CHAPTER 1

Introduction

One of the benefits of being a dad who is involved is you get much more credit than the mom does. Like, "Oh, what a great dad—like you're doing x, y, z," and that's great because you can sit by yourself and say, "Look at me! I'm an all like liberated man or whatever!" But the downside to that, it's like this expectation is somehow that it's unusual or that I'm doing something more than I might be doing. I don't—I look at me doing what I ought to be doing. . . .

Someone's like, "Oh, well you're doing such a good job with him!" Well frick of course I am lady! I spend all the time with him! . . . I get angry where there's this expectation that I'm getting a bonus or anything or extra credit brownie points. . . . I just find it annoying, patronizing, and condescending to have this sense for me as like I'm babysitting my kid on the weekend or "Oh, Daddy's day out with your son." No it's not, "Daddy's day with my son." I'm parenting right now.

—Assistant Professor, Midwestern University

I think it would have been a problem if I had said, you know, I'm going to take six weeks off to spend with my wife and my newborn. I think there would have been some people going, "Why do you need to take time off? You know, you're the man." . . . So it's definitely different. There's almost like . . . a gender bias against males taking time off to be with their newborn. Whereas, you know, if a woman did that, they'd be like "Oh yeah, of course, you know that's what's expected."

—Assistant Professor, Southern University

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

These excerpts from interviews with faculty fathers at two of the four research universities highlighted in this book point to the tensions inherent for men negotiating the demands of work and family. As the Midwestern University assistant professor pointed out, men are praised for being involved parents. A father parenting his child is regarded by many as exceeding what is generally expected of fathers. In contrast, a woman is generally expected to engage in the same behaviors as a natural part of mothering. Yet, as the Southern University assistant professor suggested, while men might be praised for being involved fathers, they are simultaneously regarded with suspicion, as if they are violating assigned roles in the workplace. This father discussed his decision not to take an extended leave of absence following the birth of his child; doing so would challenge gender norms that prescribe work for men and caregiving for women.

It is this tension that this book explores. Men are praised when they are involved parents, yet simultaneously penalized if they prioritize family over work. Traditional gender norms remain entrenched in the structure and culture of many organizations, including research universities, which are the focus of this book. And, to a certain extent, men cannot challenge these norms without risking being penalized in the workplace and by others in society.

Work/life balance is nearly always framed as a woman's issue. As I will discuss, ample evidence suggests that women experience both personal and professional consequences for becoming mothers. The stakes are compounded for female academics because faculty work places heavy expectations on those forging careers in the academy. However, simply because women experience pressure does not mean that men do not. And yet, despite the significant attention given to the challenges that women face in the academy (Armenti, 2004; Comer & Stites-Doe, 2006; Fothergill & Feltey, 2003; Liston, Griffin, & Hecker, 1997; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004, 2012; Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006a, 2006b; Wolf-Wendel, Ward, & Twombly, 2007), few studies have focused explicitly on the challenges that male academics face. This book aims to fill that gap.

Focusing on the experiences of faculty fathers is important for three reasons. First, although women may face several burdens navigating family and career, continuing to focus solely on mothers perpetuates the notion that parenting is only a woman's concern. However, it should not be—and is not—just women who worry about how to be successful employees and successful parents; men have these same concerns. One study of faculty at a research university in the South found no differences in the degree to which men and women reported feeling conflict between their work and home responsibilities (Commission for Women, 2010). Put another way, men and women reported equal senses of conflict over work and family.

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

Findings from a study of faculty at another research university echo these results; women and men were equally likely to report experiencing work/life conflict (Elliott, 2003). Of particular interest in this study, whereas both groups were equally likely to report work/life conflict, women were more likely to report that that their sense of conflict was affected by their familial responsibilities while men reported that work/life conflict stemmed from criticism at work. While both groups might feel equally conflicted, men's stress resulted from factors in the workplace. This conflict may not come as a surprise, given that men have typically derived their identities from their occupations, a topic to which I return shortly.

In addition, evidence suggests that men are spending more time with their children than ever before. Using data from four time-diary studies between 1965 and 1998, Sayer, Bianchi, and Robinson (2004) found that the proportion of fathers engaging in care had increased along with the amount of time spent with their children. In 1985, only one third of married fathers engaged in some form of child care; by 1998, more than one half of fathers reported engaging in child care. In 1985, fathers spent an average of 26 minutes a day with their children, but by 1998 that number had climbed to just under 1 hour a day. A subsequent study found that in 2012, the average father spent nearly 1 hour and 45 minutes per day engaged with his children (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013). Together, these studies suggest that fathers' time spent with their children is increasing and that they feel conflicted about meeting their responsibilities in the workplace and in the home.

Second, a study of faculty fathers is also needed to understand the ways in which gender norms dictate acceptable behaviors that individuals might adopt. Gender norms trap both men and women into fixed roles. Would men spend more time with their children if gender norms embraced active fathering as a part of masculinity? For decades, women have received a great deal of attention for being forced to make choices between their careers and child rearing. Inside the academy, there has also been attention to the fields that women might pursue. Women are still grossly underrepresented in many sciences and in engineering. These barriers are real and persistent. However, the same concerns arise about the ways that gender norms dictate acceptable male behavior. Men are encouraged to stay out of the home and avoid caregiving professions, such as nursing and elementary school teaching. Just as women need to feel free to explore traditionally masculine roles and fields, men need not be penalized for seeking more involvement with their children's lives. This study aims to explore how gender norms in the academy influence faculty fathers' personal and professional behaviors.

Finally, fathers in academia need to be studied to better elucidate the role that organizations play in their personal and professional lives.

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

As I suggested earlier, gender norms have dictated the types of acceptable behaviors for men and women to adopt, including norms around child rearing. While these norms have influenced behaviors in the home, they have also influenced the attitudes of organizations around work and family. Historically, organizations were more likely to provide accommodations to new mothers than to new fathers because women were expected to be the primary caregivers. Although workplaces are becoming more accommodating to fathers and beginning to recognize work/life demands placed upon them, men are less likely than their female colleagues to use the policies. In a study of companies in Sweden—arguably one of the most gender-equitable countries in the world because it provides state-funded leave dedicated to fathers' use—Haas and Hwang (1995) found that only 30% of employers reported that men taking leave following the birth of a child would lead to few to no problems. If 70% of men might experience penalties for taking leave in a country where leave for fathers is state-supported, imagine the consequences to men who take leave in a country such as the United States, which offers no paid federal leave for either parent.

Universities have a unique opportunity to be catalysts in changing these dated and constraining gender norms. In the United States, universities have frequently been pioneers in adopting values more progressive than those of the country as a whole. For example, although African American men and all women were not given the right to vote until 1869 and 1920, respectively, both groups attended colleges and universities far earlier, from the founding of the earliest historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) and women's colleges in the 1830s. In that same decade, Oberlin College became the first institution to admit African Americans and White women. Although the U.S. government failed to provide rights to these populations, colleges and universities provided opportunities to marginalized groups, thereby playing a part in challenging and shaping society's values.

As the civil rights protests of the 1960s illustrate, higher education institutions continued to serve as sites of revolution and change throughout the 20th century. In the 21st century, the trend continues. Although same-sex marriages do not yet have complete recognition under federal and state law, many colleges and universities have found ways to provide partner benefits to employees in same-sex relationships, demonstrating their commitment to creating an equitable environment. The increasing emphasis on work/life issues and family-friendly campuses once again provides opportunities for higher education institutions to focus on equity and promote societal change. Many campuses have established themselves at the forefront of the movement by providing an array of policies for faculty and staff that far exceeds what is available at the federal level. Whether these actions

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

are motivated by a concern for challenging societal norms about balancing work and family or are simply a recruitment and retention tool to compete with their peer institutions, the result is that some institutions are more pro-family than U.S. society as a whole.

Colleges and universities need not stop with simply providing family-friendly policies. They can go further in making inroads for women and men struggling to be committed professionals and involved parents. As I discuss throughout this book, the current culture of many higher education institutions remains thoroughly gendered. This manifests itself in several ways—from the composition of majors and departments to the allocation of funds to men's athletics. Institutions are also gendered in the type of attention often provided to work/family issues. Although policies exist for men and women to use, men are not expected to avail themselves of institutional resources. In short, different cultural expectations exist for mothers and fathers in the workplace and in the home. Universities are in a position to challenge these entrenched norms by creating a culture that encourages men and women to be active employees and active parents. Implementing policies and programs coupled with changing employee attitudes and expectations can help create a culture in which traditional gender roles are challenged, building opportunities for women in the workplace and men in the home. Although navigating work/life concerns is increasingly becoming an issue for men, prioritizing familial responsibilities remains fraught with professional complications. These challenges might be due in part to the conflict between the norm of the ideal worker and the ideal father along with notions of the gendered university, concepts to which I return shortly.

In the remainder of this chapter, I consider the expectations of faculty careers and why they create unique demands on those balancing work and family. I then review the theoretical constructs that I use to understand how the gendered culture of the academy operates to keep men in the workplace and out of the home. I discuss the disproportionate burden that female faculty face balancing personal and professional responsibilities and the related, yet more veiled, consequences born by men in the academic workplace. The last part of the chapter sets the stage for the rest of the book. I begin with an overview of the types of family-friendly policies that universities typically offer to provide some context for the family-friendliness of the four universities at the focus of this book—referred to as Eastern University, Midwestern University, Southern University, and Western University. I then introduce the universities and fathers profiled in the book before concluding with an overview of the chapters to come. My aim in this chapter is to provide an introduction to the theories along with the campuses and fathers that I will consider throughout this text.

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

Navigating Parenthood at the Research University

Although all employees contend with navigating their personal and professional responsibilities, the components of faculty work distinguish it from employment in other fields in three major ways. First, faculty work is never finished. In addition to teaching responsibilities, professors on many campuses are expected to engage in a significant amount of research as well as campus and professional service. In addition to preparing class lessons, grading papers and exams, and holding office hours, professors are also expected to conduct research, write articles, apply for grants, supervise and mentor graduate students, and engage in a host of other responsibilities. Although a faculty member may leave campus for the day, she or he always has projects that require attention. Second, faculty can perform their work nearly anywhere. Although the rise of technology has led to some shifts in other sectors as well, faculty members need not be on campus to work. Save for teaching classes or perhaps running experiments in a lab, faculty can perform a large portion of their work off campus. Such flexibility can provide both tremendous opportunity and tremendous challenge. Third, the structure of faculty careers puts significant pressure on new professors. Most new faculty have six years to earn tenure from the date of hire, which implies that assistant professors are supposed to work tirelessly in order to achieve often unarticulated goals. This stressful period demands remarkable commitment from faculty members who will find themselves out of a job if they fail to earn tenure. Few other careers place the same sorts of demands and penalties on new hires in the way that academic work does.

This book concerns the experiences of an even smaller percentage of faculty: those employed at research universities, which now account for about 6% of more than 4,000 institutions of higher education in the United States (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2010). Of all the institutional types, research universities place the greatest expectation on their faculty to engage in high-level and funded research. As others have written, recent transformations in the academy have led faculty to face additional pressure to conduct externally funded research, particularly as a way to bring additional income into the institution (Bok, 2003; Mohrman, Ma, & Baker, 2008; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Faculty at research universities are more likely to face greater pressure to publish than their peers at liberal arts colleges who tend to be rewarded more for teaching.

While one might debate whether pressure to publish or pressure to grade is more intense, faculty at research universities face additional issues that their peers employed at other types of institutions do not: many are forced to move away from families and support networks in order to take tenure-line positions. Although there are 1,085 community colleges and 726

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

comprehensive colleges in the United States, there are only 273 research universities (NCES, 2010). Most states have fewer than half a dozen research universities; many only have one. Given the competitiveness of the job market, an individual who is interested in pursuing a career at a research university has to be willing to move across the country. Such relocation removes the faculty member from his or her support network. Those who are married may find that their partner is out of a job in the move. Few other professions require their employees to change geographic locations simply to start work. While employees in other professions might choose to apply for jobs in different states, faculty work at research universities nearly always requires it. As a result, work in research universities places significant personal and professional burdens on faculty. While faculty have great flexibility as to where they can perform their work, many are under pressure to bring in grants and all are under significant pressure to publish or risk losing their jobs. Most will have moved a significant geographic distance to take their job. Simply to become professors at research universities, faculty are expected to put their professional lives ahead of their personal lives. Often, their partners also are expected to prioritize the faculty member's career over their own. As I now discuss, this expectation continues with employment.

The Ideal Worker in the Gendered University

Given significant shifts in the past few decades, few contemporary families mimic the traditional structure of a working father and a stay-at-home mom. According to the 2010 Current Population Survey, only 11% of all U.S. households comprise an opposite-sex married couple in which the father works and the mother stays home with the children. Among married couple households, 12% consist of families with children where only the father works; 28% are dual-income families with children; and 27% are dual-income families without children. The remaining 33% comprise other types of families including those headed by women as single earners and families where neither partner is in the workforce (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). This shift in labor trends extends to the academy as well. A survey of more than 9,000 faculty at 13 research universities found that 72% of full-time faculty have an employed partner, 14% of faculty are single, and 13% have a stay-at-home partner. Disaggregating the findings by gender reveals that 20% of the male faculty surveyed have a stay-at-home partner (Schiebinger, Henderson, & Gilmartin, 2008). These data suggest that faculty may have more traditional family structures than society at large. As I discuss in a later chapter, regional differences point to disparities between employment statuses of couples. The majority of faculty at Southern University were the primary breadwinners for their family whereas faculty at

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

the other campuses were more likely to be in dual-earner couples. Returning to the argument at hand, national employment trends, both inside and outside the academy, underscore that the male breadwinner/female caregiver dichotomy is an anachronistic model that applies to only a slim majority of the U.S. population.

And yet the university and many other organizations continue to operate as if families still adhere to such a traditional division of labor. The workplace expects employees to be ideal workers—or those who are able and willing to work long hours in the office with no other demands on their time (Acker, 1990; Bailyn, 2003; Ely & Meyerson, 2000). Such an arrangement suggests that the worker is either single or has someone else to take care of children and other nonwork-related demands. Organizational structures in ideal worker environments exclude participation from those with significant responsibilities in the home. As Williams (2000) pointed out, jobs that require excessive overtime are frequently not viable options for those with caregiving responsibilities. Individuals typically establish a regular childcare schedule; jobs that require additional labor on little notice are simply not possible for many parents. In addition, academic positions may require individuals to move frequently for advancement. Both of these examples operate on the assumption that the employee either has no children or has a spouse at home in charge of domestic responsibilities. When both individuals in a couple are in the labor force, the man's career often takes priority. Inherent in the definition of the "ideal worker" are notions of appropriate gender roles.

The ideal worker depends on the existence of a division of labor at work and at home. Traditionally, men have been expected to be the breadwinners while women were expected to be caregivers. In fact, research suggests that many men derive their identities from being the breadwinner for their families (Doherty, Kouneski, & Erickson, 1998; Emslie & Hunt, 2009; Marsiglio, Amato, Day, & Lamb, 2000). Being a good father is equated with being a productive member of the workforce. Men have traditionally been allowed to assume this role due to the fact that they had a wife to care for the children at home (Ely & Meyerson, 2000; Emslie & Hunt; Smithson & Stokoe, 2005). Recall the quote from the Midwestern University assistant professor that opened this chapter. Men who are involved fathers are often praised for their actions whereas a woman who performed the same work would receive nary a second look. Such praise stems from the fact that when men take care of their children, they are engaging in work outside their traditional responsibilities.

At the root of these gender roles are definitions of masculinity and femininity. What roles are men and women supposed to assume? As Kimmel (2001) and Connell (1995) argued, masculinity is typically defined in opposition to femininity. A man strives to be everything that a woman is not.

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

If women are expected to be caregivers, men are expected to be providers (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Lorber, 1998) and, by extension, ideal workers. Similarly, women are expected to be nurturing and empathic while men are expected to be aggressive and emotionless. Other features associated with masculinity include presumed heterosexuality and accompanying homophobia, physical strength, competitiveness, and being a father (Bird, 1996; Carrigan, Connell, & Lee, 1985; Connell & Messerschmidt; Kimmel, 2001; Martin, 1998). Multiple types of masculinity exist in every society, yet one particular masculinity is valued above all others; Connell (1995) labeled such a masculinity "hegemonic masculinity," which represents the type of masculinity to which all men are expected to aspire.

Although this particular configuration of masculinity might be most highly valued by society, few men actually embody such characteristics (Connell, 1995; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). For example, in American culture, sports stars are often idolized for their wealth and athleticism. Although few men ultimately achieve the same levels of success, many still measure themselves against this impossible standard. Although most men do not embody the characteristics of hegemonic masculinity, many still profit from patriarchy. As Connell and Messerschmidt argued, such men embody a complicit masculinity, wherein this group "receive[s] the benefits of patriarchy without enacting a strong version of masculine dominance" (p. 832). While a select group of men may actually fulfill the characteristics of hegemonic masculinity, the majority of men try actively to meet those standards and, in the process, profit from doing so.

Whereas the ultimate aim of hegemonic masculinity is the domination of women and perpetuation of patriarchy (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005), hegemonic masculinity also makes distinctions between and perpetuates hierarchies among men (Connell & Messerschmidt; Demetriou, 2001). In fact, as Demetriou suggested, "hegemonic masculinity refers to a social ascendancy of one group of men over others" (p. 341). This other group of men is typically referred to as embodying subordinated or marginalized masculinities (Connell & Messerschmidt) and may include men of color, men with physical disabilities, and gay men (Carrigan, Connell, & Lee, 1985; Lorber, 1998). These groups of men are labeled as subordinate because the masculinity that they embody "is inconsistent with the currently accepted strategy for the subordination of women" (Demetriou, p. 344). As both Connell and Messerschmidt and Demetriou noted, domination and subordination among groups of men does not seem to be a goal in and of itself, but rather a means of achieving domination over women.

However, subordinated masculinities are not always rejected outright. Rather, the dominant group often appropriates behaviors of the subordinate group into accepted definitions of hegemonic masculinity (Demetriou,

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

2001). The example of the metrosexual may be instructive. Over the past decade, definitions of masculinity have shifted to incorporate characteristics that were once solely associated with gay men, such as careful attention to grooming and a particular style of dress. Appropriating such behaviors into mainstream definitions of masculinity means that the boundaries between hegemonic and subordinated masculinities have become less clear (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Demetriou, 2001). Rather than leading to a more egalitarian masculinity, Demetriou suggested that such practices "render the patriarchal dividend invisible" (p. 354). In other words, patriarchy and other forms of domination are not disappearing, but are simply taking on new, and less recognizable, forms.

As this discussion should make clear, hegemonic masculinity is not a static construct. In fact, masculinity, and indeed, all gender is created and sustained through interaction with others (Bird, 1996; Connell, 1995; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Demetriou, 2001). Men and women may police each other's behaviors to ensure that each is enacting the appropriate form of gender. Because gender is created through interaction, definitions of hegemonic masculinity change over time (Connell; Connell & Messerschmidt). The characteristics that were most valued in men in the 1950s are different than those valued today. The mutability of gender suggests the possibility of change toward a masculinity that does not oppress and marginalize groups of men and women. Just as definitions of hegemonic masculinity shift across time, so too do they differ across cultures (Connell & Messerschmidt). One can certainly agree that definitions of ideal masculinity are different in the United States than they are in Russia, but even within the same country, hegemonic masculinities differ by context. The image of the ideal male academic differs from the image of the ideal male auto mechanic. Each trade takes different skills to be successful and ultimately rewards some behaviors over others. Academia has the potential to shape organizational culture in such a way to encourage a new definition of masculinity to bloom—one that rewards men for being involved parents, or at the very least, does not punish them. Although gender norms may be slowly shifting, being a father who spends any time with his children outside of the socially prescribed roles violates gender norms and the characteristics of the ideal worker and is therefore punished personally and professionally.

The Gendered University

As I suggested earlier, definitions of masculinity and femininity are crafted within specific historical and cultural contexts. Organizations play a role in shaping the behavior of their workers, including rewarding or sanctioning workers for adhering to or violating gender norms. And yet much of orga-

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

nizational theory operates as if organizations are gender neutral. As others have pointed out over the past several decades (Acker, 1990; Collinson & Hearn, 2005; Connell, 2006; Ely & Meyerson, 2000), organizations are not gender neutral, but are gendered organizations that perpetuate distinctions between workers as well as laud hegemonic masculinity. Acker, one of the earliest theorists in this area, proves particularly useful in unmasking how gender operates within organizations.

Acker (1990) suggested that organizations are gendered in five ways. Organizations are gendered in the constructions of division along lines of gender, including through divisions of labor and the allocation of power. In many organizations, men occupy positions of leadership while women comprise the ranks of the clerical staff. Second, organizational symbols and images exist to perpetuate these divisions; for example, the ideal business leader is assumed to be both aggressive and competitive—qualities not commonly associated with women. Third, organizations are gendered in the way in which those within them interact. In a meeting with male and female employees, who is more likely to speak and who is more likely to be spoken over? Fourth, organizations are gendered in the way in which these processes reinforce differences in individual identity. As others have suggested (West & Zimmerman, 1987), gender does not exist on its own, but rather is created through repeated interactions with others. With repeated interaction, differences between genders and power imbalances are reinforced. Finally, Acker (1990) argued that organizations are gendered in that all of these processes also reinforce organizational structures. In addition to reinforcing individual identity through repeated interaction, organizational identity is also shaped.

Much of the early work on gendered organizations sought to introduce gender into organizational analysis, an arena from which it had been profoundly absent. As Acker (1990) pointed out, "Since men in organizations take their behavior and perspectives to represent the human, organizational structures and processes are theorized as gender neutral" (p. 142). In short, the ideal worker was assumed to be male, which led to significant consequences for women or others who differ from the norm. Typically theories of gendered organizations are used to interrogate the ways in which organizational structures discriminate against women and perpetuate male-dominated cultures (Britton, 1997; Erickson, 2012; Manville, 1997; Martin, 1994; McBrier, 2003; Smith-Doerr, 2004; Williams, 2000). However, the gendered organization has significant consequences for men and women alike. Whereas some might suggest that men profit from gendered structures that favor them over women, men are also constrained by these same structures. The gendered divisions, symbols, and interactions within organizations all reinforce individual identities that do not reward men who differ from the norm. I am interested in understanding the ways in which

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

organizational culture might discriminate against men who do not fit the norms of the ideal worker or seek to redefine masculinity. Given that this framework highlights the interaction of organizational structure and culture, it is particularly helpful in shedding light on the ways in which universities continue to discriminate against the involved father. Gendered universities trap men and women in stereotypical gender roles. Just as the gendered university punishes women in the workplace, so too does it punish men in the home. It is important to understand how organizational structures and culture influence all members of the organization, both those who hold power and those who are marginalized. However, as I hope to make clear, many men do not feel as if they are rewarded for their behaviors.

Throughout this book, I use theories of the gendered university, ideal worker, and hegemonic masculinity to understand the challenges that faculty fathers face as they navigate the demands of parenthood and the academy. My ultimate contention is that the culture of the academy coupled with gender norms—present in both universities as well as society—creates an environment that discourages many men from being involved fathers and punishes those who are. Understanding how these cultural norms operate—and the consequences that they have—is the first step toward dismantling them.

However, Acker (1990) is not the only scholar to point to the important role of culture in shaping the experiences of those within an organization. For decades, scholars have examined the role of culture in shaping organizational life (Bergquist, 1992; Martin, 2002; Masland, 1985; Tierney, 1988). However, most of these scholars have not used a gendered lens to understand culture and simply have sought to understand culture from a less critical perspective. For example, many studies of organizations have used Schein's (2004) cultural framework of analysis, which focused on an organization's artifacts, values, and assumptions. Schein contended that organizational culture can be analyzed via its artifacts, which include such items as the physical environment, behavior, and symbols, among others; values, which are reflected in organizational artifacts; and assumptions, which are unconscious and deeply embedded in organizational structure.

Schein's (2004) and Acker's (1990) frameworks share many similarities. For example, both scholars contended that the behavior of those inside an organization reflect cultural norms. The two theories have two significant differences, however. First, while Schein examined culture more broadly, Acker, instead, focused on how such behaviors might reflect a gendered culture. In essence, theories of gendered organizations focus the lens of analysis on a particular aspect of identity and culture. In addition, while Schein's analysis of organizational culture suggested that artifacts merely are reflections of values and assumptions that compose an organization, Acker's theory of gendered organizations suggests that artifacts help to create a gen-

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

dered culture. In other words, Schein's theory assumes that organizational culture is static whereas Acker's theory suggests that organizational culture, much like gender, is constantly created and re-created through individual interaction. Theories of gendered organizations point to the role that organizational members play in preserving the status quo, but also in pushing for change. However, while theories of gendered organizations bring many strengths, particularly to a project on the experiences of fathers facing organizational norms in the university, Schein's theory offers a more detailed set of tools to analyze organizational culture at the artifact level. While Acker's theory of gendered organizations uses divisions along lines of gender, symbols and images, and interactions to understand organizational culture, Schein's framework identifies six types of artifacts that might be used to analyze culture. As a result of this greater specificity, I use Schein's framework in conjunction with gendered organizations in chapters 3 and 4 to understand how culture operates at the campus and disciplinary levels.

To sum up, universities are not gender neutral; rather, their structures, culture, and practices perpetuate gender norms. Who has power? What behaviors are valued? Part of any organization's success is due to its employees. The conventional wisdom is that the more hours an employee works, the more productive he or she will be and, thus, the more the organization will profit. Being this ideal worker necessitates that the employee have no responsibilities outside of the workplace. The employee might be married and have children, but the structure of the workplace assumes that someone—read, the wife—can attend to all domestic responsibilities. Inherent in that definition of the ideal worker are traditional gender roles of men as breadwinners and women as caregivers. All of these forces—the ideal worker, gender norms, and the gendered university—come together to have personal and professional consequences for men trying to balance work and family. As I suggested earlier, although few have examined the experiences of men balancing work and family, a considerable body of scholarship on work/family challenges for all faculty and female faculty in particular exists. In the next section, I provide a brief overview of this literature and point to the ways in which it has frequently, and perhaps unintentionally, perpetuated the myth that work/family issues remain a woman's concern.

Work/Life Issues and the Faculty Career

A significant body of literature has examined the challenges that women and, to a lesser extent, men have faced navigating personal and professional demands. Although both genders incur penalties, past research is fairly clear that women face penalties that men do not. I briefly discuss the types of issues that both men and women face in their personal and professional lives

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

and point out the ways in which one gender might experience a greater burden than the other.

Numerous studies have found that female faculty routinely perform more work in the home than their male counterparts (Elliott, 2003, 2008; Mason & Goulden, 2004; Misra, Lundquist, & Templer, 2012; Nakhaie, 2009; O'Laughlin & Bischoff, 2005; Sax, Hagedorn, Arredondo, & Dicrisi, 2002). In her survey of 288 faculty at one U.S. research university, Elliott found that women reported doing more housework, engaging in more eldercare, and being responsible for childcare arrangements. Similarly, in their study of faculty in the University of California system, Mason and Goulden found that while men and women reported spending nearly equal amounts of time on housework, women spent nearly twice as many hours per week engaged in childcare as men. Women reported spending 35.5 hours per week with their children compared with men's 20.3 hours per week. While this discrepancy is unsettling, note how many more hours per week the average faculty father spends with his child than the data presented earlier from time diary studies of the U.S. population. While the average American father spends about 12 hours per week with his children, the average faculty father reports nearly double that number. As I will discuss in later chapters, the flexibility of the faculty career is one possible explanation for this increased time spent with children.

In addition to shouldering more responsibility inside the home, many studies have found that female faculty have to consider carefully the ramifications of having a child. Often this takes the form of delaying or forgoing having children or avoiding taking leave after the birth of children. Many (Armenti, 2004; Drago et al., 2005; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004, 2012) have documented the ways that female faculty have delayed or timed the births of their children in order to be minimally intrusive on their professional careers. In her study of 19 Canadian academics, Armenti found that the older generation of women aimed to have "May babies," timing the births of their children to coincide with the summer months to reduce the disruption to their careers. While the author found that the women in younger generations were less likely to time births for the summer, considerable evidence suggests that female faculty still carefully consider when to have children.

Timing children's births is more frequently reported as an issue that affects female faculty while men's experiences are nearly absent from the discussion. In part, this makes sense as the woman carries the child and is often the primary caregiver after the child's birth. However, both male and female faculty report minimizing the amount of leave taken following the birth of a child, frequently out of fear of career repercussions (Colbeck & Drago, 2005; Drago et al., 2005; Finkel, Olswang, & She, 1994). Although

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

both men and women might be likely to minimize the amount of leave taken following a child's birth, Drago and colleagues found that women are considerably more likely to engage in such behaviors. The authors found that only 14.4% of fathers but 51.1% of mothers came back to work earlier than they would have liked following the birth of a child out of concern for their professional reputation. Note that their findings do not suggest that women took less leave than men, only that women were likely to feel that they returned to work too soon after the birth of a child.

In addition to facing penalties with their personal lives, many women have similarly found themselves penalized in their professional lives due to their status as mothers. Several scholars have found that being married or having children impacts female faculty more than men. For example, Perna (2001) found that being married increased women's likelihood of holding a part-time, non–tenure-track appointment. That is, married women were less likely to be employed in tenure-track positions. Perna also found that having children reduces men's likelihood of being in a part-time, non–tenure-track position. Stated differently, men with children are more likely to be in tenure-line positions while married women are more likely to be in non–tenure-track positions.

Additional scholarship has found that having children affects women's—but not men's—achievement of tenure. Using data obtained through the Survey of Doctorate Recipients, a national study of postgraduate careers from 1973 to 1999, Mason and Goulden (2002) found that women who had babies within five years of obtaining their Ph.D. (defined by the researchers as "early babies") were consistently less likely to earn tenure than men in the same situation. In contrast, women with "late babies" (defined as those babies born five years postdoctorate) and women with no children had remarkably similar rates of earning tenure as their male counterparts. The authors hypothesized that the women with late babies waited until they had obtained tenure to start their families, thus removing the major obstacles to job security. The study found no similar impact on men. Perhaps one might assume that men's wives were performing more of the work in the home, thereby freeing the men to concentrate on their careers. Research suggests that having children negatively impacts women's career trajectories, but past studies have not found the same penalties for men.

Although evidence exists that being married and having children has an impact on a faculty member's employment or tenure status, the evidence is less convincing whether having children impacts a professor's productivity. Previous research confirms that women tend to spend less time engaged in research than men (Park, 1996; Tierney & Bensimon, 2000). Often, female faculty work as many hours as men, but spend their time on teaching and service. Although women and men spend their time differently, there is less

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

evidence that suggests an individual's marital or parental status shapes the types of work performed. For example, Sax and colleagues (2002) found that having children appeared to have little effect on a faculty member's productivity once typical variables such as rank and department were taken into account. Although preliminary analysis pointed to differences between men and women's productivity, controlling for significant variables indicated no difference between men and women. In other words, a faculty member with kids and one without kids appear to produce the same amount of research. Similarly, Bellas and Toutkoushian (1999) found that being married and having children affected neither teaching nor research. The authors found that faculty members with more children worked fewer hours per week, yet produced more research than faculty with fewer dependents. Their findings suggest that faculty with more children have learned how to use their limited time efficiently to maximize their productivity. The evidence is mixed with regard to the effects having children has on a faculty member's career. Some studies suggest that women are penalized; others suggest that men profit; and still others suggest that children have no effect on a career. In chapter 5, I discuss how the experiences of fathers in this study reveal similar ambiguity about the impact of children on productivity. Although there is some ambiguity on effects on career, the evidence is less mixed as to the impact of family responsibilities on a faculty member's home life.

As the literature suggests, men are more likely than women to accrue advantages or at least experience minimal penalty following the birth of a child. However, accepting these differences without exploring the nuances of men's experiences is problematic. The majority of work/life literature in the academy has focused primarily on the concerns of women. This book serves to fill the gap and represents the experiences of another segment of the population. The chapters that follow illustrate how men struggle with their competing demands. Many fathers discussed the fact that they felt like they failed to achieve in multiple domains; they felt that their professional lives suffered and that they were unable to be involved in the home. Simply saying that women shoulder a greater burden than men may be true, but it also suggests that men's experiences are not worth exploring. This book sheds light on how men navigate their personal and professional demands and the ways in which institutional cultures and gender norms shape their identities as professors and fathers.

Accommodating Family Demands at the Research University

While all types of colleges and universities have responded to work/life needs of faculty, research universities are more likely than others to offer accommodations to faculty. A survey of 255 colleges and universities found

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

that, on average, research institutions offered the greatest number of policies, with the 73 responding institutions averaging 2.99 policies per campus. In contrast, doctoral granting institutions offered 1.38 policies, master's institutions offered 1.29 policies, baccalaureate institutions offered 1.09 policies, and associate granting institutions offered 0.80 policies per campus (Hollenshead, Sullivan, Smith, August, & Hamilton, 2005). Institutional resources may determine a college or university's ability to provide accommodations to faculty; providing a paid term off from teaching brings considerable cost to the institution. The institutions profiled in this book are all research universities and therefore more likely to offer policies to help faculty and staff with work/life responsibilities. Research universities also serve a special function in that they frequently play a particular role in shaping the higher education landscape and society at large. By introducing policies and practices that promote gender equity in the workplace and the home, these institutions have the potential to shift the practices of all colleges and universities as well as those of society.

Since Stanford University implemented the first tenure-clock extension policy in 1971 (Manchester, Leslie, & Kramer, 2010), colleges and universities have increasingly offered several policies for faculty use, including parental leave, a release from teaching duties following the birth of a child, on-site childcare, emergency backup childcare, tuition remission, lactation rooms, eldercare, and other policies and programs. In this section, I review the types of family-friendly policies that many research universities offer, including the four campuses—referred to as Eastern University, Midwestern University, Southern University, and Western University—profiled in this book. It is important to keep these policies in mind since in later chapters I discuss many fathers' hesitation to use them, despite their availability.

Tenure-Clock Extension

The tenure-clock extension is perhaps one of the easiest policies for an institution to provide its faculty because it brings no additional cost to the institution. Basically, the tenure-clock extension allows faculty members who have a child to add an extra year to the time granted to earn tenure. When a professor goes up for tenure, he or she is supposed to be evaluated on work produced during the standard six-year tenure period—and not assuming extra productivity for that additional year. Campuses differ in the provision of this policy. Some institutions require that the recipient provide a substantial portion of childcare in order to be eligible. In addition, some campuses limit the number of times that an assistant professor can extend the tenure clock for family reasons; on some campuses, faculty can extend their clock only once, despite having multiple children in the pretenure

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

period. Colleges and universities have different procedures for activating the tenure-clock extension. At some institutions, the extension is automatic; once the faculty member adds his or her child to health insurance, the tenure clock is automatically extended. At other institutions, faculty members need to request the possibility of the extension, generally within one year of the birth. Requesting the possibility of the extension does not mean that faculty are required to use the extension, but rather that they have the option to do so. All four campuses profiled in this book offer a tenure-clock extension to their faculty.

Pregnancy Leave, Childbearing Leave, and Parental Leave

Some campuses also offer faculty leave following the birth of a child. On some campuses, such as Western University, leave is reserved for childbearing mothers or adoptive parents. Other campuses might offer parental leave to faculty of either gender. However, on many campuses, faculty are far less likely to be offered a paid leave than those working in staff positions. In part, this stems from the flexibility that is associated with the faculty career. One might assume that since faculty have few fixed demands on their time, aside from classes they teach, they should be able to find ways to accommodate new children without taking leave. And, indeed, historically, many female faculty timed the births of their children to coincide with summer to avoid interfering with their academic responsibilities (Armenti, 2004). Today, parental leave or pregnancy leave is often framed as a medical issue to accommodate the demands that pregnancy places on a woman's body. Of the four institutions profiled in this book, only Western University offers a childbearing leave for which fathers are not eligible.

Importantly, all employees of colleges and universities are eligible to access the provisions of the Family and Medical Leave Act, passed in 1993, which offers any employee who has worked for an organization for more than one year up to 12 weeks' unpaid leave for several life events, including childbirth or significant illness. However, because this leave is unpaid many employees cannot afford to benefit from this federal policy.

Release from Teaching Duties (Active Service/Modified Duties)

While a true leave is rarely granted to faculty, research universities are more likely to offer a release from teaching duties for one term to faculty mothers and fathers. Often termed "Active Service/Modified Duties," such leave typically releases faculty from some or all of their teaching responsibilities for one quarter or semester, which allows them to maintain their research agendas while also caring for the new addition at home. Often these leaves

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

are framed as being available to faculty with substantial caregiving responsibilities. Three of the four institutions—Western, Midwestern, and Southern universities—offer a release from teaching duties to faculty of either gender.

Although becoming more common at research universities, there is often less support for implementing such a policy, primarily because of the cost associated with it. When a faculty member is granted a release from teaching duties, his or her department often needs to find someone to teach the courses for which the professor was responsible. Departments that opt not to cancel the courses typically have two choices: ask a full-time faculty member to step in (perhaps on an overload basis) or hire an adjunct. For small departments, neither option is ideal because they have neither the human capital nor the financial capital to cover a faculty member's absence. Institutions that provide a centrally located fund to hire adjuncts, which Western University does, are more likely to have cultures in which taking a parental leave is accepted and valued by those on campus. I discuss the role of institutional culture in detail in chapter 3. While these three policies are those that are most common on campuses, some campuses offer other policies and programs to faculty parents.

Part-Time Tenure Track

Some campuses provide a part-time tenure track option for faculty, although such positions also come with part-time pay. Typically, in such arrangements, the faculty member is expected to teach half of the standard number of courses and produce half the publications per year to make progress toward tenure (that is, one semester per calendar year would count toward the tenure clock). Under these arrangements, faculty often maintain full benefits and retirement. The drawback of such an arrangement is the financial penalty that comes with a faculty member only earning half of his or her income. Yet, such an arrangement allows faculty contending with a major life issue—such as a child's illness—a little flexibility with their professional lives. Eastern University proudly publicized the existence of this policy as one of the cornerstones of its family-friendly initiatives. Western University also offers a part-time tenure track option.

Backup Childcare

Most campuses now offer on-site childcare to faculty and staff (and, in some cases, students). Indeed all four of the campuses profiled in this book had either standard childcare centers or lab schools to which many of the fathers sent their children. And, of course, the perennial complaint was that there was never enough availability in any of the childcare centers. In

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany

addition to providing standard childcare, some campuses provide emergency backup childcare, designed to be used in unexpected emergencies. Say, for example, that a faculty member has to teach class, but his child is sick and not at school. Backup childcare services send a licensed and bonded professional into the home to provide care for short periods of time. Midwestern University is the only institution of the four profiled that provides such a program, which is available to faculty, staff, and students on a sliding-scale basis. The most affluent of faculty pay $20 per hour for the service and students can pay as little as $2 per hour. (The institution subsidizes the cost of the service for those lower on the scale.) While such a resource is not frequently used, it indicates that the institution aims to help faculty attend to their personal needs in unexpected situations.

MISCELLANEOUS INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMS

Many campuses provide a variety of other policies and programs to faculty and staff. Some campuses provide lactation rooms and breastfeeding support programs to new mothers. Western University has 37 lactation rooms on its campus and employs a part-time lactation consultant. While such a program is of limited use to the faculty fathers profiled here, the existence of lactation rooms signals the degree to which the campus supports employees contending with a significant personal event. Many other campuses offer eldercare services, most frequently in the form of referrals to community providers. Another popular program that institutions offer is a spousal hiring program. As I pointed out earlier, given that two out of every three professors is married to someone who is also in the workforce (Schiebinger et al., 2008), many families need employment assistance. In recognition of this fact, all four institutions profiled here offer either official or unofficial spousal hiring assistance. Some of the campuses, such as Western University, have a website on which they advertise their policies. Other campuses, such as Eastern University, acknowledged that the policy was unofficial. On each campus, a partner or spousal hire typically worked in the same way. Imagine that a dual-career academic couple—one chemist and one historian—was hired at a university. The chemist was lucky enough to get the tenure-track job while his partner was hired as a full-time lecturer in history. Spousal hiring programs typically call for the historian's salary to be split in three ways—between the sponsoring department (in this case, chemistry), receiving department (history), and the provost's office for a fixed period of time. At the end of this period, the historian would be expected to find more permanent employment. While such a program is helpful in that it provides an immediate position for many faculty partners, it often delays the "two body problem" (Wolf-Wendel, Twombly, & Rice, 2003) for several years until funding runs out.

© 2014 State University of New York Press, Albany