=153) were male. Twenty-eight percent (n=90) of respondents who provided their age were under age 35. Nearly half (n=156) of the respondents were between ages 35 and 54. Twenty-four percent of respondents (n=77) were over age 55.

Eighty-three percent (n=264) of respondents reported their ethnic/cultural background as Caucasian. Seven percent (n=21) reported African American backgrounds, four percent (n=13) reported Asian American backgrounds, and three percent (n=10) reported Hispanic or Latino backgrounds. All other reported ethnic or cultural backgrounds accounted for approximately one
percent of the total sample, respectively: Native American \((n=4)\), Middle Eastern \((n=1)\), Biracial \((n=3)\), and Other \((n=1)\). Three women and eight men respondents did not report an ethnic or cultural background.

Over 90% of the respondents identified themselves as having a heterosexual orientation \((n=293)\). Six percent \((n=20)\) identified themselves as either gay or lesbian; and three percent identified themselves as bisexual \((n=10)\).

Nearly 75\% \((n=239)\) of respondents were married or in a committed relationship. Twenty-six percent \((n=85)\) of the sample reported being single. Fifty-five percent \((n=182)\) of respondents reported that they were parents and 45\% \((n=146)\) were childless.

Twenty-eight percent \((n=90)\) of respondents were full professors, 28\% \((n=91)\) were associate professors, and 36\% \((n=119)\) were assistant professors. Two percent \((n=7)\) of respondents worked as lecturers, eight percent \((n=15)\) worked as adjuncts, and two percent \((n=5)\) identified their faculty rank as “Other.”

Fifty-three percent \((n=172)\) of the sample had already achieved tenure. Thirty-four percent \((n=112)\) reported that they were currently on a tenure track, and 13\% \((n=43)\) were not tenured and not pursuing a tenure track. Ninety-four percent \((n=309)\) of respondents worked full-time, and six percent \((n=19)\) worked part-time.

Though equal numbers of surveys were distributed to CACREP accredited and non-CACREP accredited programs throughout the United States, the majority of respondents indicated that their programs had CACREP accreditation. Of women respondents, 70\% \((n=123)\) respondents indicated that their programs were accredited; 27\% \((n=47)\) worked for non-accredited programs. Similarly, a majority of men respondents (70\%) indicated that their programs were CACREP accredited \((n=107)\). Twenty-eight percent \((n=43)\) of the men’s sample.
reported that their programs were not CACREP accredited, and 1 respondent indicated that his
program held another accreditation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age*</td>
<td>29 - 78</td>
<td>46.38</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>50.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at Current Rank**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>8.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>8.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Years as Faculty***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>24.84</td>
<td>8.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>9.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at Current Workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>9.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months in Primary Contract****</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Gross Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,200 – $130,000</td>
<td>$48,451</td>
<td>$15,415</td>
<td>$58,641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data based on the number of participants who reported age (n= 171 women; n=152 men)
**Data based on the number of participants who reported number of years at current faculty rank (n= 171 women; n=152 men)
***Data based on the number of participants who reported number of years at current faculty rank (n= 172 women; n=153 men)

(table continues)
As shown in Table 2, respondents’ ages ranged from 29 to 78 years. The mean age of the sample was 48.07 (SD=9.91). The mean age of women in the survey was 46.38 years (SD=9.402) and mean age of men in the survey was 50.03 (SD=10.15).

Respondents were asked to identify the number of years at their current rank, the total number of years worked as a faculty member, and the number of years during which they had worked at their current university. The mean number of years at current faculty rank was 11.19 (SD=7.98) for full professor; 4.98 years (SD=6.20) at associate rank; 3.60 years (SD=2.58) at assistant rank; 1.72 years (SD=1.13) as a lecturer; 4.73 years (SD=2.90) as an adjunct, and 6.66 years (SD=10.50) as “Other.”

Of the 325 participants responding regarding the total number of years worked as a faculty member, full professors had worked a mean number of 22.97 years (SD=8.04); associate professors 11.47 years (SD=7.17); assistant professors 4.14 years (SD=3.06); lecturers 2.33 years (SD=2.65); adjuncts 5.87 years (SD=2.64), and “Other” 8.46 years (SD=11.17).

Respondents were also asked to identify the number of years they had served in their current college or university. The mean number of years at the current workplace was 18.41 years (SD=8.61) for full professors; 9.38 years (SD=7.28) for associate professors; 3.34 years (SD=2.49) for assistant professors; 2.33 years (SD=2.65) for lecturers; 5.60 years (SD=2.97) for adjuncts, and 8.46 years (SD=11.17) for the “Other” category.
Predictably, the majority of respondents in both the men’s and women’s survey indicated that they worked a traditional 9-month contract. The average length of primary contract for respondents was 9.49 years ($SD=1.79$).

The average income of respondents was $53,235 ($SD=17,965$) over a 9-month contract. Of women faculty, the average salary was $48,451 ($SD=15,415$). The mean salary of men respondents was $58,641 ($SD=19,125$).

**Instrumentation**

The survey was originally developed by Dr. Cynthia Chandler to elicit information regarding the work experiences of male and female counselor educators. No previous study has included the vast amount of information intended to be gained by this survey, so no alternate validated surveys were available for use. An exhaustive review of the literature concerning existing research in counselor education was conducted to determine basic categories of information for inclusion in the survey.

The survey was designed to elicit broad categories of information concerning the work experiences of women counseling program faculty members. That survey was later adapted to explore the work experiences of men counselor educators. Both surveys included both quantitative and qualitative questions: 18 demographic items, 26 categorical survey questions, and three open-ended qualitative questions. Survey questions explored both work-related and life or personal variables, and each question included space for subjective responses in which to elaborate responses to questions. Surveys were similar in content, except for questions designed to specifically fit the sample population (e.g., women’s beliefs about men’s experience in the work environment, and vice versa). In the men’s survey, two-part questions regarding sexual harassment, gender discrimination, research time, service time, and decision-making power were
asked to elicit responses about men’s own experiences and their beliefs about comparable women’s experiences.

By its nature exploratory research demands that reliability and validity be considered at a different level than experimental research (Buckingham & Saunders, 2004). Exploratory, or descriptive, research is intended to provide a snapshot of a topic about which little is known. Therefore, validity is limited because measurement is intended to make an initial identification of important variables or dimensions of the topic under study. For the same reason, reliability is limited because the topic is in the initial stages of exploration. This study included both closed-ended, or categorical, questions for the purpose of enhancing reliability, and open-ended, or qualitative, questions to enhance validity of responses.

Available methods of determining validity included content validity and construct validity. Construct validity was determined by two methods: survey questions were designed based on the available, but admittedly limited, information regarding the work experiences of faculty in higher education and counselor education programs; survey questions were also reviewed by two tenured faculty members and two doctoral students for relevance. Categories of questions were also examined by two faculty members and two doctoral students to determine whether content validity existed.

As a study intended to investigate very personal information that potentially impacts the worklives of counselor education faculty members, reliability is a particular concern. Complete anonymity of respondents was considered by to be imperative because of the sensitive nature of some of the questions (Fowler, 1993). Logic dictates that respondents would be more likely to give honest and accurate responses to sensitive questions if there was no method of identifying them by university affiliation or otherwise, and if potential respondents would not be contacted
repeatedly with requests to fill out and return the survey. A good example of this potential problem was the questionnaire research by Miller and Larrabee (1995) on sexual contact with students. In that survey, participants were selected using the ACES mailing list and identified so that requests could be made in order to enhance response rate; ultimately, so few male faculty responded that male respondent’s surveys were totally excluded from the study. As in that example, it seems inherently unlikely that a respondent who could potentially be identified would admit having sexual contact with a student. Similarly, for the purposes of this survey, some respondents might fear revealing gender discrimination or sexual harassment by colleagues or professors if the offender is still employed by the program or department, and the inherent nature of any power imbalance could conceivably render the respondent at risk if he or she could be identified, though many universities have “zero-tolerance” policies. In practice zero-tolerance policies are a well-intentioned but are exceedingly difficult to enforce. Therefore, the decision was made to sacrifice traditional methods of response rate enhancement and reliability for the sake of a potentially more accurate representation of the work experiences of counselor educators.

Variables to be included in the survey were conceptualized from a holistic perspective, in the sense that the potential existed for an inter-relationship between multiple dimensions specific to both demographic or personal variables and to the work environment itself in affecting respondent’s experience of the work environment. Demographic and employment data included work and “life” or personal factor items: participant’s age, gender, relationship status (married; committed/partnered; single; divorced; widowed), ethnicity, sexual orientation, parenting information (parents or childless), faculty rank as applicable (assistant, associate, or full); tenure
status as applicable (seeking tenure or not); hours worked per week; and annual salary (based on 9- or 10-month primary contract for faculty members).

Survey questions included items were further designed to elicit perceptual and attitudinal responses to work and life variables potentially affecting the work environment for counselor educators. The response format for these items was categorically consistent, i.e. “yes,” “no,” “does not apply,” and “I don’t know.” Each survey question also encouraged the respondent to elaborate on any positive response to questions and provided space for any elaboration. The respondents were asked to continue any additional elaborations on a separate piece of paper if the space provided was not sufficient.

Open-ended questions were included at survey’s end in an attempt to gain additional qualitative information related to work and life experiences. Each question was worded to apply specifically to the sample population. For the women’s survey, these items included:

1) Please describe those experiences, events, and accomplishments that have assisted you the most in your work and promotion process as a faculty member.

2) Please describe those experiences and events that have hindered you the most in your work and promotion process as a faculty member.

3) What advice would you offer to a new woman faculty to promote her success as a faculty member?

For the men’s survey, the items included:

1) Please describe those experiences, events, and accomplishments that have assisted you the most in your work and promotion process as a faculty member.

2) Please describe those experiences and events that have hindered you the most in your work and promotion process as a faculty member.
3) What advice would you offer to a new male faculty to promote his success as a faculty member?

Men respondents were also asked,

4) Would the advice described (above) be in any way different if you were advising a new woman faculty?

_procedures_

Surveys were mailed to the 180 randomly-selected counselor education separately from one another, with an approximate lapse of 18 months between mailings. Each survey was individually packaged in a return postage envelope so that each could be returned directly to the researcher and not to the program liaison. Accompanying each survey was a cover letter addressed to the participant describing the purpose of the study and ensuring that the survey was completely anonymous and could in no way be traced back to the respondent. Because surveys were intended to be completely anonymous, no reminder notices were sent. No exclusions of subjects existed, excepting employment as a counselor educator. Consent to participate was indicated by completing and returning the questionnaire packet. Because participants were not identified in any fashion, surveys were coded solely for the purpose of expediting data analysis and transcription of qualitative responses.

_data analysis_

All demographic information and survey responses were coded using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 11. This information was used to describe the sample population, to provide a foundation for hypothesis testing, and to assist in identifying appropriate questions for inclusion in the development of a new survey. Data analysis included the calculation of descriptive statistics for all responses to demographic and survey questions.
Further, the chi-square ($\chi^2$) distribution was utilized to compare differences between observed and expected frequencies for each survey item and thereby to test research hypotheses.

Additionally, qualitative responses to open-ended questions were examined for the emergence of themes related to work and life factors. Responses were color-coded to identify responses that were similar in nature. Color-coded responses were then grouped for further examination, to determine that responses were actually similar in terms of meaning. Each set of color-coded responses was then given a brief title to identify its theme, e.g., “positive mentoring.” All research hypotheses were then tested using descriptive statistics, chi-square statistics, and emergent themes from qualitative data.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore personal, or “life” factors and work-related or “work” factors that potentially impact the worklives of counselor education faculty. The survey was intended to be broad and inclusive, for the purpose of identifying as many important factors as possible relating to faculty members’ experience of the work environment in counselor education. In this chapter, the results of the study are presented. The analyses computed to investigate research hypotheses are reviewed along with emergent themes of qualitative responses.

Two separate surveys were mailed to faculty women and to men, with a lapse of approximately 18 months between mailings. Ninety CACREP-accredited and 90 non-CACREP accredited programs were contacted for this survey, for a total of 180 programs. The initial survey was mailed to women counselor educators in January 2001. Approximately 18 months later, another set of surveys was mailed to men counselor educators using the same mailing list of programs.

Vaux (1996) recommended that at least twice the amount of surveys needed should be distributed in order to ensure at least a 50% response rate. Programs were identified using the Hollis and Dodson (2000) text, which also identifies the number of faculty members in each program, their names, and available contact information. Seven surveys were sent to each program with the expectation that the number of surveys included would be sufficient; and permission was given in the letter to the contact person to photocopy the survey if necessary. For each mailing, a total of 1260 surveys were sent.
To determine some approximation of response rate, it was necessary to identify as closely as possible the number of men and women faculty for each department. The Hollis and Dodson (2000) text identified 349 women faculty working in the randomly selected CACREP-accredited programs and 306 women faculty working in non-CACREP accredited programs, for a total of 655 potential respondents. Using the same method, 416 men faculty were working in selected CACREP-accredited programs and 402 were identified as working in non-CACREP accredited programs, for a total of 818 potential respondents. In the survey mailed to women counselor educators, nine packets were returned with incomplete or missing survey data thereby precluding analysis. Likewise, in the men’s survey mailing, six surveys were unusable due to missing data. Of 184 surveys received from women faculty 175 were complete, for an approximate response rate of 27%. After discarding 6 unusable surveys from the men faculty mailing, 153 remained for an approximate response rate of 19%. Because the Hollis and Dodson text is published every four years, it does not necessarily reflect recent changes to faculty in counseling programs. It is not known how many faculty members may have been hired, transferred, or retired from the programs contacted for this survey.

Because of the sensitive nature of the survey questions, no attempt was made to improve response rate. I concluded that any attempts to contact potential respondents repeatedly asking for the survey to be returned would tend to discourage, rather than encourage, participants to respond because their identities would be known, at least for the purpose of making contact (Braverman, 1996). Although confidentiality and anonymity were assured in the cover letter accompanying each survey, it seems evident that continued contacts by this researcher would tend to imply that at least to some degree participants’ identities were known.
Data Analysis

All demographic information and questionnaires were coded using SPSS, Version 11. Descriptive statistics were used to examine potential differences between categorical responses to survey items. Data was then analyzed using the chi-square ($\chi^2$) distribution to compare statistically significant differences between observed and expected frequencies for life and work survey items. Qualitative responses to survey items were transcribed, color-coded, and grouped according to meaning. Qualitative responses to open-ended questions were then examined for the emergence of themes related to work and life factors.

Hypothesis Testing

To test the four research hypotheses, descriptive statistics, chi-square contingency table results, and emergent themes of qualitative data were utilized. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the sample population and provided frequencies for categorical responses to survey questions. Chi-square contingency tables were computed to identify statistically significant differences between observed and expected frequencies for life and work survey items. Finally, qualitative responses to all survey questions were examined for the emergence of important themes in the worklives of counselor educators. In this section, each of the four hypotheses is restated, the statistical results of the hypothesis testing are presented, and the relationships between the variables are analyzed.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 proposed that experiences of the work environment would be significantly different for men and women counselor educators. To test this hypothesis, descriptive statistics related to mentoring, parenting, sexual harassment, gender discrimination, salary equity, teaching and service time, and decision-making power were reviewed. Seventy-seven percent ($n=134$) of
women respondents and 71% (n=107) of men respondents reported that they had experienced positive mentoring that they believed assisted them in the promotion process. Of the respondents who had children, 51% of women (n=56) and 54% (n=64) of men indicated that parenting impacted their experience of the work environment. The majority of both women (n= 137) and men respondents (n=140) reported that they had not experienced sexual harassment, though a socially significant 20% (n=35) of women respondents reported that they had been sexually harassed by a colleague or administrator. Thirty-three percent (n=56) of women and 14% (n=21) of men reported that they had experienced gender discrimination in the work environment, though the majority had not. Fifty-one percent (n=87) of women believed that their salaries were equitable to those of the opposite gender, though a socially significant 22% (n=38) of women did not think their salaries were equitable. In contrast, 71% (n=109) of men respondents believed their salaries were equitable to women’s salaries, though 16% (n=24) did not. Eighty percent (n=136) of women and 92% (n=140) of men believed that they were not asked to dedicate more time to teaching than the opposite gender. Sixty-six percent (n=114) of women and 92% (n=141) of men believed that they were not asked to dedicate more time to service than the opposite gender. In terms of decision-making power, 73% (n=126) of women and 91% (n=139) of men believed that they had fair and just representation in decision-making power, though a socially significant 20% (n=35) of women respondents did not believe they had fair representation in decision-making.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender and Work Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.160*</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.865*</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Discrimination</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.958*</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Equity</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.391*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.596</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Collaboration</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Time</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.689*</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Time</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.876*</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Representation</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.677*</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $p < .05$

Table 3 depicts results of the contingency table comparing respondent gender with responses to the nine selected work variables. Comparisons of gender by faculty rank indicated that men faculty were significantly more likely to hold the rank of full professor, while women faculty were more likely to hold the rank of assistant professor, $\chi^2(5, N=327) = 13.160, p = .022$. Women faculty were significantly more likely than men faculty to report having experienced both sexual harassment, $\chi^2(2, N=325) = 15.865, p = .000$; and gender discrimination, $\chi^2(2, N=325) = 26.958, p = .000$. Men faculty were significantly more likely to report that they believed their salaries were equitable to women’s salaries, whereas women were more likely to report that they did not know whether their salaries were equitable, $\chi^2(2, N=323) = 14.391, p = .001$. Women faculty were significantly more likely than men faculty to report the perception that they spent more time in teaching, $\chi^2(2, N=324) = 16.689, p = .000$, and in service activities, $\chi^2(2, N=325) = 39.876, p = .000$. Men and women faculty differed significantly in their experiences of decision-making power, indicating that women faculty were significantly more likely to believe that they did not have as much power in making decisions affecting their programs as did men faculty, $\chi^2$.
(2, \( N=325 \)) =16.677, \( p=.000 \). Faculty rank was not significantly related to experiences of mentoring and collaboration activity.

Qualitative responses suggested that women and men respondents had different phenomenological experiences related to sexual harassment, gender discrimination, the impact of family on career, and the impact of age. Women respondents commented more often on experiences of sexual harassment per se and described a wide variety of experiences from inappropriate comments and touch to strong sexual advances. Men respondents seemed more often to experience sexual harassment in the form of jokes, propositions, and unfair allegations, particularly by female graduate students. In terms of gender discrimination, women noted discrimination toward women faculty in the form of salary and workload inequities and negative attitudes by other faculty, particularly men in administrative positions, toward childrearing. In contrast, men respondents commented on the unfairness of women being given salary equity raises and on automatic assumptions of guilt when students alleged sexual harassment against them. Both men and women respondents reported experiencing significant role strain while attempting to balance career and family responsibilities. Though women faculty noted that this role strain resulted in having less energy to dedicate to their work, men seemed to more often note that their families were a significant source of joy and fulfillment. Related to age, women faculty commented on receiving less respect and credibility as younger faculty members, while older women faculty noted that they were perceived as having more credibility and experience. Similarly, older men faculty reported receiving automatic respect and credibility from student and faculty due to their age.

These results indicate that on several variables, women and men counselor educators may experience the work environment differently. Statistically significant differences between gender
were observed in experiences of sexual harassment, gender discrimination, salary equity, teaching and service time, and representation in decision-making. Qualitative themes suggested that women and men faculty differed in experiences of sexual harassment, gender discrimination, and the impact of family on career. Taken together, the frequencies of survey responses, chi-square analysis, and qualitative data partially support hypothesis 1.

**Hypothesis 2**

Hypothesis 2 proposed that pretenured faculty members would indicate fewer positive experiences in the work environment than tenured faculty members. To test this hypothesis, descriptive statistics, selected chi-square statistics and qualitative data were examined. Descriptive statistics of the samples indicated that, in contrast to the men survey respondents, women faculty members tended to be more highly concentrated in the assistant or “lower” ranks of promotion. At the assistant rank, 61% ($n=73$) of respondents were women and 39% ($n=46$) were men. At the associate rank, 53% ($n=48$) of respondents were women, and 47% ($n=43$) were men. At the full professor rank, 37% ($n=35$) of respondents were women and 61% ($n=55$) were men. Of women respondents, almost 46% ($n=80$) were tenured, slightly over 38% ($n=67$) were on a tenure track, and 16% ($n=28$) were not tenured and not seeking tenure. Of men respondents, almost 61% ($n=92$) were tenured, 30% ($n=45$) were on a tenure track, and almost 10% ($n=15$) were not tenured nor seeking tenure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure and Work Variables</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Discrimination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary Equity</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.231*</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.043</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Collaboration</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.911*</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Time</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.888</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Time</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.549</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Representation</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.630*</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05

Table 4 depicts the results of a contingency table comparing tenure status with work variables of sexual harassment, gender discrimination, salary equity, mentoring, publication, collaboration, teaching and service time, and decision-making representation. Tenure status was shown to be a statistically significantly variable as related to sexual harassment, \( \chi^2(4, N=324) = 9.738, p = .045 \), indicating that tenured faculty were significantly more likely than untenured faculty to report that they had not experienced sexual harassment. Tenured faculty were significantly more likely than untenured faculty to indicate that they believed their salaries were equitable with those of other faculty, \( \chi^2(4, N=322) = 10.231, p = .037 \). Tenured faculty were also significantly more likely than untenured faculty to report that they did collaborate with colleagues for the purpose of publication, \( \chi^2(2, N=321) = 10.911, p = .004 \). Tenure status was significantly related to beliefs about decision-making representation, indicating that tenured faculty were significantly more likely than untenured faculty to believe that they had fair and just decision-making representation, \( \chi^2(4, N=324) = 12.630, p = .013 \). Tenure status was not shown to be statistically significantly related to gender-based discrimination, experiences of mentoring, or time spent in teaching and service.
Qualitative responses indicated that pretenured faculty had negative experiences related to mentoring, childrearing, lack of support, service requirements, hostile work environment, and administrative duties. A frequent theme by many pretenured faculty was the report that they received little or no adequate mentoring in their tenure and promotion process. Those respondents who stated that they had received good mentoring noted that their mentoring programs were formalized by university and departmental policies. However, many respondents in both the women’s and men’s surveys indicated the belief that their senior faculty members were simply too busy to provide mentoring time, and many pretenured faculty fended for themselves in deciphering the requirements of tenure or asked for help from other faculty outside their own departments. Women respondents often noted perceived negative experiences with senior faculty who advised them to delay having children during the pretenure years, or avoid having children altogether. Many respondents identified mentoring and collaboration as important experiences that assisted them in the tenure and promotion process, including professional and personal support and interaction with senior faculty. Respondents also identified lack of support and mentoring as experiences they perceived as significantly hindering them in the tenure and promotion process. Respondents often cited multiple service requirements as taking time away from research, which hindered the promotion process. Both men and women respondents also identified hostile work environments and administrative duties as hindering the promotion process. However, in general qualitative responses seemed to indicate that negative experiences and potential stressors in the work environment affected both pretenured and tenured faculty members.

These qualitative results indicate that though pretenured faculty did experience fewer positive experiences in the work environment related to parenting, poor mentoring, and
overwork, these experiences also tended to be shared by tenured faculty. The results of a chi-square analysis suggested that being tenured served as a mediating factor as related to avoiding sexual harassment, perceiving salary equity, collaborating with others, and having adequate decision-making representation within programs or departments. Qualitative themes suggested that pretenured faculty often experienced little effective mentoring, were advised to avoid having children, and were overburdened with service and administrative duties during the tenure process; however, these emergent themes were not considered to be qualitatively different than the experiences mentioned by tenured faculty. Thus, the second hypothesis was partially supported by these findings.

**Hypothesis 3**

The third hypothesis proposed that older faculty members would indicate more positive experiences of the work environment than younger faculty members, as measured by comparisons between demographic data and quality-of-work item responses. To test this hypothesis, descriptive statistics, chi-square analysis between age and work factors, and qualitative data were examined.

Descriptive statistics indicated that women respondents comprised 62% \( (n=56) \) of respondents under age 35, and men respondents comprised 38% \( (n=34) \). Of respondents who reported their age as being between 36 and 54 years old, 57% \( (n=89) \) were women and 43% \( (n=67) \) were men. Of respondents over age 55, women respondents comprised 34% \( (n=26) \) and men respondents comprised 66% \( (n=51) \). Sixty-five percent \( (n=110) \) of women and 68% \( (n=104) \) of men respondents believed that age had little impact on their experiences in the work environment, though a socially significant 35% \( (n=58) \) of women and 32% \( (n=48) \) of men respondents reported that age did impact their work experiences.
Table 5 depicts the results of a chi-square contingency table between respondent’s perception of the impact of age against work variables including tenure rank, sexual harassment, gender discrimination, salary equity, mentoring, publication for collaboration, teaching and service time, and representation in decision-making. Respondents’ perception of age was not statistically significantly related to any of these work variables.

Qualitative responses about the impact of age suggested some differences between the experiences of younger faculty and older faculty, and in some responses these subjective experiences appeared to be impacted by gender. In general, older faculty of both genders reported that they enjoyed the benefits of increased respect and greater credibility with students and other faculty. Women faculty particularly noted experiencing less energy to devote to their jobs, whereas several men faculty noted being unfairly forced to retire due to age. Conversely, younger faculty, particularly women faculty, often reported experiencing less respect from both colleagues and students due to the appearance of youth and interpreted this experience as the belief of students and colleagues that they were inexperienced.
Demographic statistics indicate that the majority of women respondents were under age 35, whereas the majority of men respondents were over age 55. The majority of respondents indicated the belief that age had little impact on their experiences of the work environment. The results of a chi-square analysis revealed no statistically significant relationship between age and nine selected work variables. Qualitative themes suggested some differences in terms of the respect and credibility afforded faculty members based on age. Thus, the third hypothesis was weakly supported by the qualitative findings.

_Hypothesis 4_

Hypothesis 4 proposed that faculty members who were married or in committed relationships would indicate more positive experiences in the work environment than faculty who were unpartnered. To test this hypothesis descriptive statistics, chi-square analysis between age and work factors, and qualitative data were examined.

Forty-eight percent \((n=118)\) of women respondents and 52\% \((n=125)\) of men respondents indicated that they were either married or in committed relationships. Sixty-seven percent \((n=57)\) of women respondents and 33\% \((n=28)\) of men respondents reported that they were single. Sixty-five percent \((n=110)\) of women and 71\% of men \((n=108)\) reported that they did not perceive their relationship status as having an impact on their experience in the work environment, though a socially significant 35\% \((n=58)\) of women and 29\% \((n=45)\) of men respondents did experience an impact on their work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Impact of Relationship Status and Work Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Rank</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_(table continues)_
Table 6 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>( df )</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.904</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Discrimination</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.160*</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Equity</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.815*</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Collaboration</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.892</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Time</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.604</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Time</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.864</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.719*</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *\( p < .05 \)

In Table 6, a chi-square analysis examined the relationship between respondent’s subjective experience of relationship status and selected work variables, including tenure rank, sexual harassment, gender discrimination, salary equity, mentoring, publication for collaboration, teaching and service time, and representation in decision-making. Significant results for this comparison were negative, in the sense that faculty who did not believe that their relationship status impacted their experiences of work were significantly more likely to have experienced gender discrimination at work, \( \chi^2(2, N=318) = 11.160, p = .004 \), and were more likely to believe that their salaries were equitable to those of other faculty, \( \chi^2(2, N=317) = 6.815, p = .033 \), that their service time was equitable, \( \chi^2(2, N=318) = 5.864, p = .053 \), and that they had equitable decision-making representation, \( \chi^2(2, N=318) = 8.719, p = .013 \). The impact of relationship status was not statistically significantly related to rank, sexual harassment, mentoring, collaboration, or teaching time.

Results of the qualitative analysis regarding the impact of relationship status were mixed. In particular, respondents noted a positive benefit of heterosexual privilege. Respondents
reported that role strain between their relationships, including parenting, often translated into having less energy to do their work. Respondents also indicated that their relationships were frequently a source of support. Single women respondents frequently commented feeling socially isolated from married faculty, and reported a belief that they were perceived as having more time to devote to work than married faculty. Because the vast majority of the sample was heterosexual \((n=293)\), responses of gay, lesbian, or bisexual respondents may have been eclipsed in the qualitative analysis. However, a few gay, lesbian, or bisexual respondents noted feelings of isolation from married faculty and reported the belief that they were perceived differently by students and faculty because of their sexual orientation.

These results indicate that the majority of respondents did not experience relationship status as having an impact on their work experiences, though a socially significant portion of the sample did experience an impact. Chi-square analysis revealed that relationship status was statistically significantly related to gender discrimination, salary equity, service time, and decision-making representation in that respondents who did not experience relationship status as having an impact on the work environment were more likely to report experiencing equity across these variables. Qualitative themes suggested that heterosexual respondents experienced privilege associated with being part of the majority group, may have less energy to devote to both relationship and career, and that married or committed respondents perceived their relationships as a form of support. Gay, lesbian, or bisexual respondents indicated experiencing social isolation related to both peers and students due to their sexual orientation and relationship status. The fourth hypothesis was therefore partially supported by these findings.
Summary of the Results

The results of this study were presented by providing a description of the sample and descriptive statistics of survey responses. Contingency tables were computed to identify statistically significant differences between observed and expected frequencies of demographic or “life” variables and nine selected work-related variables. Emergent themes arising in qualitative responses to survey questions were presented. The results partially supported the first hypothesis, partially supported the second hypothesis, weakly supported the third hypothesis, and partially supported the fourth hypothesis. In Chapter V, a discussion of the results, implications for counselor education, and recommendations for future research are presented.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In Chapter IV, the results of a study examining the inter-relationship between life and work variables impacting the work environment of counselor educators were presented. The results indicated that to some extent, the experiences of counselor educators in the work environment are affected by demographic variables related to their personal lives, including gender, relationship status, and parenting status; and by variables specific to the work environment, including rank, sexual harassment, gender discrimination, teaching and service activities, and representation in decision-making. Because no previous research has examined the broad spectrum of variables affecting the worklives of counselor educators, results of this exploratory study clearly suggest directions for future research in counselor education.

Discussion of Results

In this section, the relationships between various life and work variables related to the work environment of counselor educators are discussed. The primary research questions explored what demographic variables impact the work experiences of counselor educators, whether these variables are inter-related, and which variables enhance or detract from counselor educators’ experience of the work environment. Variables in this section are grouped into six life variables and nine work variables identified earlier in the study, rather than by results of hypotheses, for the purposes of unifying and clarifying discussion. Therefore, discussion of hypotheses 1, 3, and 4 are included in the section pertaining to life variables, and discussion of hypothesis 2 is included in the work variables section. Post hoc analyses are included on variables that were not related to the four research hypotheses.
Life Variables

The study identified six demographic variables, hereafter referred to as life variables, for inclusion in the study. These life variables included gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, relationship status, and parenting status. The findings indicated that of these variables, gender, relationship status, and parenting status were significantly related to the experiences of counselor educators in the work environment. Qualitative responses also suggested influences of age, sexual orientation, and ethnicity.

Table 7
Impact of Life Factor Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( % )</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( % )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Age</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Ethnicity</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Sexual orientation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Relationship Status</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Parenting Status*</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percents are based on the number of participants who reported that they had children (\( n = 110 \) women; \( n = 119 \) men)

Table 7 depicts the respondents’ perceptions of the impact of five life variables on work experienced listed by gender. Thirty-five percent (\( n = 58 \)) of women respondents and 32% (\( n = 48 \)) of men respondents (\( n = 48 \)) identified age as a factor that had an impact on their experiences of the work environment. Sixty-five percent (\( n = 110 \)) of women respondents and 68% (\( n = 104 \)) of men respondents did not believe that age had an impact on their experience as a faculty member.
Thirty percent ($n=51$) of women faculty believed that their experience of the work environment was impacted by their ethnicity, whereas 70% ($n=119$) of women faculty did not. Of the men faculty responding to this question, 41% ($n=63$) believed their work experience was impacted by their ethnicity, whereas 58% ($n=88$) did not. One respondent reported being uncertain.

Eighty-nine percent ($n=153$) of women respondents and 85% ($n=130$) of men respondents reported that sexual orientation did not impact their experience of the work environment. Eleven percent ($n=19$) of women respondents and 15% ($n=23$) of men respondents did experience sexual orientation as having impacted their work experiences.

Relationship status was identified as either married or committed, or single. Thirty-five percent ($n=58$) of women respondents and 29% ($n=45$) of men respondents believed that their relationship status affected their experience of being a faculty member. Sixty-five percent ($n=110$) of women and 71% ($n=108$) of men did not believe that their work experience was impacted by their relationship status.

Fifty-one percent ($n=56$) of women respondents believed that their work was impacted by their experience of parenting, whereas 45% ($n=50$) believed it did not impact the work environment. Four percent ($n=4$) of women respondents were uncertain. Fifty-four percent ($n=64$) of men faculty reported that their work experience was impacted by parenting, and 46% ($n=55$) believed that it did not.

**Gender**

Hypothesis 1 was proposed to determine whether men and women faculty experience the work environment in counselor education differently. The impact of gender in the academic work environment has been identified in past research (Menges & Exum, 1983; Sax et al., 2002),
but little research has focused on the impact of gender in counselor education faculties (Ramsey et al., 2002; Roland & Fontanesi-Seime, 1996). In this study, gender was considered to be a major factor potentially impacting the qualitatively different experiences of counselor educators in the work environment.

Findings suggested that women and men counselor educators may in fact experience the work environment qualitatively differently. As compared to men respondents in this sample, women respondents on average were younger, more often held the rank of assistant professor, had spent fewer years at their faculty rank, and made less money than their male counterparts. The majority of men respondents reported that they had not experienced sexual harassment or gender discrimination, believed their salaries were equitable, and found their decision-making representation to be just and fair. Unlike men respondents, however, women respondents were more likely to report negative experiences in the work environment. Socially significant percentages of women faculty reported experiencing sexual harassment, gender discrimination, and salary inequities. Significant differences were also noted between men and women in their perceptions of teaching time, service time, and decision-making representation; women respondents were statistically significantly more likely to report that they spent more time in teaching and service activities than their male colleagues and to believe that they did not receive fair and just representation in departmental decision-making. The confluence of gender with these work-related variables provides support for the importance of considering gender in regard to the work experiences of counselor educators.

Age

Hypothesis 3 proposed that older faculty would indicate more positive experiences in the work environment as compared to younger faculty members, based on the assumption that
younger faculty would be more likely to be seeking tenure and parenting children. The majority of respondents under age 35 were women, and the majority of respondents over age 55 were men, reflecting the national trend of faculties “top-heavy” in older men (Kennedy, 1997; Maples & Altekruse, 1993). In this study, the majority of both men and women faculty members indicated that age did not impact their experience of the work environment, though socially significant percentages in both samples did experience age as having an impact. No statistically significant relationships between the perceived impact of age and nine selected work variables were found, though this hypothesis was weakly supported by qualitative responses (See Appendix B). Qualitative responses of respondents did indicate differences between how young and older faculty members perceived the credibility and respect they received from students and fellow faculty. Whereas younger faculty reported experiencing less respect due to their age and feeling as though their credibility was questioned, older faculty reported receiving “automatic” respect and credibility simply due to their age. Results suggested that though credibility and respect from students and fellow faculty are likely different for younger and older faculty members, in general faculty appeared to experience similar stressors related to work regardless of age. Demographic data also reflected the national trend of increasing numbers of relatively “young” faculty, most predominantly women, rising through the tenure ranks in counselor education, with evident implications for women faculty in the work environment.

*Relationship Status*

Hypothesis 4 proposed that married or committed faculty members would indicate more positive experiences in the work environment than would single faculty members. Studies suggest that faculty members in higher education, particularly women, struggle with balancing responsibilities between work and their personal lives (AAUP, 2003a; Johnsrud, 2002;
Lindholm, 2003; Olsen & Near, 1994), but no known studies have examined the impact that marriage or committed relationships may potentially have on faculty worklives. In this study, statistically significant relationships were found between relationship status and gender discrimination, salary equity and decision-making power. Respondents who indicated that their relationship status had no impact on their work experiences were significantly more likely to report that they had not experienced gender discrimination and to believe that they had equitable salaries and decision-making representation. This finding tends to suggest that perceptions of the impact of relationship status may be a mediating factor in whether counselor education faculty perceive equity in their work environment, thereby partially supporting the hypothesis. Conversely, it may be that faculty who do experience greater role strain between their personal lives and worklives would also be likely to experience elements of their work environments as inequitable. As previous studies suggested (AAUP, 2003b; Dey, 1994; Sax et al., 2002; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989), this study upheld the contention that women faculty seem to experience greater role strain between home and work than do men faculty in counselor education.

**Parenting Status**

A number of studies have examined the role strain between work and personal lives, typically in terms of parenting responsibilities (AAUP, 2003b; Dey, 1994; Johnsrud, 2002; Lindholm, 2003). Sax et al. (2002) suggested that women faculty may be more likely than their male colleagues to be forced to choose between family and career because on average childbearing years tend to coincide with the pretenure years, between the ages of 33 and 40. In this study, a majority of men respondents were parents, whereas the majority of women respondents did not have children.
Post hoc analysis of the effect of parenting status as compared against work variables is shown in Table 8. Faculty members who reported that they were not parents were statistically significantly more likely to hold the rank of assistant professor, whereas full and associate professors were more likely to indicate that their work had been impacted by parenting, $\chi^2(15, \ N=323) = 40.385, p = .000.$ Respondents who believed their parenting had impacted their work experience were significantly more likely than non-parents to report that they had experienced gender-based discrimination, $\chi^2(6, \ N=321) = 13.661, p = .034,$ and that they did not believe their salaries were equitable to other faculty members, $\chi^2(6, \ N=319) = 19.023, p = .004.$ Respondents who indicated that they were not parents were statistically significantly more likely than parents to indicate that they had equitable representation in decision-making power in their programs or departments, $\chi^2(6, \ N=321), = 14.542, p = .024.$

Results of a comparison between parenting status and faculty rank indicated that respondents who held the rank of assistant professor were more likely to be childless, suggesting
that faculty in the pretenure years may choose to have no children or to delay childbearing until later years of employment. Of all respondents who were parents, the majority of whom were concentrated in senior ranks, approximately half indicated that parenting did impact their experience of the work environment. Taken together, the results suggest that not only may pretenured faculty members choose not to have children prior to gaining tenure, but also that those who have no children perceive more equity in the work environment as related to gender equity, salary equity, and decision-making.

It seems evident that faculty who are raising children experience considerable difficulty in attempting to balance family and work obligations. Qualitative responses of respondents indicated that faculty members, especially women faculty, struggle to balance their work obligations with child-rearing obligations (See Appendix B). In particular, women faculty emphasized the stress of balancing home and work, whereas men faculty tended to describe parenting as enhancing them personally. It may be that faculty who are parents experience more disparate demands on their time and money than do faculty who are not parents. Overall, these findings support research on role strain between work and home life for faculty members, and suggest that parenting may have a negative impact on faculty members’ perceptions of gender discrimination and salary equity.

Sexual Orientation

In society as well as in academia, gay, lesbian, and bisexual (GLB) individuals comprise a sexual minority. Very few studies have focused on the experiences of this sexual minority in academia (Dolan, 1998), and to date none have examined the experiences of GLB faculty in counselor education. In this study, almost 10% of women respondents and 8% of men respondents identifying sexual orientation were gay, lesbian, or bisexual. The majority of
respondents indicated that their sexual orientation had no impact on their experiences of the work environment, potentially paralleling the fact that the vast majority of respondents also identified their sexual orientation as heterosexual.

| Table 9 |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|
| Impact of Sexual Orientation and Work Variables | N | df | Value | p |
| Tenure Rank | 324 | 5 | 4.502 | .480 |
| Sexual Harassment | 322 | 2 | 4.242 | .120 |
| Gender Discrimination | 322 | 2 | 7.942* | .019 |
| Salary Equity | 320 | 2 | 2.880 | .237 |
| Mentoring | 322 | 1 | .593 | .441 |
| Publication Collaboration | 322 | 1 | .010 | .919 |
| Teaching Time | 324 | 2 | .107 | .948 |
| Service Time | 322 | 2 | .308 | .857 |
| Decision-Making Power | 322 | 2 | 2.518 | .284 |

Note. *p < .05

Post hoc analysis of results concerning the impact of sexual orientation on experiences as a faculty member are shown in Table 9. The sole statistically significant difference emerging from this comparison indicated that respondents who reported that their work experience was not impacted by their sexual orientation were significantly more likely to indicate that they had not experienced gender discrimination, but no other statistically significant results emerged between the impact of sexual orientation and work variables. The impact of sexual orientation was not significantly related to rank, sexual harassment, beliefs about salary equity, mentoring, collaboration, teaching or service time, or decision-making power.

It seems evident that being part of the heterosexual majority group is one mediating factor in individual’s experiences of the work environment. Qualitative responses of heterosexual
faculty indicated that many respondents were aware of the “heterosexual privilege” benefits they received by being part of the heterosexual majority (See Appendix B). The results should be interpreted with caution due to very small sample size of GLB faculty. It may also be that the question format regarding “gender discrimination” was the primary format in which GLB faculty could indicate whether they had in fact experienced discrimination due to sexual orientation, responding that while they themselves did not experience their sexual orientation as having an impact on their work experiences, they did experience discrimination from others. Because the study included no question regarding discrimination due to sexual orientation per se, qualitative responses to survey questions may have been the only arena in which GLB faculty could express whether they had experienced bias or discrimination. Qualitative responses of gay, lesbian, and bisexual faculty indicated that they did experience marginalization in the sense of feeling socially isolated from their heterosexual colleagues, but did not suggest overt discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

Ethnicity

Minority faculty are significantly underrepresented in higher education (Johnsrud & DesCharlais, 1994; Perna, 2001; Tillman, 2001) and in counselor education (Magnuson et al., 2001; Young & Chamley, 1990). Ethnicity did not emerge as a strong significant variable impacting experiences of the work environment in this study, but these results should be interpreted with caution because the vast majority of respondents identified their ethnicity as Caucasian.
As shown in the post hoc analysis in Table 10, faculty who indicated that their ethnicity did not impact their work experience were also significantly more likely to indicate that they did not experience gender discrimination, $\chi^2(4, N=319) = 33.862, p = .000$. Ethnicity of faculty members was not significantly related to any other work variable, including rank, experiences of sexual harassment, beliefs about salary equity, mentoring, collaboration, teaching, or service activities, or decision-making power.

The majority of respondents in this study indicated that their ethnicity did not impact their experiences in the work environment; however, it should also be taken into account that 83% of the sample identified their ethnicity as Caucasian. Though on the face the findings seem to suggest that ethnicity had little impact on counselor educator’s experiences of their work, results may also likely reflect both the benefits of white privilege and the fact that no question explored discrimination on the basis of racial or ethnic background per se. Ethnicity did emerge as an important theme in the qualitative responses to survey questions (See Appendix B). Ethnic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of Ethnicity and Work Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Rank</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.617</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.596</td>
<td>.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Discrimination</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.862*</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Equity</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.528</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Collaboration</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.332</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Time</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Time</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.758</td>
<td>.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Power</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.010</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *$p < .05$
and racial minorities indicated that they did experience negative effects of their ethnicity, in terms of feelings of social isolation, disrespect from students and colleagues, and assumptions from other faculty that they would teach and research diversity issues. Caucasian respondents tended to comment more often on their knowledge that they received automatic white privilege. Responses of these majority group members also noted beliefs that ethnic minorities seemed to be more desirable, particularly as compared to white males, in the hiring process. Given that diversity is an increasingly important emphasis of counselor education programs and required for CACREP accreditation, it is evident that more attention should be given to the experiences of ethnic minority faculty members in counselor education.

Work Variables

The exploratory study explored numerous variables specific to the work environment of counselor educators. Of these 33 variables, 12 were identified as demographic questions, including faculty rank, number of years at current rank, number of total years as a faculty member, number of years in the current workplace, work status, tenure status, gross income, number of months in the primary contract, number of faculty in program/department, the ranks of fellow women and men faculty, and CACREP accreditation. The remaining variables included various dimensions of respondents’ perceptions of work experience including administrative positions held, sexual harassment, gender discrimination, mentoring, collaboration, gender issues courses, teaching and service time, and decision-making representation. Nine work variables were selected as appropriate for further analysis using contingency tables, including faculty rank, sexual harassment, gender discrimination, salary equity, mentoring, collaboration, teaching time, service time, and representation in decision-making.
Faculty Rank and Tenure

Hypothesis 2 proposed that pretenured faculty members would indicate fewer positive experiences in the work environment than tenured faculty members, based on the expectation that in general persons seeking tenure would experience greater stress, role strain, and time constraints. Due to changing trends in academia, including the counselor education profession, there are marked disparities related to gender and rank (AAUP, 2003a). Tenure and faculty rank were examined as a potential variable impacting the experiences of counselor educators in the work environment.

In this study, women respondents were predictably overrepresented in junior faculty ranks whereas the majority of men respondents held the rank of full professor, reflecting national trends (Sorcinelli, 1999). Overall, women respondents had spent fewer total years as faculty members and fewer years at their current rank than men respondents. For faculty of both genders, holding tenure was positively related to beliefs about salary equity and decision-making representation, higher perceived levels of scholarly collaboration with other faculty, and avoidance of sexual harassment.

Faculty rank was not shown to be statistically significantly related to life variables including age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and relationship status. Faculty rank was a significant variable as related to parenting status, indicating that regardless of gender, assistant faculty were more likely to have no children than faculty holding higher ranks. Qualitative responses also indicated that pretenured faculty in junior ranks perceived significant difficulty with choices between career and family, and suggested that pretenured faculty often chose to delay having children. Because the majority of assistant professors in this sample were women and the majority of persons holding the assistant rank indicated that they did not have children, these
findings potentially suggest that women faculty may avoid or delay having children in the early years of their careers. This extrapolation of the data should be viewed with caution as regards faculty rank, however, because comparisons of rank and parenting were not correlated with gender in the statistical data. Hypothesis 2 was partially supported.

Sexual Harassment

Very little research concerning sexual harassment in counselor education has been conducted (Miller & Larrabee, 1995). Because the vast majority of professors in higher education are male (Sorcinelli, 1999), power differentials between men and women faculty members may tend to increase the chances of sexual harassment and gender discrimination in the work environment (Dey et al., 1996; Hoffman, 1995; Paludi & Brickman, 1991). There is very little data concerning the incidence of sexual harassment in higher education, and even less as pertains to harassment between faculty members. Though most research in higher education concerning gender-related issues such as gender discrimination and sexual harassment has focused on students (Leitich, 1999), this study showed that a socially significant 20% \( (n=35) \) of women respondents reported that they had experienced sexual harassment from other faculty or administrators, as compared to 7% \( (n=10) \) of men respondents. In a comparison of gender and sexual harassment, women faculty were statistically significantly more likely than men faculty to indicate that they had experienced sexual harassment. Though the majority of both men and women respondents reported that they had not been sexually harassed, socially significant percentages of both genders also reported knowing colleagues who had experienced sexual harassment. Though most respondents were uncertain whether there was a decrease in sexual harassment over the past five years, 27% \( (n=37) \) of women and 29% \( (n=32) \) of men believed that the incidence of sexual harassment had decreased.
Qualitative responses regarding sexual harassment suggested that women and men faculty may experience sexual harassment differently. This study suggested that sexual harassment experienced by women faculty may be more frequent, overt and severe than that experienced by men faculty in counselor education. Women respondents reported experiencing sexual harassment in the form of inappropriate comments, inappropriate touch, propositions, physical intimidation, and “joking” threats about receiving tenure for sex (See Appendix B). Qualitative responses of men respondents reported inappropriate sexual jokes and propositions, and men respondents also reported more frequent allegations of harassment from students, which they seemed to regard as a type of harassment in itself. Some respondents in this study appeared to confuse sexual harassment with incidents more indicative of gender discrimination, such as receiving negative feedback on their time spent in parenting activities rather than committee meetings. Though on the whole it is encouraging that the majority of respondents in this sample had not experienced sexual harassment, any sexual harassment is clearly at odds with the mission and purpose of counselor education. Sexual harassment is an issue deserving of continued consideration in both society and counselor education.

*Gender Discrimination*

Male privilege in academia may be pronounced due to differentials in the sheer numbers of male faculty in positions of power (Finkel et al., 1994; Perna, 2001), and due to the increasing numbers of young female faculty entering the counselor education profession (Sorcinelli, 1999), the potential for gender discrimination exists. Though the majority of both men and women respondents in this study indicated that they had not been discriminated against on the basis of gender, a socially significant percentage of women respondents believed that they had experienced gender discrimination, primarily in the form of salary inequities, workload and work
type inequities, and negative attitudes toward childrearing. Gender discrimination was shown to be statistically significantly related to gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, relationship status, and parenting status. Of these results, statistical analysis indicated that respondents who were female and respondents who were parents, regardless of gender, tended to be more likely to indicate having been victims of gender discrimination. The results of comparisons between gender discrimination and ethnicity, sexual orientation, and relationship status revealed that persons who reported they had not experienced gender discrimination were significantly more likely to report that they experienced ethnicity, sexual orientation, and relationship status as having no impact on their work experiences.

These results appeared to indicate that existing gender discrimination primarily affected women and parents. It seems logical that women would be more likely to experience gender discrimination, given the prevailing power differentials that exist between men and women in academia (Hoffman, 1995), but the result comparing parenting and gender discrimination was somewhat unexpected. Given that faculty members experience significant role strain between family and career (Dey, 1994; Johnsrud, 2002), it seems likely that parents would be more likely to experience unpleasant or negative conditions if forced to make choices in favor of family responsibilities rather than work.

Additionally, gender discrimination may be more pervasive and difficult to define than sexual harassment. Qualitative responses indicated that women respondents more often perceived discrimination as related to salary, disrespect from male colleagues, and parenting responsibilities, whereas men respondents perceived discrimination in the form of “unfair” salary equity raises for women but not men, and in being automatically assumed guilty if female students filed sexual harassment charges. Men respondents also seemed to have more difficulty
discerning between sexual harassment and gender discrimination, for example, perceiving inappropriate touch as discrimination rather than harassment.

Salary Equity

Respondents’ beliefs about salary equity were compared against their perceptions of gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, relationship status, and parenting status. The results indicated that though the majority of both women and men respondents in this study believed their salaries to equitable to those of the opposite gender, a socially significant 22% ($n=38$) of women did not believe their salaries were equitable, as opposed to 16% ($n=16$) of men. These findings parallel the national findings that women earn less than their male counterparts in academia (AAUP, 2003a; Leatherman, 1991; Smart, 1991). Men respondents were significantly more likely to believe that their salaries were equitable to those of their female counterparts. No significant results were found in comparing salary equity against age, ethnicity or sexual orientation. Significant results were found as related to relationship status and parenting status, indicating that persons who did not believe their relationship status affected their experiences in the work environment were significantly more likely to believe their salaries were equitable; and conversely, persons who were parents were significantly less likely to believe their salaries were equitable. The finding regarding the impact of relationship status potentially suggests that these respondents experienced less role strain between their relationships and work. Thus it follow that respondents who were either single or who did not experience role strain between personal and worklife perceived their salaries as equitable, whereas respondents who struggled to balance roles and provide for families perceived salary inequities. Qualitative responses regarding salary equity indicated that women faculty frequently noted substantial salary differentials between themselves and their male counterparts and believed that they worked more and made less in
merit raises than men. Men respondents very infrequently commented on salary equity issues, except to note that women’s salaries were lower. Some men respondents reported experiencing salary equity raises for women as discriminatory against men, seeming to miss the point that the purpose of salary equity raises was to make women’s salaries equitable to the salaries men already made.

*Mentoring*

The majority of respondents in this sample reported that they had experienced positive mentoring that assisted them in their work or in promotion. Seventy-seven percent \( (n=134) \) of women and 71% \( (n=107) \) of men reported having received positive mentoring, but a socially significant 23% \( (n=40) \) of women and 29% \( (n=44) \) of men had not. In general, the majority of respondents indicated that they did not believe that either gender spent more time mentoring faculty of their own gender than in mentoring faculty of the opposite gender, in essence “playing favorites.” In comparisons of positive mentoring experiences and gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, relationship status, and parenting status, no statistically significant differences were found. Qualitative responses were fairly evenly divided between those who received very good mentoring and those who received poor or no mentoring. Both men and women respondents expressed the view that senior faculty were too busy or “tired” to provide mentoring. Many respondents commented that mentoring was entirely absent and adopted a “sink or swim” mentality to finding their way through the tenure and promotion process. In addition, those faculty who did not receive mentoring frequently commented on the sense of isolation they perceived from other faculty, suggesting that mentoring could serve both professional and personal socializing purposes. The data of this study did not refute previous research regarding mentoring, such as Sorcinelli (1994), but rather tends to align with it; good mentoring likely
enhances new faculty development, and lack of mentoring may negatively affect the tenure and promotion process. Though most respondents in this study experienced positive mentoring, approximately one-quarter of respondents did not, with evident implications for leadership in counselor education programs.

**Collaboration**

Collaboration with colleagues for the purpose of publication has been identified as a potentially important factor in the success of counselor educators (Niles et al., 2001). Fifty-eight percent \((n=98)\) of women respondents and 63% \((n=96)\) of men respondents indicated that they collaborated with colleagues for the purpose of publication, though a socially significant 42% \((n=71)\) of women and 37% \((n=57)\) of men did not. The majority of respondents reported they did not perceive either women or men colleagues as collaborating more often with faculty of the same gender. Collaboration activities were not significantly related to gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, relationship status, or parenting status. These findings tended to parallel those of Ramsey et al. (2002), indicating that women and men counselor education faculty appear to have similar rates of scholarly activity, though the Ramsey study did not examine whether women and men faculty worked together for the purpose of publication. Qualitative responses of women respondents indicated the perception that men did not collaborate with women or with each other. Men respondents did not comment on collaborating for publication.

**Teaching Time**

Studies suggest that faculty in higher education experience significant role conflict between work requirements including teaching, service, and research (Monohan & Greene, 1987; Olsen & Near, 1994), which may result increased stress (Dey, 1994). In this study, 80% \((n=136)\) of women respondents and 92% \((n=140)\) of men respondents indicated that they did not spend
more time in teaching than the opposite gender. However, in a comparison between gender and women’s time spent in teaching, women respondents were significantly more likely than men to believe that women spent more time in teaching. Qualitative responses of women respondents indicated the belief that they taught more classes, more evening classes, and classes that were more labor intensive. Men respondents did not comment on perceptions of time spent in teaching.

Service Time

A common myth in higher education is that women faculty tend to spend more time in service activities than do men faculty (Sax et al., 2002). Though the majority of respondents believed that they were not asked to spend more time in service activities than colleagues of the opposite gender, a socially significant 25% (n=45) of women in this study reported that they were asked to do more service. Time spent in service activities was not found to be significantly related to age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, relationship status or parenting status, but comparisons with gender indicated that women were significantly more likely to believe they spent more time in service. In their qualitative responses, women respondents commented that they spent more time in committees, mentoring, student concerns, and social activities than men. Men respondents commented very infrequently, except to note that women performed more social functions for the department. Both women and men counselor educators commented that whether or not women were asked to dedicate more time to service activities, they often volunteered. Taken together, these findings tend to suggest that in many cases women faculty may perform more service activities simply because they choose to, whether they would prefer to or not.
Representation in Decision-Making

Changing proportions of male and female graduates from doctoral programs may tend to reduce the differential between decision-making power of men and women faculty as more women enter the professoriate (Zimpfer, 1990). The majority of women and men respondents in this study believed that they had fair and just representation in decision-making within their programs or departments, though a socially significant 20% ($n=35$) of women respondents did not. Representation in decision-making was not related to age, ethnicity, or sexual orientation, but was significantly related to gender, relationship status, and parenting status. A comparison between decision-making representation and gender revealed that women faculty were statistically significantly more likely than men faculty to believe that they did not have fair and just decision-making representation in their work environment. Comparisons with parenting status indicated that respondents who were not parents were significantly more likely than parents to believe that they had adequate decision-making representation. Comparisons with relationship status indicated that persons who did not perceive their relationship status as having an impact on their work experiences were also significantly more likely to believe that they had fair and just decision-making representation. It is of note that persons who were childless and persons who did not experience their relationship status as impacting their work experiences tended to believe that they did have adequate decision-making representation, though women faculty did not. Conversely, these findings may also suggest that women faculty, who may experience greater role strain between family and work than their male colleagues (Menges & Exum, 1983; Sax et al., 2002), find themselves more often “out of the loop” in terms of the ability to have an impact on decision-making in their programs or departments. Qualitative responses suggested that for many programs or departments, decision-making representation and
power depended on the composition of the organization, such as the ratio of men and women faculty, tenure rank, and how much power was held by the chair (See Appendix B). Men respondents commented infrequently about the composition of their department, whereas women respondents commented extensively about age, tenure, and power differences between men and women faculty as affecting decision-making. These findings tend to align with Zimpfer’s belief that though decision-making power is likely becoming more equitable over time, continued attention to the decision-making power of women faculty in counselor education is justified.

Factors Enhancing the Work Atmosphere

Qualitative responses were used to determine respondents’ beliefs about what factors in the work environment tended to assist or hinder them the most in their work and promotion (See Appendix B). Women respondents mentioned multiple benefits of interacting with others as assisting in the tenure and promotion process. In particular these interactions were typified by mentoring, collaboration, networking with colleagues outside their own department or university, and the support of others, including spouses, women’s groups on campus, department chair, and other faculty. Respondents commented frequently on the necessity of maintaining professional involvement in local and national organizations as helpful to gaining tenure. Predictably, women respondents frequently mentioned publications as one of the factors most assisting in the tenure and promotion process.

Men respondents also frequently cited mentoring by experienced senior faculty members as a significant factor in their efforts to achieve tenure and promotion. Respondents experienced the support of colleagues, including department chairs, and of their own spouses as being particularly helpful. Like women respondents, men faculty also reported national professional involvement and high publication rates as beneficial in the tenure and promotion process.
These responses suggest that women and men faculty members in counselor education are cognizant of the benefits of good mentoring and collegial relationships with other faculty, though mentoring may not occur with the regularity and consistency it should. Professional involvement with others, including professional affiliation with counseling organizations and scholarly collaboration likely provides a foundation for a sense of social belonging as well as supporting ongoing professional development in work-related functions and promotion.

**Factors Detracting From the Work Atmosphere**

Women respondents consistently reported feelings of isolation and a lack of support or mentoring, especially from senior faculty members and administrators, as hindering them in the tenure and promotion process. Many women described working in a hostile environment in which they experienced paternalistic attitudes, sexual harassment, or gender discrimination. In particular, many women faculty described significant difficulties in balancing work requirements and family needs. Additionally, women frequently described feeling overburdened by too much committee work and too many administrative duties.

Men respondents described overwork, especially in administrative requirements, as a distinct hindrance to the tenure and promotion process. Several respondents perceived service requirements as taking time away from research time, thereby making the tenure and promotion process more difficult. Respondents also described experiencing a hostile work environment in which they had to deal with negative departmental politics. Unlike women respondents, men faculty frequently reported a lack of publications as negatively impacting their ability to achieve tenure and promotions in a timely fashion.

These responses suggest that, while both men and women faculty experience overload in their work roles, women faculty may perceive requirements of work as taking time away from
family as well as work, whereas men faculty may tend to perceive the same requirements as
detracting from research and publication functions. Experiences of a hostile work environment
also appear to be qualitatively different for women and men faculty, as described by women in
terms of gender discrimination and sexual harassment and described by men in terms of
departmental politics.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations of this study are common to exploratory research, but a better understanding
of the particular limitations of this study are vital in developing future research on counselor
educators’ experiences in the work environment. The nature of the study, as intended to examine
a broad array of variables that may potentially impact the worklives of counselor educators,
determined that the study be as broad and inclusive as possible. Similar to any initial exploratory
effort, this study must be considered as only an introduction to the topic.

Because the study was intended to examine subjective experiences of the work
environment, the results must be considered phenomenological “truths” generalizable only to the
sample population. As Fowler (1993) noted, there is no objective method of validating responses
concerning subjective data, such as opinions, beliefs, and attitudes. The subjective perception of
work may potentially be affected by many additional contextual factors not measured by the
instrument; for example, personality style, job “fit”, traumatic life events, or any number of other
unforeseen factors not specifically targeted by survey questions. Additionally, perceptions and
attitudes toward work are not necessarily static states of being and may constantly change over
time or may change as a result of the previously mentioned contextual factors.

Sampling factors are likely to have affected the outcome of this study. Random sampling
of CACREP accredited and non-CACREP accredited counseling programs across the United
States was used to limit the possibility of a Type I error; however, the necessity of anonymity in this survey precluded tracking of received surveys, and therefore it cannot be known whether the sample is truly “representative” of different geographic regions of the United States. Similarly, counseling programs were selected from the Hollis and Dodson (2000) text, which provides information on accreditation and faculty working in counselor education programs, but because this text is published every four years it is not known how many counselor educators are actually working in a given program or department, or how many may have retired or transferred to another workplace. Recent accreditation of programs or changes in the composition of faculty of selected programs since the publication of that text may have resulted in “sampling” a different population than the one intended.

The length of the survey, its inquiry into potentially sensitive variables, and the lack of follow-up contact with respondents resulted in very low response rates of the original survey. In this exploratory effort, it was vital to obtain as much information as possible about perceptions and experiences in the work environment of counselor educators, including survey items that were sensitive in nature. Thus, the survey was very long and included questions about potentially sensitive information, including sexual orientation, salary, gender discrimination, and sexual harassment. Because inquiry into sensitive information tends to lower response rates (Braverman, 1996; Buckingham & Saunder, 2004), survey respondents were guaranteed anonymity, thereby also ensuring that they could not be contacted again. Regardless of the benefits of guaranteed anonymity, the decision to forego traditional methods of enhancing response rate for this study resulted in an extremely low response rate for the two mailings.

In particular, validity and reliability issues in descriptive research such as this study tend to further decrease generalizability of the results. As an initial foray into the worklives of
counselor educators, the exploratory nature of the research itself and the original instrument provided very limited reliability and validity (Buckingham & Saunders, 2004). Combining quantitative and qualitative information in the original study was both a strength and a weakness, in the sense that though gaining immense amounts of information is intended to lead to a richer understanding of the related issues, it also tends to result in a methodologically “weaker” study (Hackett, 1981). Qualitative questions, by their subjective nature, may reflect on endless variations of responses to a given stimulus question, but tend to improve validity of responses over the sample population (Buckingham & Saunders, 2004). Categorical survey questions tend to improve reliability of responses. The intent of this survey was for the quantitative and qualitative data to complement one another and to thereby produce a richer understanding of the variables related to worklife of counselor educators. Though this study produced a deeper understanding of counselor educators’ experiences in the work environment, there is a definite need for confirmation of the results by future research.

Question construction may have also limited the validity of the study. Some questions did not readily lend themselves to statistical analysis, either due to instrument error or respondent error. Some questions, such as impact items (e.g., “Do you feel that age has in any way impacted your experience as a faculty member?”) had an ill-defined scope, resulting in unclear statistical analysis. For example, both young and old faculty members might answer “yes,” some of them meaning that age had a negative impact and some meaning that age had a positive impact. Several questions asked for information concerning the experiences of others (e.g., “Do you know of other women in your department/program that have been the recipient of sexual harassment from fellow faculty or administrators?”), which typically do not yield useful information (Fowler, 1995). Questions of this type asked respondents to conjecture about the
nature of others’ experiences rather than asking for the respondents’ own perceptions and experiences. Additionally, the men’s survey was not identical to the women’s survey; though it contained every question presented in the women’s survey, it also asked additional questions regarding men’s perceptions of women’s experiences and activities.

Respondent bias is also a consideration in questionnaire research. A common limitation of self-report instruments is that they may measure what respondents report rather than what they are intended to measure. Several possibilities exist for the limitation of respondent bias, including the general tendency for some individuals to respond more readily to questionnaires than others, the tendency for individuals with a particular interest in the topic or with “negative” experiences to more readily fill out questionnaires because they have something to say, or a possible tendency for some counselor educators to respond to questionnaires because of a commitment to leadership and to supporting doctoral student research in the counseling field. In the case of response rates as low as those in this study, respondents must be considered self-selected, and therefore not necessarily representative of the total population of counselor educators.

Qualitative responses to questions are an important dimension of more fully understanding participant’s subjective experiences (Heppner & Heppner, 2004) but have limited generalizability. Qualitative research does not seek to be generalized in the strictest sense (Merriam, 1988), and may be considered primarily contextual in nature, because this study seeks to examine perceptions and experiences rather than facts. However, examination of emergent themes in qualitative responses may lead to the equivalent of a Type I or Type II error by the researcher in attempting to identify salient patterns of subjective responses (Patton, 1990). Additionally, for those respondents who did complete the survey but did not choose to respond to
qualitative items, as was the case with the majority of the men’s surveys, valuable information concerning perceived work experience may have been lost. Additional research will be needed to operationalize constructs related to the work environment as experienced by counselor educators. It may also be useful to examine how experiences of the work environment in counseling programs may change over time.

In particular, limitations of the original survey have strong implications for the outcome of this study. Problems related to the exploratory nature of the survey, validity and reliability of the instrument, response rate, and question construction limit the generalizability of results to the characteristics of the sample and to individuals with backgrounds similar to those who participated in the study. The information gained in this study is nonetheless valuable, and provides a good framework for developing future research. The existing data justifies the need for future in-depth study of the worklives of counselor educators.

Implications

Counselor Education and Training

The findings of this study have significant implications for the worklives of counselor educators. As a profession historically rooted in vocational psychology and devoted to a growth and development model of human potential over the lifespan, it is vitally necessary to consider the relevance of the work task for counselor education faculty. A better understanding of the implications of the work environment of counselor educators can lead to systemic change.

As noted by Johnsrud (2002), faculty have been traditionally reluctant to study themselves, but research into the worklives of counselor educators can potentially lead to appropriate self-regulation and improvement as a profession. Counselors are trained in the growth and developmental model of human development and the impact of gender and diversity
on development. This study suggests that women and men faculty in counselor education do experience the work environment differently. The data on gender discrimination and sexual harassment in this study also suggest that, in light of developing trends in counselor education, continued and concentrated attention should be given to the experiences of women faculty in the work environment. Likewise, counselors are trained to recognize the impact that diversity issues have on lifespan development. Though the overall results concerning ethnicity and sexual orientation did not reach statistical significance in this study, qualitative themes suggest that there is an ongoing need for a commitment to better understanding the experiences of ethnically and sexually diverse faculty.

The findings of this study also have implications for graduate students in counselor education. The primary mission of counselor education is the training of future counselors and counselor educators. As Hazler and Carney (1993) noted, counselor educators have an impact on graduate students, who are the future of the profession. The impact of gender, role strain, professional isolation, gender discrimination, and sexual harassment are likely to have a definite effect on the wellbeing and effectiveness of counselor educators. It seems likely that graduate students would be at least peripherally impacted by these factors because in a broad sense, they share the academic environment with counselor educators. An improved understanding of the worklives of counselor educators may also lead to improved understanding of graduate students’ experiences of their graduate school careers.

Recommendations for Future Research

Little research has been conducted about the worklives of counselor educators. Due to workforce trends in academia, and changes in counseling philosophy and professional identity, counselor education is a profession undergoing great change. This change implies that counselor
educators re-examine themselves and forces that affect their work for the purpose of developing positive change. Additionally, as the leaders of this profession counselor educators are uniquely poised to examine the needs of counselor education programs in general, to actively engage in the career stewardship of new faculty, and to further enhance the career development of graduate students. A deeper understanding of the work experiences of counselor educators provides a solid beginning for these broader mandates. This survey provided a forum for beginning to identify dimensions of work and personal life that may affect this experience.

The results of this study justify the need for a better understanding of various aspects of the worklives of counselor educators. Because experiences of work may be affected by a wide variety of factors (Johnsrud, 2002; Lindholm, 2003; Sackney et al., 2000) and may change as a result of time and experience (Olsen & Near, 1994; Sorcinelli, 1999), it is important to better understand how and why experiences of the work environment may shift for faculty in counselor education. A longitudinal study that assesses potential changes in the perceptions of counselor educators over their careers is recommended.

Additionally, as Johnsrud (2002) has noted, the perceptions of faculty members are closely related to their attitudes and behaviors in the work environment. Identifying perceptions and experiences of counselor educators should lead to positive systemic growth and change, for individuals and for faculties. Increased attention can also be given to improving specific variables in the worklives of counselor educators, such as salary equity, better defined tenure requirements and more formalized mentoring, and increased flexibility for faculty who are raising families during the tenure-seeking process.

Last, counselor education faculty do have an impact on the academic “worklife” of graduate students (Hazler & Carney, 1993; Granello et al., 2000). It may be that the work
experiences of counselor educators have an effect on the academic experiences of graduate students. If the central purpose of counselor education programs is to develop future counselors and counselor educators, it would be very useful to better understand how counselor educators’ attitudes and behaviors effect the attitudes and behaviors of their students.

Conclusion

This study was the first large-scale effort to develop an enhanced understanding of the dimensions of work and life impacting the experiences of counselor education faculty in their work. As Adler (1927/1957) noted, work is a significant life dimension contributing to an individual sense of personal worth and myriad social and economic benefits. For faculty in counselor education, work is a task that is holistically related to other dimensions of life. Because faculty frequently struggle to balance work and personal lives (Johnsrud, 2002; Olsen & Near, 1994), and spillover between work and personal responsibilities is pronounced for faculty members (Dey, 1994; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989), there is a strong likelihood that counselor educators face numerous challenges related to their experiences of work. Like most faculty in higher education, counselor educators face the rigors of the academic environment, including the stressors inherent in tenure and promotion. However, unlike other faculty, counselor educators are counselors first and also bear the responsibility of personal growth for themselves and their students (ACA, 1995; Myers, 1991; Witmer & Young, 1996). As a profession, counseling must be dedicated to the self-regulation and growth inherent in its etiology and purpose, for clients and students as well as for educators (Niles et al., 2001; Sowa & May, 1994).

The survey was intended to identify work and life factors that affect the work experiences of counselor education faculty. A literature review revealed that little research has been conducted regarding the work experiences of men and women faculty in counselor education,
though the profession has long acknowledged the importance of work in the lives of individuals (Dollarhide, 1997). As an initial effort, the original study served as the first known study to examine the breadth and complexity of work-related variables as experienced by counselor educators.

These research findings validate the necessity of further inquiry into the relationships between the variables under study. Implications for counselor education as a profession indicate a need for continuing to develop methods of understanding dimensions of worklife that affect faculty. Further research is needed to increase awareness and understanding of the rich interrelatedness of work and life variables identified by this study.
APPENDIX A

EXPLORATORY SURVEY OF COUNSELOR EDUCATORS

Reproduced with permission from Dr. Cynthia Chandler,
University of North Texas.
Survey of Women Faculty in Counseling Programs

If you are a woman faculty member in a counseling program, please complete the information requested and return the survey in the envelope provided or to the following address: Dr. Cynthia Chandler, P.O. Box 311337, University of North Texas, Denton, TX 76203-1337. Thank you for your assistance.

This is an anonymous survey. All of the information from this survey will be kept in strictest confidence by the researchers. Any publication or release of data cannot and will not relay identifying information of individual persons or institutions. This survey is designed to gather information regarding the positive and negative experiences of women faculty in their work and promotion process. The information can be very helpful to the profession.

Demographics
Faculty rank: Full Professor Associate Professor Assistant Professor Lecturer Adjunct Other 
(circle one) (list)

Number of years at current faculty rank: _____
Number of total years as a faculty member: _____

Number of years at current college/university as a faculty member: _____

Current work status: Full Time _____ or Part Time _____
Tenure status: Tenured _____ Not tenured and on tenure track _____ Not tenured and not on tenure track _____

Age in years: _____ Ethnicity you most identify with: _______________________________

Current relationship status: Single _____ or Married or In a committed relationship _____
Number of children you had/have living with you under the age of 17 while a faculty member: _____
Total number of children you have/had of any age: _____

Sexual orientation: Homosexual _____ Heterosexual _____ Bisexual _____

Estimated current gross income under a primary faculty contract: (excluding summer, etc.) ______________

List the number of months your primary contract covers: ______

Total number of faculty members in your department/program: _____ Number that are women: _____

Number of women faculty members in your counseling department/program that are:
Full Professor _____ Associate Professor____ Assistant Professor_____ Lecturer _____ Adjunct _____ Other_____

Number of men faculty members in your counseling department/program that are:
Full Professor _____ Associate Professor____ Assistant Professor_____ Lecturer _____ Adjunct _____ Other_____

Is your department/program CACREP accredited? Yes _____ No _____

Survey Questions
The following items address the positive and negative experiences you may have had as a woman faculty member. Feel free to elaborate or explain your responses further in the space provided or on additional pages.

1. Have you now or before held a position of primary administrative responsibility in your department/program, such as, department/program chair, director of a center or clinic, etc.? Yes _____ No _____ If yes, please
describe your position. Also, describe whether or not and how you feel this responsibility has assisted or hindered your work and promotion process as a faculty member.

2. Have you ever been the recipient of sexual harassment from fellow faculty or administrators? Yes____ No____
If yes, please describe.

3. Do you know of other women in your department/program that have been the recipient of sexual harassment from fellow faculty or administrators? Yes____ No____ If yes, please describe.

4. Do you feel there has been less sexual harassment of women faculty in your department/program in the past five years than before that? Yes____ No____
Does Not Apply _____ I don’t know _____

5. Do you feel that your salary is equal to that of the male faculty in your department/program with approximately the same job rank and experience? Yes____ No_____ I don’t know ____ If no, list the percentage you think you receive compared to your male peers (i.e., 70%, 75%, 80%, etc.) _______

6. Have you been the recipient of gender-based discrimination in your department/program?
   Yes ____ No ____ If yes, please describe.

7. Do you know of other women faculty in your department/program that have experienced gender-based discrimination? Yes ____ No ____ . If yes, please describe.

8. Do you feel there has been less gender-based discrimination of faculty women in your department/program in the past five years than before that? Yes____ No____
Does Not Apply _____ I don’t know _____

9. Do you feel that men faculty in your department/program extend more effort mentoring (advising/coaching) fellow male faculty than they do female faculty? Yes____ No ____
I don’t know ______

10. Do you feel that women faculty in your department/program extend more effort mentoring (advising/coaching) fellow female faculty than they do male faculty? Yes____ No ____ I don’t know ______

11. Have you received positive mentoring from any fellow faculty in your department/program to assist you in your work and/or promotion? Yes ____ No ____ . If yes, how many were: male faculty ___ female faculty ___.

Please feel free to elaborate on your opinion of the presence or absence of mentoring in your department/program and how this may have hindered or assisted you in your work and promotion process.
12. Do you feel that men faculty in your department/program extend more effort collaborating in research activity with fellow male faculty than they do female faculty? Yes _____ No _____ I don’t know _____

13. Do you feel that women faculty in your department/program extend more effort collaborating in research activity with fellow female faculty than they do male faculty? Yes _____ No _____ I don’t know _____

14. Have you collaborated with fellow faculty in your department/program in publishing national refereed journal articles, books or book chapters? Yes ____ No ____
If yes, how many did you publish with fellow faculty in your department/program that were co-authored with only female faculty _____ only male faculty _____ with both male and female faculty _____.

15. Do you feel that your ethnicity has in any way impacted your experience as a faculty member?
Yes ____ No ____ If yes, please elaborate.

16. Do you feel that your relationship status (single, married, divorced, in a committed relationship, etc.) has in any way impacted your experience as a faculty member?
Yes ____ No ____ If yes, please elaborate.

17. Do you feel that your sexual orientation has in any way impacted your experience as a faculty member?
Yes ____ No ____ If yes, please elaborate.

18. Do you feel that the presence of children in your home while a faculty member has in any way impacted your experience as a faculty member?
Yes ____ No ____ Does not apply _____. If yes, please elaborate.

19. Do you feel that your age has in any way impacted your experience as a faculty member?
Yes ____ No ____ If yes, please elaborate.

20. Does your department/program offer a course to students primarily about women’s issues? Yes ____ No ____
If no, do you feel that they should offer a course like this? Yes ____ No ____ I don’t know ____

21. Do you have a primary area(s) of teaching interest? Yes ____ No ____ If yes, please describe.

22. Do you have a primary area(s) of research interest? Yes ____ No ____ If yes, please describe.
23. Do you feel that women faculty in your department/program are asked to dedicate more time than men faculty to teach classes thereby taking time away from research activity? Yes _____ No _____ I don’t know _____

24. Have you created any new major programs, centers, or clinics? Yes _____ No _____ If yes, please describe.

25. Do you feel that women faculty have fair and just representation in major decision-making as compared to the men faculty in your department/program? Yes ____ No ____ I don’t know ____ If no, please elaborate.

26. Do you feel that women faculty in your department/program are asked to dedicate more time than men faculty to perform service based activities thereby taking time away from research activity? Yes ____ No ____ I don’t know____. If yes, please elaborate.

27. Please describe those experiences, events, and accomplishments that have assisted you the most in your work and promotion process as a faculty member.

28. Please describe those experiences and events that have hindered you the most in your work and promotion process as a faculty member.

29. What advice would you offer a new woman faculty to promote her success as a faculty member?

30. Would the advice described in item 29 above be in any way different if you were advising a new man faculty? Yes _____ No _____ I don’t know _____. If yes, please elaborate.
Survey of Men Faculty in Counseling Programs

If you are a male faculty member in a counseling program, please complete the information requested and return the survey in the envelope provided or to the following address: Dr. Cynthia Chandler, P.O. Box 311337, University of North Texas, Denton, TX 76203-1337. Thank you for your assistance.

This is an anonymous survey. All of the information from this survey will be kept in strictest confidence by the researchers. Any publication or release of data cannot and will not relay identifying information of individual persons or institutions. This survey is designed to gather information regarding the positive and negative experiences of men faculty in their work and promotion process. The information can be very helpful to the profession.

Demographics
Faculty rank: Full Professor Associate Professor Assistant Professor Lecturer Adjunct Other (circle one) (list)
Number of years at current faculty rank: _____
Number of total years as a faculty member: _____
Number of years at current college/university as a faculty member: _____
Current work status: Full Time _____ or Part Time _____
Tenure status: Tenured _____ Not tenured and on tenure track _____ Not tenured and not on tenure track _____
Age in years: _____ Ethnicity you most identify with: _______________________________
Current relationship status: Single _____ or Married or In a committed relationship _____
Number of children you had/have living with you under the age of 17 while a faculty member: _____
Total number of children you have/had of any age: _____
Sexual orientation: Homosexual _____ Heterosexual _____ Bisexual _____
Estimated current gross income under a primary faculty contract: (excluding summer, etc.) ____________________
List the number of months your primary contract covers: _____
Total number of faculty members in your department/program: _____ Number that are men: _____
Number of men faculty members in your counseling department/program that are:
Full Professor ____ Associate Professor ____ Assistant Professor ____ Lecturer ____ Adjunct ____ Other ____
Number of women faculty members in your counseling department/program that are:
Full Professor ____ Associate Professor ____ Assistant Professor ____ Lecturer ____ Adjunct ____ Other ____
Is your department/program CACREP accredited? Yes _____ No _____

Survey Questions
The following items address the positive and negative experiences you may have had as a faculty member. Feel free to elaborate or explain your responses further in the space provided or on additional pages.

1. Have you now or before held a position of primary administrative responsibility in your department/program, such as, department/program chair, director of a center or clinic, etc.? Yes _____ No _____
If yes, please describe your position. Also, describe whether or not and how you feel this responsibility has assisted or hindered your work and promotion process as a faculty member.

2. a) Have you ever been the recipient of sexual harassment from fellow faculty or administrators?  
   Yes ___ No ___ I don’t know ____ If yes, please describe.

   b) Do you know of any other male faculty in your department/program that have been the recipient of sexual harassment from fellow faculty or administrators? Yes ___ No ___ I don’t know ____ If yes, please describe.

3. Do you know of any women in your department/program that have been the recipient of sexual harassment from fellow faculty or administrators? Yes ___ No ___ I don’t know ____ If yes, please describe.

4. Do you feel there has been less sexual harassment of women faculty in your department/program in the past five years than before that? Yes ___ No ___ 
   Does Not Apply ____ I don’t know ____
5. Do you feel that your salary is equal to that of the female faculty in your department/program with approximately the same job rank and experience? Yes ___ No ___ I don’t know ____ If no, list the percentage you think you receive compared to your female peers (i.e., 120%, 80% etc.)

6. a) Have you been the recipient of gender-based discrimination in your department/program? 
   Yes ___ No ___ I don’t know ____ If yes, please describe.

   b) Do you know of any other male faculty in your department/program that have been the recipient of gender-based discrimination in your department/program? Yes ___ No ___ 
   I don’t know ____ If yes, please describe.

7. Do you know of women faculty in your department/program that have experienced gender-based discrimination? 
   Yes ___ No ___ I don’t know ____ If yes, please describe.

8. Do you feel there has been less gender-based discrimination of faculty women in your department/program in the past five years than before that? Yes ___ No ___ 
   Does Not Apply ____ I don’t know ____

9. Do you feel that men faculty in your department/program extend more effort mentoring (advising/coaching) fellow male faculty than they do female faculty? Yes ___ No ___ 
   I don’t know ____

10. Do you feel that women faculty in your department/program extend more effort mentoring (advising/coaching) fellow female faculty than they do male faculty? Yes ___ No ___ I don’t know ____

11. Have you received positive mentoring from any fellow faculty in your department/program to assist you in your work and/or promotion? Yes ___ No ___ If yes, how many were: male faculty ___ female faculty ___. 
   Please feel free to elaborate on your opinion of the presence or absence of mentoring in your department/program and how this may have hindered or assisted you in your work and promotion process.
12. Do you feel that men faculty in your department/program extend more effort collaborating in research activity with fellow male faculty than they do female faculty? Yes _____ No _____ I don’t know _____

13. Do you feel that women faculty in your department/program extend more effort collaborating in research activity with fellow female faculty than they do male faculty? Yes _____ No _____ I don’t know _____

14. Have you collaborated with fellow faculty in your department/program in publishing national refereed journal articles, books or book chapters? Yes ____ No ____

If yes, how many did you publish with fellow faculty in your department/program that were co-authored with only female faculty ______ only male faculty ______ with both male and female faculty ______.

15. Do you feel that your ethnicity has in any way impacted your experience as a faculty member? Yes ____ No ____ If yes, please elaborate.

16. Do you feel that your relationship status (single, married, divorced, in a committed relationship, etc.) has in any way impacted your experience as a faculty member? Yes ____ No ____ If yes, please elaborate.

17. Do you feel that your sexual orientation has in any way impacted your experience as a faculty member? Yes ____ No ____ If yes, please elaborate.

18. Do you feel that the presence of children in your home while a faculty member has in any way impacted your experience as a faculty member? Yes ____ No ____ Does not apply _____. If yes, please elaborate.

19. Do you feel that your age has in any way impacted your experience as a faculty member? Yes ____ No ____ If yes, please elaborate.

20. Does your department/program offer a course to students primarily about men’s issues? Yes ____ No ____

If no, do you feel that they should offer a course like this? Yes ____ No ____

I don’t know _____

21. Do you have a primary area(s) of teaching interest? Yes ____ No ____ If yes, please describe.

22. Do you have a primary area(s) of research interest? Yes ____ No ____ If yes, please describe.
23. a) Do you feel that men faculty in your department/program are asked to dedicate more time than women faculty to teach classes thereby taking time away from research activity?  
   Yes ____  No ____  I don’t know _____  If yes, please elaborate.

   b) Do you feel that women faculty in your department/program are asked to dedicate more time than men faculty to teach classes thereby taking time away from research activity?  
   Yes ____  No ____  I don’t know _____  If yes, please elaborate.

24. Have you created any new major programs, centers, or clinics? Yes _____  No _____  If yes, please describe.

25. a) Do you feel that men faculty have equal, fair and just representation in major decision-making in your department/program? Yes ____  No ____  I don’t know _____ If no, please elaborate.

   b) Do you feel that women faculty have equal, fair and just representation in major decision-making in your department/program? Yes ____  No ____  I don’t know _____ If no, please elaborate.

26. a) Do you feel that men faculty in your department/program are asked to dedicate more time than women faculty to perform service based activities thereby taking time away from research activity?  
   Yes ____  No ____  I don’t know _____. If yes, please elaborate.

   b) Do you feel that women faculty in your department/program are asked to dedicate more time than men faculty to perform service based activities thereby taking time away from research activity?  
   Yes ____  No ____  I don’t know _____. If yes, please elaborate.

27. Please describe those experiences, events, and accomplishments that have assisted you the most in your work and promotion process as a faculty member.

28. Please describe those experiences and events that have hindered you the most in your work and promotion process as a faculty member.
29. What advice would you offer a new male faculty to promote his success as a faculty member?

30. Would the advice described in item 29 above be in any way different if you were advising a new woman faculty?  
   Yes _____ No _____ I don’t know _____. If yes, please elaborate.
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE QUALITATIVE RESPONSES
Sample Qualitative Responses

The samples included in this table are not intended to diminish the value of any excluded subjective response. Samples were chosen on the basis of subjective evaluation and coding of common qualitative responses considered representative of work and life variables. All sample responses are exact quotes or very close paraphrases of respondents.

Women Survey Respondents

**Sexual harassment:**
Received lewd comments- e.g. ‘You’re in a good mood today. You must have gotten laid last night.’
Male faculty member trying to look down my top & also making me the object of sexual jokes!
Inappropriate touch.
Inappropriate sexual comments. Received unwanted sexual comments related to my dress and body.
Cornered in hotel room by fellow faculty member- he wanted a sexual relationship.
In a previous university I received unwanted sexual advances from another female faculty member who was the chair of the department.
I was propositioned several times by one male faculty who retired.
Chair of Department told me ‘the only way you’ll get promotion and tenure is if you sleep with me.’ (said as a joke!).
Woman experienced it as rape, never told others (except me).
Inappropriate gestures from a male faculty member, now retired.

**Gender discrimination:**
When I speak up in college meetings (not so much in my department) I am dismissed and ignored much more than my male colleagues. If I push to be heard, I am labeled as a bitch and a troublemaker.
Discrimination in distribution of work tasks & teaching loads.
My program chair has yelled and screamed at me because I have objected to a decision made. He told me that I was unpredictable in my decisions and that first-year and 2nd-year professors should trust the process and keep their opinions to themselves.
In initial salary negotiations- male hirees have been successful in obtaining higher pay for same rank- the males had less education and less experience.
Favors, benefits given to men in department.
It happens all the time- especially now that I am the only woman in the dept who is in child bearing years.
I was refused optional family leave when I had my baby. Resulted in great personal stress and poor student evaluations.
I’ve been chastised for leaving in afternoon to pick up my son at school. When a male faculty member was hired, no one blinked an eye at him doing the same.
I was told by a single, male, tenured faculty to put my job before my kids (I’m a single mother).
My opinions and assertiveness are considered noncooperative- rather than real concerns to be considered- male faculty can disagree without retribution.
Comments in faculty meetings disrespecting females. Putting down ideas of females, then a male proposes the same idea & it is wonderfully accepted by males.
When the coordinator of the program was hired approximately 10 years ago, the dept was 100% male faculty. One faculty member directly stated there was no place for a woman in ‘their’ program.
I would describe the experiences as difficult to classify. Many women have felt devalued & struggled to reach tenure.

**Poor mentoring:**
The ‘mentoring’ offered was very paternal. I was told who & what I would be, what I would teach- as a full professor.
I’ve learned to make it on my own.
No real mentoring present in department.
With the males & females the mentoring seems to be that which can benefit them. There has been no offering of joint projects, writing, etc. There has been offering of those things which they do not want to do.
Mentoring is inadequate, poorly structured and mostly ineffective.
Senior faculty here seem too ‘tired’ to mentor.
Received no mentoring- was on my own.
Mentoring was available from certain faculty yet was not consistent or assigned…a sort of hit and miss experience, which I feel has greatly hindered my feelings about remaining in this field.
Men mentor men…Women sink or swim.
They said they don’t do that.

**Impact of ethnicity:**
I’m ‘comfortably White’ in a ‘comfortable White’ institution.
Everything is easier if one is White.
I have the privilege of white skin so I most likely have received some unearned privilege because of it.
White privilege is a factor anywhere.
Minority faculty receive higher salaries.
I was perceived as passive & submissive and that I would not stand up for my opinion.
I think it was part of the reason I was hired.
I’m now the multicultural “Expert”- on all fronts. I’m the one who takes on all diversity projects & ethnic minority students.
Jokes during departmental meetings- students laughing, etc.
At times, I can feel isolated/different.
Increased demand from students of color for advising…more challenges of my authority & competence in the classroom.

**Impact of family and career:**
In this small community couples socialize with couples, so it’s sometimes hard to be ‘in the loop’.
Being married is understood better.
I feel that as a single person I’m expected to be around & accessible more than my partnered
I may, at times, be viewed as having greater flexibility re: schedules, etc. (This is not an accurate perception).

My experience as a faculty member has definitely impacted my comfort with having children- I am so overloaded and constantly scrutinized, I don’t feel I have enough left to do justice to having a child, sadly.

Sometimes other faculty believe you should be available for every kind of duty. Because you are single, they think you don’t have any other responsibility.

I am an ‘unknown’ quantity.

I’m a bisexual in a relationship with a woman. In spite of acceptance, often sense tension when I discuss my relationship.

Sexual bias toward non-heterosexuals has influenced me to keep my orientation closeted.

Dual partner career concerns…having to attend to both relationship and work sets some limits on time dedicated to career.

When I was hired in 1995 there was a definite preference with regards to salary for married men. As a single-childless-female I earned $5000 less than a male hired in the same department at same rank.

All my professional decisions are based on how they affect my family unit, not just me. Less energy for my job.

It is very difficult to be a working mother and a faculty member with tenure requirements.

Having children definitely interferes with certain aspects of professional productivity! I love being a parent (most of the time) and believe that my career hurts my parenting time more than my parenting hurts my career.

Allowance was made by the college & dept when time taken for birth of children.

I have competing demands of motherhood & career. I don’t want to give up either. So I generally feel that I am neglecting one or the other. People without children really can’t relate.

Balancing work & childcare challenging. Less time spent at university as a result.

Men don’t have the responsibilities of children. They let their wives handle it.

I mentioned wanting to have a 2nd child and received negative feedback from a tenured colleague.

Women are struggling just to make it and preserve their families.

I experience constant role conflict as a mother and a faculty member trying to get tenure.

I find the faculty role very unfriendly to the parenting role- because it requires a great deal of time away from home.

Advantages and drawbacks of age:

It has been an advantage- I came to the position with 10 years of experience as a licensed psychologist. I have a lot of credibility with students. The downside has been that I don’t have as much energy as I did 10-20 years ago.

Being older has been an asset.

I’m more tired/stressed.

Due to the struggle of work/home balancing, I’m not doing much research. Also I’m in menopause. Thus I’m viewed as someone “who should retire”.

Heightened respect for my life experience; opinions sought and valued.

Credibility…respect of students & colleagues.

When I was younger (25- early 30’s) my voice was often not heard or ignored. It’s almost as if
my ideas weren’t considered worth listening to until I was a little older. However, I don’t think my ideas or opinions have changed significantly in the past 10 years. It is easier to be treated seriously as I have gotten older. Sometimes I feel like others look down on me & devalue my opinion due to my age. I am young and have a young appearance- both I believe influence perceptions of me. Lack of credibility due to young age. Students are less respectful to younger faculty (especially younger female faculty). They come late, argue more about grades, etc.

**Overloads in teaching and service commitments:**
We all are expected to work 24 hours a day. I have taught 23 different courses (a total of 62 actual classes taught) in 8 ½ yrs! I am more often assigned more labor intensive skills classes than men- not respected for contributions to specific classes. A female faculty was driving off-campus (1 ½ hours away) 3 times a week & 4 days in summer school. Everyone is on service overload. ‘Older’ men have less trouble saying ‘no’. Faculty of color, male or female, have greatest pressure in service area. All the women are assigned to teach practicum & internship which requires many hours of supervision each week. Some women faculty more inclined to get it done. Men just refuse to do the work or are assigned & never show up to the meetings. I think for some reason non-involvement by men faculty will be glossed over or not seen as so serious. I am always on more service committees than my male faculty colleagues. I don’t know that they’re ‘asked’ but the women faculty certainly assume more service activities. There’s definite gender-related roles- men do more research, women do more service & are more involved with specific student concerns. Whether or not women are asked to do more, they do. Women are not asked to but often volunteer more than the males. Older men are no longer willing to serve.

**Experiences that assisted the tenure and promotion process:**
My own research & publications. Publications so far are the key. In my present position mentoring by women has been helpful & supportive. Being involved in professional organizations…collaborating. Collaboration with colleagues outside of my department…Advice & support from other faculty. Extensive professional association work resulting in networking, etc. Supportive male & female faculty members. I made friends with 2 other women from my doctoral program who were going into academic positions as well. We sort of developed a pact to help each other out as we went along. We share information about our dept’s policies & procedures, about tenure/promotion process, about research/funding opportunities, & about opportunities for collaboration. This has been, by far, the most helpful influence on my career. I would definitely not still be in academia if it weren’t
for this ‘alliance’.
Mentoring outside of dept….collegial relationships (mostly outside of current dept.)…chair here
is very helpful, but very busy.

Experiences that hindered the tenure and promotion process:
Lack of support from male administrators- have more than once been promised support that did
not materialize & sometimes the exact opposite occurred.
Jealous male faculty- competitive male faculty irritation & irrational male faculty & a lot of
dumping service on me.
Working with men who expect me, as a woman, to do all of the work & then hand over the
product so that they can take credit.
My asking questions that others feel should not be asked.
Lack of teamwork within the department.
The isolation within my department has hindered me the most.
Lack of collegiality/cooperation… isolation.
Alienation from the ‘boys group’ and therefore from decision making.
Having to deal with sexist & racist behavior from male colleagues.
When I first got here, I felt that I was given grunt work and held to expectations for service that
was NOT the case with a male peer hired at the same time.
Time- my priority is my children.
Being a mother.
Demands on my time at home were a challenge. However, I would never change my situation. I
have 2 wonderful grown children.
Having a baby with no maternity leave policy- university or department- tenure clock does not
stop!
Lack of mentoring in research was my biggest problem.
I am finding that few people discuss ‘how to do’ this work- how to be successful in this role
given all its demands.

Advice for new women faculty:
Keep your life balanced.
Seek out and take advantage of mentoring experiences.
Find a support network.
Insist on support & mentoring. Don’t be afraid to ask for what you need. If you can’t get it- get
out!
Find mentors outside your home department.
Find people to mentor you- ask for lots of help.
Carefully guard your research time.
Collaborate in writing and research.
Learn to play the political game; do not buck the system.
Learn the political game and play it even if you don’t like or want to.
Avoid politics as much as possible.
Don’t bring up family needs (children, elder care) if you can help it.
Don’t have a child during tenure process- too risky to promotion to have to advocate for what
you need. First year of having child is too stressful to be able to do adequate work.
I might advise a new woman faculty not to seek position if she has young children.
Start family after tenure. 
Do no service- Teach to a minimum- Ignore your personal life- Devote yourself to research!!
Don’t do any service- focus solely on research and don’t care how well you teach- nothing matters but research.

Forget your gender and others will also.
How can you advise someone to ‘set their priorities and boundaries clearly’ when their actions in this direction would make my workload even bigger?

Don’t do for anyone else what they are not willing to do. They don’t want to do it for a reason.
Do what you enjoy. This is a wonderful career; enjoy it.
Sexual harassment:
I had female full professor create double standard re: appropriate touch, & informal nature of personal office. Used words like ‘seductive” without evidence or clarity. Inappropriate sexual jokes about students. Homosexual male instructor advancement to doctoral student (male). Junior male faculty member has been pressured into sexual relationship with senior female faculty member in program. Senior male faculty member tried to entice a junior female faculty member to swim without clothing. Male faculty member made unwelcome, offensive comments about a female colleague and women who forecast the weather on television. Proposition by a female colleague. Thereafter, I would not meet with her without my administrative assistant present. Innuendos, inappropriate jokes, “friendly” kisses. Lewd, unwelcome jokes. One male full has physically intimidated several female grad students. Another made inappropriate comments to a few female grad students.

Gender discrimination:
A female faculty remarked “I wish I had a wife so I could be free to write like you” about my publishing. Radical feminist told me I could never be right because I am a male. On some occasions, I have noticed that disagreements turn into the “he’s sexist” commentary. Is that playing the “gender card”? Received “bias against men” treatment from a female professor. By being a white male I have been categorized and on occasion judged unfairly- as one who would purposely exploit white male privileges. Female faculty have at times created an atmosphere that values feminism & blames males for society’s problems. Also, they feel free to touch male colleagues but question males’ motives for touch. Assumed guilty of inappropriate conduct with female student before facts were considered- later fully exonerated. Recent attempts to increase the number of female administrators at my university has reduced opportunities for advancement of outstanding male faculty members. Women- only- were given a raise several years ago. I feel females receive preferential treatment in the hiring process. Females receive higher salaries. A lawsuit was filed and settled for a number of women who were paid less than male counterparts.

Poor mentoring:
I have a female mentor- she is program chair and is very busy. Mentoring program: Sink or swim.
I feel that I am expected to publish more than I am prepared for and that mentoring is not adequate to overcome the pressure.
The senior faculty are self-absorbed & offer very little assistance in terms of providing administrative information.
There is very little mentoring by senior faculty of junior faculty. This is a source of dissatisfaction among the junior faculty but nothing has been done. Junior faculty are trying to assist each other but this is not easy without mentoring by more experienced faculty members.
Mentoring is totally absent. The opposite culture exists— you are oppressed, harassed, or subjected to a hostile work environment. If you survive, you may be tenured.

**Impact of ethnicity:**
White males are not as desirable.
I am a white male—bottom of the list. I have more experience but am paid less than the female Asian-American assistant professor.
My lack of apparent ethnicity has cost me positions I have applied for when minority hiring was needed.
It’s a bad position to be in as white male we are clearly the emerging underclass in academia. New white faculty are less able to negotiate starting salaries as high as new minority faculty. Provided privileges I may not have had if I was not White.
Growing prejudice against white males; not overt but covert.
Being stereotyped by students.
My ethnicity is ignored— or considered too aggressive.

**Impact of family and career:**
My family (wife and children) is a priority. As a result, I have made decisions at times that have impacted my experience and production.
I am less involved in campus life, over all, to balance children/family needs.
Being married with kids may have provided some consideration in terms of scheduling, etc.
As a husband and recent father I feel that I have more pressure to balance family with research requirements.
I am blessed with a very supportive partner and still experience role strain (educator, husband, father).
Having children has made getting my work done challenging, but the challenge is worth the reward.
I’ve enjoyed my life more, therefore work goes more smoothly.
I feel blessed. I have a beautiful infant daughter that reminds me daily that life extends beyond academia.
More comfortable & exciting to see them grow and learn together with me.
They are a source of joy mainly, which helps buffer against bad days at work.
If there is white privilege, I suspect there is also straight privilege and married privilege!
Being single allowed me more time for scholarly work.
Stereotyped as a gay male, e.g., that I do not share “family values”. Particularly discriminated against in national organizations & specific counseling area.
As an openly gay man, the social interpersonal relationship differs, for example heterosexual married faculty invited chair & wife to home for dinner & other married
Advantages and drawbacks of age:
Old is better… at least most of the time.  
I have more experience, wisdom and grandfather type respect.  
My age probably has given me more automatic respect (an oldie & a goodie).  
Only that as we mature, we typically get more respect, and as we being the decline, we typically turn the reigns over to younger.  
The older I get, the less stress I feel at work.  
Older faculty are salary compressed & written off despite excellent research publication & teaching.  
I’m being forced to retire just because of age.  
When I was first hired, my qualifications were questioned b/c of my age (by students mostly).  
I’m very young & get the sense that I need to prove myself to get respect.  
I am 35 and there is still a older is better sentiment.  
Being young, it seems that I have to work sometimes twice as hard to gain recognition.

Experiences that assisted the tenure and promotion process:
Mentoring relationship with other faculty.  
My association with colleagues.  
Talking to and having outside mentors.  
Strong mentoring from both male and female faculty toward writing, research, and service.  
Publications!  
Publication; service to national professional organizations.  
Productive publication record.  
My association with colleagues.  
Giving myself adequate time for teaching prep is the core element toward promotion, carving out research/scholarship time is second. All other activities are of minimal importance.  
Time to research.  
Setting aside a dedicated writing day at home.

Experiences that hindered the tenure and promotion process:
Political B.S.  
It took me a long time to learn that universities do not reward people who are politically naïve.  
Departmental conflict.  
Administrative prejudice.  
Deans; politics; nonsense meetings.  
Sitting on useless committees and producing reports of data the administration already has in five different formats.  
Excessive service demands.  
Getting bogged down by “administrivia” prevents research time.  
Too much administrative responsibility!  
Doing too much administrative work. Conducting too few research studies.  
An oppressive administrative environment where faculty are not treated fairly.
Advice for new faculty:
Hit the ground running. “No amount of good teaching can save bad or no research”
Work hard, publish!!!
Embrace the competitive nature of the place- work very hard and stay focused!
Outpublish the rest of your department and stay open to new opportunities.
Learn about the work of others so you can compare; focus on your research.
Play the game.
Write and ignore requests to provide school or university service (i.e. committees).
Focus time management on research activities- let teaching and service take a “back seat”.
Publish, publish, publish- the rest doesn’t matter except to you!
Don’t make the mistake of believing that any activity is more important than research.
Don’t expect that life in Higher Ed will be fair!
Don’t act like a man. Be or pretend to be a feminist.
Collaborate with others; balance work & family; balance work & self.
Keep a balanced life.
Teach well. Like students. Think for yourself. Don’t care what other people do. Don’t worry about money. Please- really please- yourself.
Be of service to your students and attend to the rights & feelings of your colleagues.
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