

**Work, Life, And Community College Faculty: Understanding Community
College Work/Life Balance Issues Through Socialization Theory And
Academic Discipline**

A Dissertation Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

David S. Key
August 2013

Copyright © 2013 David S. Key
All rights reserved

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank to all of the members of my committee who provided guidance and support throughout this project, Dr. Vincent Anfara, Dr. Lane Morris, and Dr. Trina Paulus. \

A special thanks goes to Dr. Norma Mertz. I really appreciate Dr. Mertz's willingness to help her students crystalize and shape often broad ideas and topic into viable research questions and studies. I also appreciate Dr. Mertz's wiliness help guide this study and provide invaluable feedback and guidance through this project.

I especially want to thank Dr. Margaret Sallee for not only helping me shape and refine this dissertation countless times, but also for the invaluable time you shared with me and my fellow Ph.D. Candidates. The time you spent teaching and counseling us proved invaluable. Your conscientious dedication allowed the members of my class to not only gain in our appreciation of methods and research, but more importantly gave us the encouragement and feedback we needed as we progressed through the program.

I want to thank classmates for providing constant feedback and encouragement. While obtaining a Ph.D. was our ultimate goal, the journey was made so much more worthwhile by our friendships.

I want to thank my colleagues and friends and Pellissippi State Community College. Your guidance and encouragement has been invaluable to me.

I also want thank Dr. Chris Henderson. Your encouragement, insight, and expertise were always helpful.

To my family, I appreciate the steadfast support you have given me throughout my academic career. Without your love and support, this accomplishment would not have been possible.

To my wife Leah, I appreciate the support you have given me in the completion of this lifelong goal. I cannot thank you enough for your willingness to listen to my ideas and read my often “wordy sentences.” I love you very much.

Finally to my daughter Mia, the love and joy that you have brought into my life is without measure. I look forward to watching you grow into a strong, compassionate, and independent person. Always know that not a moment goes by where you are not at the forefront of my thoughts.

Abstract

Research has established that college faculty at research institutions often struggle to maintain a balance between their personal and professional lives (Drago & Williams, 2000; Mason & Goulden, 2002, 2004; Quinn, 2010; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). While some work/life research has focused on two-year faculty, the research on community college faculty and work/life balance issues has often proved contradictory (Lester & Bers, 2010; Perna, 2001; Sallee, 2008; Townsend & LaPaglia, 2000; Wolf-Wendel, Ward, & Twombly, 2007). Furthermore, little is known about how community college culture and discipline affect the ability of two-year faculty to balance their professional and personal lives. While many theories of socialization have been utilized to explain faculty work (Bess, 1978; Merton, 1957; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) and disciplinary culture (Austin, 1990; Becher, 1984, 1987; Biglan, 1973; Clark, 1987; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Tierney, 1990), this body of literature has not often focused on community college faculty.

The purpose of this study was to gain a greater understanding of community college faculty work/life balance issues. As a result, I sought to gain a greater understanding of how academic socialization affects community college faculty. Furthermore, I investigated if these changes in socialization patterns produce a culture that presents work/life challenges unique to the community college. Finally, I sought to interrogate the degree to which discipline affects work/life challenges.

Data were collected through interviews with 11 full-time community college faculty members from both science and English who had a least one child. The findings revealed Southern State faculty members struggled to balance their personal and professional lives due to time demands associated with faculty workload and family life. The results also indicated that issues associated with instruction often led to work/life issues among the science faculty, while

grading was the biggest work/life stressor among the English faculty. Tierney and Rhoads' (1994) concept of faculty socialization and culture also proved helpful in identifying the causes and patterns of faculty behavior crucial to understanding work/life balance issues specific to community college work.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Theoretical Framework	6
Statement of the Problem	9
Purpose of the Study	9
Research Questions	10
Significance of the Study	10
Organization of the Study	11
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
Work/life Balance: Research, Tenure, and Gender	13
Work/life Balance: Beyond the Research Setting	21
Academic Discipline and Culture	25
Academic Discipline and Work/life Balance	27
Socialization as a Cultural Framework	28
The Anticipatory Stage	30
Organizational Socialization	31
Dimensions of Organizational Socialization	33
Key Agents of Socialization	40
III. METHODS	43
Research Design	44
Research Setting	46
Participant Selection	50
Description of Participants	51

Data Collection Methods	53
Interviews.....	53
Documents	55
Data Analysis	56
Trustworthiness.....	58
Statement of Reflexivity	59
Limitations	60
Delimitation	61
IV. FINDINGS.....	62
Time Demands, Family, Workload and Work/Life Balance	62
Work/Life Balance and Academic Discipline	74
Learning the Ropes: Socialization into Community College Life.....	82
Conclusion	90
V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	92
Question 1: What Are the Work/Life Issues Experienced by Community College Faculty? ..93	
Question 2: How Do Community College Work/Life Balance Issues Differ by Academic Discipline?	96
Question 3: How Does Socialization Theory Help Explain the Work/Life Balance Issues Experienced by Community College Faculty?	98
Question 4: How Are Socialization Theory, Academic Discipline, and Community College Work/Life Balance Issues Interrelated?	103
Implications for Practice	104
Recommendations for Future Research.....	107

Conclusion	108
REFERENCES	110
APPENDICES	120
Appendix A.....	121
Appendix B.....	122
Appendix C.....	124
Appendix D.....	125
VITA	129

Chapter I: Introduction

On September 26, 2011 at a ceremony to introduce the National Science Foundation's new Career-Life Balance Initiative, first lady Michelle Obama highlighted the importance of increased family-friendly policies:

If we're going to out-innovate and out-educate the rest of the world, then we have to open doors to everyone. We need all hands on deck. That means clearing hurdles for women and girls as they navigate careers in science, technology, engineering, and math..... The folks at the NSF understand that you should not be penalized or lose a chance to advance in your career because you're taking care of a new child or a mom or dad who has gotten sick. We all know that when you take steps to make life easier for working parents, it's a win for everyone. (Obama, 2011)

The first lady's comments highlight the growing concern of how work, family, and caregiving affect research and education in the United States. The comments also reflect how changing demographics have led to a push for greater work/life initiatives. For example in 2008, while women earned 41% of all doctoral degrees conferred in science, technology, engineering, and mathematical (STEM) fields, they constituted only 28% of tenured STEM faculty. Policies such as the NSF's Career-Life Balance Initiative are essential as over 50% of PhDs conferred in 2008-2009 were awarded to women (NCES, 2008). While the NSF's policy attempts to create more gender balance in STEM fields, the policy's structure also highlights the growing concerns of male caregivers. The NSF initiative allows male and female grant recipients to postpone or suspend their grants for childbirth, adoption, and family leave for up to one year. Michelle Obama's observation of the NSF's work/life proposal highlights a salient point. Work/life balance issues often transcend family and gender equity issues and highlight the overall social and economic health of the nation.

What is Work/Life Balance?

While work/life concerns are becoming more prevalent, an understanding of the definition of work/life balance is often elusive because the term balance implies an equal distribution of work and life. Greenhaus, Collins, and Shaw (2003) defined work/life balance in terms of both equality and engagement. They asserted that work/life balance is the degree to which people are equally engaged and satisfied with both work and family roles. While this characterization of work/life balance denotes a sense of equilibrium between work and life, often people struggle to find an equal division between their professional and personal lives. In reality, people who strive to obtain such a harmony will most likely discover what they are actually seeking is work/life integration (Barnett, 1999). Work/life integration occurs when one role spills over into another role. As a result, spillover is viewed as a positive effect that helps enrich the individual's life (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999). In order to foster a healthy integration, both employers and employees need to view work and their personal lives as equally valued entities (Bailey, 2008). While work/life integration or work/life harmony (McMillan, Morris, & Atchley, 2011) may serve as more apt descriptors, for the purposes of this study I will use the standard term work/life balance.

Work/Life Balance and College Faculty

While an academic lifestyle is rewarding, it is often difficult to maintain. As the demands of academic life intensify, faculty members often find it challenging to preserve a healthy personal life (Finkel & Olswang, 1996). While the overlap between work and life is often overwhelming for new faculty members, work/life stress only intensifies as the demands of family life begin to increase (Sorcinelli & Near, 1989; Twombly & Townsend, 2008; Wolf-Wendel, Ward, & Twombly, 2007). Recently the changing demands and structures of modern

family life have caused a tremendous amount of work/life stress for academics (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). Families struggle to cope as the demands of work skew the balance between job and family. For example, faculty members often seek to balance academic responsibilities such as lecture preparation, grading, and committee work with family responsibilities such as caregiving and the scheduling demands of the modern family. As dual-income families become the norm, college faculty are finding it increasingly difficult to balance their work with their family responsibilities (Sallee, 2008; Twombly & Townsend, 2008; Wolf-Wendel, Ward, & Twombly, 2007). As a result, many faculty choose to enter the ranks of the community college professoriate in hopes of striking a balance between their families and their careers (Twombly & Townsend, 2008; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2007).

Although not beset by the rigors of research, increased teaching loads and professional demands consistently affect the work/life balance of community college faculty (Sallee, 2008). The notion of an academic life focused purely on instruction and student interaction, however, often becomes derailed by long hours of college service. As community college faculty take on greater instruction and service responsibility, more demands are made of their time. These increased demands and responsibilities make it difficult for community college faculty to achieve a healthy work/life balance (Lester & Bers, 2010; Sallee, 2008).

Work/life balance issues are important for community college faculty given the expansion of community colleges over the past few decades and the relative gender equality found at two-year institutions (NCES, 2008). The demographic make-up of community college faculty is different than their four-year counterparts. There is relative equality in the percentage of male and female faculty members compared with public and private four-year institutions where males predominate comprising about 60 percent of faculty members (NCES, 2008). While

there are relatively equal numbers of male and female faculty, most of the prevailing literature on community college work/life issues has centered on female faculty and issues concerning caregiving (Twombly & Townsend, 2008). However, such studies have often produced contradictory results.

Respondents in Wolf-Wendel, Ward, and Twombly's (2007) study on female community college faculty with children were often satisfied with their ability to balance their teaching schedule with family responsibilities. The researchers suggested, however, that this contentment could be a result of faculty who had entered the professoriate from other professions. They also concluded that faculty might receive more empathy from community college students who are also managing multiple roles (Wolf-Wendel, Ward, & Twombly, 2007).

While some studies found community college faculty to be satisfied, other studies have found that many faculty members expressed dismay at their overall workload and lack of institutional support (Lester & Bers, 2010; Sallee, 2008). Often, community college faculty have fewer resources than university faculty and have consistently felt less supported by their administrations. For example, Sallee (2008) found that two-thirds of community college faculty reported they often must choose between their personal and professional lives. In addition, the faculty in her study reported an absence of policies designed to improve faculty work/life balance. While some research suggests that community college faculty are more content, contradictory evidence suggests that community college faculty experience a myriad of work/life balance issues.

While there have been some studies on work/life at the community college, they have tended to treat the college as a monolithic whole. However, previous researchers suggest (Austin, 2002; Becher, 1987; Biglan, 1973) that colleges and universities are composed of

multiple disciplines that each have their own unique culture. Furthermore, in order to gain clear insight into the work/life problems of community college faculty, it is also important to understand how community college culture and academic disciplines may influence community college faculty work/life issues. Because most college faculty are acculturated to norms inherent in four-year schools, an examination into disciplines at the community college level might reveal a potential source of work/life stress.

While examining how community college culture gives rise to work/life conflict is key to understanding the work/life experiences of two-year faculty, examining variances in socialization by specific discipline also allows for a better understanding of community college work/life balance issues. While to date, there have been no studies conducted on work/life balance as it relates to community college culture and academic discipline, the prevailing research on socialization indicates the importance of understanding the impact of socialization at a disciplinary level (Austin, 1990; Becher, 1984, Becher & Trowler, 2001; 1987; Biglan, 1973; Clark, 1987; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Tierney, 1990).

Discipline most often defines a faculty member. Each discipline uniquely outlines research questions and methods, the relationship between teaching and research, and work relationships between scholars (Austin, 1990). Disciplinary variations can also make significant differences in the lives of faculty members. For example, a faculty member in English is likely to carry out research alone while a professor of chemistry is more likely to conduct research with fellow colleagues and graduate students. In addition, humanities scholars tend to value books and monographs as products of intellectual work whereas natural and physical scientists and social scientists tend to favor refereed articles (Austin, 2002). These differences are most often cemented in graduate schools and perpetuated throughout the life of a faculty member. While

faculty at community colleges are socialized throughout graduate school, their experiences in graduate school may fail to prepare them for the realities of community college life. As a result, I sought to gain a greater understanding of how academic socialization affects community college faculty. Furthermore, I sought to investigate if these changes in socialization patterns produce a culture that presents work/life challenges unique to the community college. Finally, I also sought to interrogate the degree to which discipline affects work/life challenges.

Theoretical Framework: Socialization to Organizational Culture

This study utilized Tierney and Rhoads' (1994) conceptualization of faculty socialization to explain how community college culture fosters work/life issues that are specific to two-year faculty. Their theory continued earlier works focused on socialization and culture by Merton (1957), Clark (1987), Van Maanen and Schein (1979), Becher (1987), and Tierney (1988). In earlier work, Tierney (1988) developed a framework for understanding colleges and universities as cultures by pointing to the importance of specific environment, mission, and socialization processes. This emphasis on a more localized understanding allows a greater understanding of the intricacies and specificity of the socialization process. Accordingly, Tierney's emphasis at the local level gives rise to the nuances that may exist between different academic institutions and cultures.

Tierney and Rhoads (1994) viewed the process of faculty socialization from a cultural perspective where organizational socialization is a bidirectional, mutually adaptive process between the organization and the individual. This process shapes faculty culture at both an institutional and departmental level. Concomitantly, both institutional and disciplinary culture affects faculty work/life experiences. For example, although socialization experienced in graduate school might have oriented a potential faculty member to disciplinary norms, it may not

prepare faculty for the challenges specific to community college life where research is not the dominant norm. Socialization to community college norms will generally occur as new faculty members orient to their new roles. In order to explain how this process creates cultures specific to community college faculty, I discuss the stages of faculty socialization that give rise to distinct institutional and disciplinary cultures.

Tierney and Rhoads' (1994) asserted that faculty socialization includes an anticipatory stage and an organizational stage. Anticipatory socialization pertains to how potential members take on the attitudes and attributes of groups to which they aspire to belong. Potential faculty members generally experience anticipatory socialization largely during graduate school. As a result, during the anticipatory phase, prospective faculty members acclimate to both professional and disciplinary norms. For aspiring faculty members, graduate school serves to socialize graduate students to the expectations of faculty life. During anticipatory socialization, potential faculty members are often acculturated to a set of norms that may not necessarily match the culture of their new organization (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). For community college faculty, inconsistencies often emerge as they enter the organizational phase of faculty socialization and discover the values they learned in graduate school are incongruent with their new surroundings.

As faculty members enter the organizational stage of socialization, they are socialized through an initial or entry phase and a role continuance phase. The entry phase begins during the recruitment and selection process and continues through the initial stages of employment. The role continuance phase begins as individuals become firmly situated within the organization. For community college faculty, the transition into the entry and role continuance phase of the socialization process may be the most difficult as the academic and institutional norms they were

subject to in the anticipatory stage are incongruent with their new role as community college faculty. For example, faculty members who were socialized in research-oriented graduate programs are confronted with a teaching-focused institutional and departmental setting at the community college. While most faculty members experience some level of transformation as they enter the professoriate, faculty members who gain employment at teaching-focused institutions often discover a culture that is much different than the research-oriented culture that shaped their view of both institutional and disciplinary norms (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994).

Given the scarcity and discrepancy of knowledge surrounding community college work/life issues, I sought to not only gain insight into community college work/life issues, but also to examine the origins of community college work/life balance issues. Accordingly, I used socialization theory to explain how issues specific to community college culture and academic discipline affect the ability of community college faculty to balance their professional and personal lives. For example, while the values incorporated into the academic and disciplinary culture validate faculty behavior in the research university, they can also be a source of stress for faculty working in teaching-focused institutions where teaching, rather than research, is the dominant institutional commitment (Austin, 1990). As a result, it is important to understand how academic and disciplinary culture manifests itself in settings beyond the research university. In addition to informing the underpinning research to this study, the Tierney and Rhoads' (1994) theory of socialization served as the guiding framework for the interview protocol. Questions were designed to gain further knowledge of the anticipatory and organizational stages of the socialization framework. Furthermore, the socialization framework guided data analysis by providing the lens through which interview and document data were examined.

Statement of the Problem

Research has established that faculty at research institutions often struggle to maintain a balance between their personal and professional lives (Drago & Williams, 2000; Mason & Goulden, 2002, 2004; Quinn, 2010; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). While the predominance of work/life research has focused on research institutions, less is known about the experiences of faculty at two-year institutions. While some work/life research has focused on two- year faculty, the research on community college faculty and work/life balance issues has often proved contradictory (Lester & Bers, 2010; Perna, 2001; Sallee, 2008; Townsend & LaPaglia, 2000; Wolf-Wendel, Ward, & Twombly, 2007). Furthermore, little is known about how community college culture and discipline affect the ability of two-year faculty to balance their professional and personal lives. While many theories of socialization have been utilized to explain faculty work (Bess, 1978; Merton, 1957; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) and disciplinary culture (Austin, 1990; Becher, 1984, 1987; Biglan, 1973; Clark, 1987; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Tierney, 1990), this body of literature has not often focused on community college faculty.

Purpose Statement and Research Questions

The purpose of this dissertation is to gain a greater understanding of community college faculty work/life balance issues. As a result, I will seek to not only identify community college work/life issues, but I will utilize Tierney and Rhoads' (1994) conceptualization of faculty socialization theory to help explain how aspects of community college culture create work/life balance issues that are specific to that environment. Further, I am also interested in investigating how socialization theory may explain differences by academic discipline, particularly in terms of

work/life balance issues. Accordingly, the following research questions served to guide this study:

1. What are the work/life issues experienced by community college faculty?
2. How do community college work/life balances differ by academic discipline?
3. How does socialization theory help explain the work/life balance issues experienced by community college faculty?
4. How are socialization theory, academic discipline, and community college work/life balance issues interrelated?

Significance of the Study

Although research on work/life balance issues has accelerated concurrent with changing trends in family life and academia, much of the research has focused on work/life issues at research-intensive institutions (Mason & Goulden, 2002, 2004; Mason, Goulden & Frasch, 2009; Quinn, 2010; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989). In addition, much of the existing research on faculty work/life balance has focused specifically on the experiences of female faculty members (Drago & Williams, 2000; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). While studies at research institutions have given rise to a greater understanding of the work/life problems of a particular group of faculty, little research has focused on community college work/life issues. Additionally, little is known about how community college culture and academic discipline impacts the ability of community college faculty to balance their personal and professional lives. To clarify the ambiguity of community college work/life issues, I will utilize socialization theory in order to gain a greater understanding of work/life issues that affect community college faculty. As a result, this study will expand what is known about community college work/life issues while concurrently expanding the literature on faculty socialization. The findings contained in this study may also be used by community college faculty and staff to inform and promote future policy and practice.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation was organized into five chapters. While chapter one served as an introduction, chapter two contains a review of relevant work/life literature while providing a more detailed discussion of the theoretical framework utilized in this study. Chapter three comprises a discussion of the methodological approach I implemented, while chapter four contains the findings derived in this study. I concluded in chapter 5 by framing the findings derived in this study with the existing literature while also discussing the implications and conclusions garnered in this study.

Chapter II: Review of Literature

As the demands of family life and academia have increased, more research has sought to investigate work/life balance issues. This increase in work/life study is essential given the greater demands placed on the professoriate, the increase in dual earner families, and the constant demands of family and caregiving. As a result, the predominance of recent faculty work/life studies have focused on issues of family, caregiving, and gender (Drago & Williams, 2000; Mason & Goulden, 2004; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). While faculty from all types of institutions are susceptible to work/life stress, the majority of the work/life literature has focused on four year institutions. While not as expansive, some studies have also tried to discern more subtle aspects that affect work/life balance such as faculty rank, departmental concerns, and academic discipline (Jacobs, 2004; Perna, 2001; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). Although this recent trend in work/life research is promising, it has not always been reflective of issues beyond the four-year institution. While some studies have focused on the experiences of comprehensive and community college faculty, more expansive research is needed to understand faculty work/life concerns beyond the research institution. Since faculty are socialized by academic and institutional norms, this study utilized socialization theory to understand community college work/life balance issues.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine how the prevailing literature on both work/life balance and socialization theory can provide insight into understanding work/life issues of community college faculty. I will begin with an examination of literature focused on the work/life issues inherent to research institutions. I will continue with an analysis of literature that extends the scope of work/life research beyond four-year institutions. Concomitantly, I will address issues such as gender and tenure that have encompassed much of the prevailing literature. Additionally, I will examine relevant socialization literature and conclude with an

analysis of how socialization theories can be utilized to explain community college culture and work/life issues.

Work/Life Balance: Research, Tenure, and Gender

For many faculty members, working at a research institution is regarded as the pinnacle of academic success. While research institutions often serve as the standard bearers for academic success, the heavy demands placed on their faculty are accompanied by both professional and personal stress (Sorcinelli & Near, 1989). While all research-oriented faculty face the pressures of academia, the prevailing knowledge on work/life balance indicates female faculty members are especially susceptible (Finkelstein & Schuster, 2001; Hochschild, 1989; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004).

Academic Motherhood

Although recent studies have explored the issue of academic fatherhood (Reddick, Rochlen, Grasso, Reilly, & Spikes, 2011; Sallee, 2012), the predominance of work/life literature is most often focused on female faculty. Whereas both male and female faculty members struggle with the task of achieving a successful work/life balance, the challenge for women is greater than that for men given the logistics of the biological clock, the tenure clock, the demands of pregnancy and childbirth, and the gendered expectations associated with caregiving (Drago & Williams, 2004; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). While gender-specific research models may seem somewhat dated given the complexities of modern family life (Barnett, 1999), women consistently bear the brunt of childrearing responsibilities in U.S. society (Hochschild, 1989).

The percentage of women in academia has grown substantially. In 1969, 20% of new faculty members were women. Since then, the number of female faculty members has more than doubled. Forty-four percent of faculty members in their first six years are now women

(Finkelstein & Schuster, 2001). This trend is likely to continue because women now receive more than half of all doctoral degrees awarded to United States citizens (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). Despite an increase in the number of female faculty, women are consistently worried about how family life might affect their careers (Drago & Williams, 2000; Mason & Goulden, 2004). Even as traditional gender and caregiver roles are being challenged, female faculty members with children still face obstacles as they try to balance successful motherhood while remaining on the tenure track.

The structures of academia, especially for those in their pre-tenure years at four-year universities, have many characteristics that both encourage and challenge academic mothers. In order to gain a better idea of how female faculty members with small children manage their parental and professional roles at research universities, Kelly Ward and Lisa Wolf-Wendel (2004) interviewed 29 pre-tenure female faculty members with children under the age of five from nine different research universities. While several respondents indicated how much they enjoyed the freedom and flexibility inherent in academic life, they also alluded to the time-intensive nature of both academic work and family life. Respondents were often quick to acknowledge that their freedom and flexibility are coupled with a significant amount of stress.

The results of Ward and Wolf-Wendel's (2004) study serve to further illuminate the conflicts that exist between the dual roles of mother and professor. While the expectations of motherhood are often all-consuming, the responsibilities of academia are often just as daunting. There are always papers to grade, articles to read, proposals to write, and syllabi to update. As a result, while female faculty members expressed a fondness for their work, the high demands of both work and motherhood left them feeling as though time was always an issue. Invariably,

faculty mothers begin to experience stress and guilt given the never-ending expectations of family and academia (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004).

Gender, Family, and Academia

Often the demands and complexities of academic life and tenure not only give rise to work/life stress, but also push faculty members to choose between work and family.

Mary Ann Mason and Marc Goulden (2002) echoed this theme in their work on work and family conflict. Using data from the National Science Foundation's Survey of Doctorate Recipients (SDR), the researchers argued that although women have entered graduate schools in large numbers, the demands of family often derail their academic ambitions. Specifically, the researchers examined the lives of faculty members to distinguish if childbirth had an effect on their careers. Their findings indicated that having children had an impact on faculty promotion and tenure. Furthermore, their research denoted that the timing of babies also impacts the promotion and tenure cycle. The timing of children affects female faculty members much more than their male counterparts. A consistent gap in tenure achievement exists between women who have early babies and their male counterparts. An “early baby” is one who joins the household prior to five years after his or her parent completes their Ph.D. Men with early babies are 38% more likely than women with early babies to gain tenure (Mason & Goulden, 2002). The effects of having babies join their household more than five years after gaining a Ph.D. are less dramatic. Overall women with “late” babies and women who do not have children achieve tenure at the same rare. While this study indicated that babies make a significant difference to women in tenure track positions, academic work/life issues also have an effect on family planning.

In a subsequent follow up study, Mason and Goulden (2004) added to their earlier contentions by again using the longitudinal SDR to track faculty careers. The follow up study was augmented by a survey of the entire ladder-rank faculty employed in the University of California system. The authors found that only one in three women who take a tenure track university job before having a child will ever become a mother. Some female faculty members choose to delay motherhood while others choose to have fewer children than they wanted (Mason & Goulden, 2004). The research also indicated the stresses of tenure and academia disproportionately affect the relationships of female faculty members. Women who gain tenure are more than twice as likely as their male counterparts to be single 12 years after earning their doctorate. Female faculty are also more likely to become separated or divorced (Mason & Goulden, 2004). As the results indicate, the realities of childcare and family often prompt female faculty members to choose between becoming mothers and continuing their career in the professoriate. While issues of family life have longed plagued the careers of academics, they are causing great concerns in the nation's graduate schools. Issues such as life, work, and family are seminal issues among prospective faculty members. These issues threaten the professoriate as the pitfalls of balance between family and faculty life prompt many burgeoning academics to question the constructs of their profession.

Changing Expectations

As subsequent generations enter academia, they are becoming less willing to sacrifice family life. Using data from an extensive survey of University of California doctoral students, Mason, Goulden, and Frasch (2009) found that research-oriented universities are developing a bad reputation with doctoral students. When asked about their career plans, 84% of women and 74% of men were concerned about the "family-friendliness" of their employers. While both men

and women stated concerns about the family-friendliness of their employers, only 29% of female respondents thought that research-oriented institutions would promote a family-friendly environment. Increasingly, work/life issues and family concerns are pushing doctoral students toward an uncertain future as 48% of women and 35% of the men report that other life interests are pushing them away from careers in academe. For women especially, the decision to move away from the professoriate often focused on motherhood. Forty-six percent of the female respondents indicated issues related to children and work/life balance might eventually push them away from the academy (Mason, Goulden, & Frasch, 2009).

As the preceding studies indicated, graduate students and faculty members are concerned how a career in academia will affect their ability to balance their professional and personal responsibilities. Increasingly, newer generations of faculty members have a different approach to academia. They are willing to work to achieve tenure, but they also want more flexibility in order to gain a balance between their work and personal lives (Trower & Gallagher, 2009).

While some studies indicated the demands of research institutions push faculty toward community colleges, more information is needed to gain a greater understanding of how faculty who are socialized into the norms of a research institution cope with life as community college faculty members. In addition, it is also essential to understand how institutional work/life policy has mirrored evolving trends in family life and faculty work.

Family, Tenure, and Policy

As the demographics and expectations of academics have shifted in recent years, a number of studies have documented the need for more family-friendly policies (American Association of University Professors, 2001; Drago & Williams, 2000; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Hollenshead, Sullivan, Smith, August, & Hamilton, 2005). Ironically family-friendly

policies are necessary because of the nature of academic careers. While the common assumption posits that the flexibility of faculty work provides the perfect opportunity for family and work balance, the demands of the academic workplace often negate this perceived advantage (Sorcinelli & Near, 1989). In addition to everyday challenges and conflicts between work and life, the very structure of higher education is often at the center of faculty work/life balance issues. As a result, the central focus of most work/family policies at four-year institutions concerns tenure. Historically, tenure provided job security and academic freedom to faculty after they successfully complete a probationary period, which typically lasts six years. Paradoxically, tenure has also served to create an immense amount of faculty work/life stress.

While tenure has been historically beneficial to college faculty, it is modeled on outdated caregiver and gender norms (AAUP, 2001; Drago & Williams, 2000; Mason & Goulden, 2002). The tenure cycle is often burdensome to female faculty members because the quest for tenure often corresponds with the age and often the desire to begin family life. Accordingly, the outdated tenure model serves to jeopardize the career of faculty members who also serve as caregivers, regardless of gender. Although male faculty members are certainly pressed by the demands of academic work and tenure, women are most likely to be affected by tenure policies (Williams, 1999). While women in the 1990s entered graduate school in roughly the same proportions as men, they attain fewer than 15% of all tenured academic posts. Most often this is a result of outdated professional norms. As the academy took shape, women were largely excluded from professorships. As with other professions, the ideal faculty member was someone who worked without career interruptions such as childbearing and child-rearing (Williams, 1999). Accordingly, as faculty concerns have escalated, many institutions of higher education have implemented family-friendly policies both formally and informally over the past few

decades in an attempt to aid faculty with caregiving responsibilities (Quinn, 2010). Although many of these policies are designed to assist faculty members as they try to achieve a greater work/life balance, the realities of life at research institutions demand that the majority of these policies focus on the reconfiguration of tenure. Policies such as tenure clock extensions and part-time tenure models have sought to ease the pressures that are inherent in traditional tenure models (Drago & William, 2000; Quinn, 2010). While the availability of flexible tenure options has accelerated, the increase in policies does not always translate into increased faculty work/life balance and satisfaction.

Although new tenure policies increased opportunities for family leave, they have often been underutilized. Quinn (2010) sought to assess these policy changes as she investigated the usefulness of tenure clock extension policies in both supporting and retaining faculty. The results indicated less than a quarter of all faculty in the sample received a tenure clock extension. Of those who received an extension, 32% were women and 18% were men. Extension recipients also differed by academic field. Thirty-one percent of the recipients were in the arts and humanities, while the lowest percentage of recipients (14%) were in STEM fields. These statistics revealed the importance of understanding the relationship between work/life balance and academic discipline. Also, of the 11 faculty members who received tenure clock extensions, the reasons for their extension differed by gender. Forty-two percent of women received tenure clock extensions for personal or family reasons, while 68% percent of men gained tenure clock extensions for professional reasons. These differences highlight that although family norms and responsibilities have undergone some change, women still often are most responsible for caregiving.

While tenure clock extension policies gained more acceptance in the 1970s and 1980s, in recent decades scholars of both labor and higher education have touted the need for even greater tenure flexibility (Drago & Williams, 2000; Hochschild, 1989; Williams, 1999). Although policies such as tenure extensions are somewhat beneficial, they are inherently gender biased. Most often the timing of tenure is not advantageous for women as the average age at which women can expect to receive a Ph.D. is 34. As a result, the “tenure clock” often begins at the end of the reproductive cycle (Drago & Williams, 2000). Essentially, the formative years of child rearing and the decisive years of academia are in constant conflict. In response, many academics begin to look at ways to alter the traditional tenure norms to adequately reflect a more modern approach to work and family.

While some institutions have enacted tenure clock extension policies, it is often difficult to get faculty utilize them. Quinn, Lange, and Riskin (2004) interviewed 12 faculty at The University of Washington to investigate tenure clock extension policies. The results indicated faculty often have problems initiating their leave at the department level. This is due in large part because changing institutional policy does not automatically mean that departmental culture will accept part-time tenure track faculty. Furthermore, because these policies are relatively new, faculty members and administrators do not have experience in their implementation (Quinn et al., 2004). In addition to the lack of guidelines, research also indicated that the faculty are often unwilling to take part in leave policies because they believe they will be stereotyped as poor colleagues (Drago, et al., 2005). These findings indicated policy implementation is only the first step in creating family-friendly work environments.

Getting faculty to take advantage of programs such as part-time tenure track, tenure clock extension, and leave can be challenging (Drago et al, 2005; Quinn, Lange, & Olswang, 2004).

To gain a greater understanding of faculty members' unwillingness to use family policies, Drago and colleagues (2004) conducted an extensive nationwide study administered to 4,188 faculty at 507 institutions. The results of their study indicated that family commitments often make it difficult to achieve both career and family success simultaneously (Drago et al., 2004). The survey also revealed that a large percent of women delayed childbirth or often had fewer children in order to maintain their academic careers (Drago et al., 2004). These results delve into the key aspects of family and academic work. Faculty members feel an inherent unspoken bias against caregivers. Even as family-friendly policies expand, faculty members fear reprisals for attending to their families (Drago et al., 2004; Mason & Goulden, 2004). While biases and work/life issues are pervasive given the demands of research and tenure, many of these concerns are present among all college faculty. Given the expansion of community colleges and the change in family norms, it is important to not only expand work/life policies, but to also to understand how aspects of faculty socialization impact work, life, and community college faculty.

Although the aforementioned studies center on university faculty and their "tenure clocks," a large contingent of faculty members work at teaching-centered institutions. Even though these faculty members do not often face the pressures of publication, they face many of the same issues as their university counterparts. While faculty at liberal arts colleges, comprehensive institutions, and community colleges face work/life balance issues, few studies seek to frame work/life balance issues in these contexts.

Work/Life Balance: Beyond the Research Setting

Although limited, research on faculty work at liberal arts colleges suggest that these faculty are most often focused on teaching but they also engage in a fair amount of research (Baldwin, 1990; Clark, 1987). In contrast, faculty work at community colleges is often shaped

by heavy teaching loads and the need to serve a diverse student population (Twombly & Townsend, 2008). While faculty work varies by institutional type, it is often difficult to gain a clear understanding of how institutional type affects faculty work/life balance. Wolf-Wendel and Ward (2006) interviewed female assistant professors employed at research universities, comprehensive institutions, liberal arts colleges, and community colleges who had children who were five years old or younger. While the findings highlighted commonalities across the various institutions, their research revealed significant differences across institutional type (Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006).

At research universities, faculty were most often concerned with issues of tenure and research. At comprehensive institutions, faculty members suffered from tenure stress, but also discussed the need for being productive in terms of teaching and service. Conversely, the liberal arts and community college faculty spoke more favorably about their ability to balance their work and family life. Many of the community college faculty members in the study discussed how they intentionally moved to community college work in an effort to obtain a greater balance between their work and family. While the community college respondents were more often satisfied with their work/life balance, it is also noteworthy that some of these faculty were gauging their community college work/life experiences in relation to their former careers (Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006). As a result, while community college faculty face many of the same issues that concern faculty at four year institutions, their teaching-focused role makes comparisons with four-year faculty problematic.

Work, Life and the Community College

Paralleling their four-year counterparts, community college work/life studies frequently focus on issues central to female faculty. Wolf-Wendel, Ward, and Twombly (2007) echoed the

themes of gender and caregiving in their qualitative study of 30 community college women faculty with children. The findings indicated that the participants felt like the community college environment offered the best chance to fulfill their needs in teaching at the postsecondary level while also enabling them to balance family demands. The respondents also specified they felt that the four-year sector would have never provided them the possibility to balance their family and professional lives. The researchers indicated this contentment may stem from the fact that so many of their participants had worked in professional contexts outside of academia. The flexibility inherent in academic life moved them toward a career change (Wolf-Wendel et al., 2007).

These findings are consistent with contentions made by Townsend (1998) in her study of 113 female faculty members employed by the Chicago City Colleges about community college satisfaction. An overwhelming percentage (70%) of the respondents revealed they were satisfied with their employment. Respondents also commented they considered the community college environment ideal because it provided autonomy, a teaching-centric focus, and flexible scheduling that facilitated caregiving.

In contrast to the aforementioned studies, Sallee (2008) contended while many faculty gravitated toward two-year institutions in hopes of achieving a greater work/life balance, the findings in her study also suggest community college faculty also face serious work and family issues. The results of her study indicated that the faculty feel overworked and undervalued by their institution. Mirroring previous studies, 72% of the faculty chose to work in a community college to gain a greater balance between their personal and professional lives. Despite consciously seeking an improved work/life balance environment, the faculty reported they were often overwhelmed by their multiple responsibilities (Sallee, 2008). These negative perceptions

also extended to their institutional and departmental climates as only 17% of the participants agreed the college encouraged faculty to balance their personal and professional lives. Findings indicated that while the campus offered some family-friendly policies, the campus administration failed to disseminate this information to their faculty. In addition, the results of the study may also indicate that like their four-year counterparts, community college faculty were also hesitant to take advantage of existing work life policies because of bias avoidance (Drago et al., 2005). Sallee's (2008) findings highlight the deficit in community college work/life programs.

While many research institutions have enacted more family-friendly policies, community colleges lag behind. In a survey of 255 colleges and universities, Hollenshead, Sullivan, Smith, August, and Hamilton (2005) found that research institutions have 2.99 family-friendly policies per campus, while community colleges 0.80 policies for campus. Additionally, of the 30 community colleges surveyed, 50% offered no family policies, 37% offered one policy, and 7% offered two. Of the policies offered by community colleges, 43% indicated they had unpaid leave beyond the Family and Medical Leave Act. Other policies such as part-time job share, reduced appointment, pay dependent care, and tenure clock stoppage received little attention with the majority of community college respondents indicated their college did not offer policies beyond the FMLA. (Hollenshead, et al., 2005).

While the results on community college work/life balance and satisfaction have proved incongruous, this may be in large part because they are often framed against the constructs of the private sector and four-year faculty life. Therefore, while many community college faculty members perceive that community colleges offer better work/life environments, these contentions do not necessarily reflect the beliefs of all community college faculty. In addition, while it is certainly important for work/life studies to continue to focus on issues such as gender,

tenure, and policy use, it is also essential that future work/life studies also include departmental and academic disciplinary factors. Regardless of institutional size and mission, the study of academic disciplines is central to understanding how faculty perceive work and family balance.

Academic Discipline and Culture

Since faculty are most strongly socialized to the norms of their academic discipline, an analysis of disciplinary culture may give insight into faculty work/life issues as the creation of a powerful and distinct disciplinary culture gives rise to a close knit culture that often overshadows other personal, institutional, and interdisciplinary relationships (Becher, 1987). Ladd and Lipset (1975) described the intimacy of this intellectual relationship in their definition of the nature of academic disciplines:

Academic disciplines are units of association in which faculty members spend large portions of their professional lives. These associations are personal. A professor will often know members of his [or her] field at universities across the country better than he [or she] will know most people in other departments at his [or her] own university. But his [or her] associations within his [or her] field are with the bodies of ideas, interests, norms and values, and professional styles as well. (p. 56)

As a result, the personal relationships and close nature of academic disciplines and departments most often define faculty members.

Historically the academic world was often divided into two principal cultures consisting of the sciences and the humanities. Biglan (1973) suggested that disciplines might be characterized as hard or soft and applied or pure. Traditionally the divide between hard and soft sciences is in the inability of soft science to draw concrete research conclusions. Biglan (1973) and Becher (1987) characterized the physical sciences as both hard and pure, promoting a faculty

culture that is both competitive and well-organized. The humanities are characterized as soft and pure, inclusive of faculty who are concerned with understanding and interpretation. As a discipline, humanities faculty are often more individualistic and people-oriented. Applied sciences, such as mechanical engineering, are described as both hard and applied. Their disciplinary culture is pragmatic and often entrepreneurial. Finally, the applied social sciences such as education are categorized as a soft utilitarian science whose practitioners are uncertain in their academic status (Becher, 1987; Biglan, 1973). Clark (1987) concurred with these categorizations as he asserted the cultures of individual disciplines give rise to behaviors that are exhibited by both individuals and academic departments. He contended that most great differences in academic life often appear between the humanities and the sciences (Clark, 1987).

While differences in discipline explain nuances in faculty culture, these differences begin to take shape as soon as prospective faculty members enter graduate school. Austin (2002) found that faculty are socialized to adhere to a discipline-specific culture. She found that students in the hard sciences more frequently participated in group research while students in the humanities and soft sciences tended to cultivate more individual faculty relationships. In addition, students in the hard sciences participated in more research while graduate students in the humanities and social sciences frequently concentrated on teaching and instruction (Austin, 2002). Disciplinary socialization has created strong subcultures within institutions that have given rise to distinctive disciplinary cultures (Tierney, 1988; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). These cultures, in turn, have a dramatic impact not only on how individual faculty perceive work/life policies, but also highlight gender inequity that remains a constant issue in work/life research.

Discipline and Work/Life Balance

While some work/life studies have included academic departments and disciplines as variables (Drago & Williams, 2000; Reddick et al., 2011; Mason & Goulden, 2002; Perna, 2001; Quinn, 2010; Quinn et al., 2004; Wolf-Wendel et al., 2007), little research has focused on understanding how discipline may actually affect faculty work/life balance. Although studies of work/life are often constructed to include a broad range of disciplines, their inclusion is often aimed at gaining a representative sample. A few examples, however, serve to illustrate work/life issues by discipline.

Mason and Goulden's (2002) study on the effects of babies on academic careers and work/life pointed out that gender continues to be an issue in the hard sciences. Their study determined the even 12 to 14 years after receiving their PhD, there is an overall 24% gap between the tenure rate of men and women. The researchers also ascertained that the same phenomenon exists in the humanities and the social sciences, but the gap in tenure achievement between men and women who have babies is closer to 20% (Mason & Goulden, 2002). Again, these differences underscore the need for understanding how academic discipline affects faculty work/life balance issues. Similarly, Quinn, Lange, and Riskin (2004) surmised that departmental issues often affect the way faculty utilize institutional work/family policies because they often have to negotiate their time off in addition to their departmental status. The process of part-time tenure is further hindered by an existing academic culture that values full-time tenure track progression (Drago, et al., 2005).

While the preceding studies highlighted disciplinary variances, few studies delved into the disciplinary attributes that impact faculty work/ life balance. Furthermore, even less is known about how academic discipline affects the work/life balance of community college

faculty. While few studies addressed how academic discipline affects community college work/life balance, research suggested that discipline and culture are key components in understanding faculty behavior. Accordingly, in order to understand how community college discipline and culture affect community college work/life balance, this study sought to understand how socialization theory can be used to explain community college faculty culture.

Socialization as a Cultural Framework: Understanding Organizations and Faculty Life

In order to gain a greater understanding about how socialization theory can be utilized to understand the work/life balance issues of community college faculty, I examined the relevant literature on socialization to highlight the evolution of socialization theories and how these theories can be used to better understand the faculty socialization process. This study utilized Tierney and Rhoads' (1994) conceptualization of socialization as a cultural framework. I began with a discussion of socialization as cultural framework inclusive of an analysis that highlighted the paradigm shift from the modernist to the postmodernist perspective. I continued with an analysis of the stages of organizational socialization followed by an examination of the dimensions of organizational socialization. I concluded with an explanation of how socialization framed this study.

To gain a clear understanding of socialization as a cultural framework, it is also necessary to understand the differing interpretive positions that have given rise to understanding socialization through a cultural lens. Modernist assumptions were predicated on the notion that an organization's culture is coherent. This assumption implies that all people within a culture are the same. As a result, socialization gets viewed as a unitary, one-size-fits-all process. Under this modernist assumption, the purpose of socialization is organizational assimilation. For faculty, the modernist assumption would focus on how faculty are socialized by their

surroundings (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). In essence, faculty are expected to conform to the standard norms and practices of the existing culture.

Conversely, a postmodern perspective posits that culture is not waiting to be discovered and acquired. Postmodernists contend that an organization's culture derives from the knowledge of each person who is engaged in the socialization process. This is a key facet in understanding organizational socialization as a cultural process. Because cultural socialization is bidirectional, organizational culture is constantly being re-created. Thus the notion of a re-created culture transcends the modernist perception of socialization as knowledge has multiple perspectives (Creswell, 2007).

Tierney (1988, 1991, 1997) suggested that socialization is an interpretive process involved in the creation, rather than the transmittal, of meaning. Culture is not discovered, but rather the socialization process involves a bidirectional acculturation where new organizational members make sense of an organization through their own unique perspectives, contexts, and backgrounds (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Consequently, the postmodern view of socialization as culture can best explain how faculty from differing backgrounds interpret the socialization process. The postmodern view of socialization can also be used to explain how faculty are actively engaged in creating academic cultures. Invariably, faculty socialization and the creation of academic culture occur in two interrelated socialization processes.

As new students enter higher education, they become accustomed to the organization's norms and values. As students evolve into members of the professoriate, they undergo an extensive process of socialization. Faculty socialization is a multistage process that includes an anticipatory stage and an organizational stage. Anticipatory socialization may occur during graduate schools or as prospective faculty move into the professoriate while organizational

socialization occurs when a faculty member become acclimated to their new institution's values and culture (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). I discuss each stage here in greater detail.

The Anticipatory Stage

The first stage of organizational socialization involves anticipatory learning on the part of the individual (Van Maanen, 1976). Anticipatory socialization pertains to how nonmembers take on the attitudes, actions, and values of the groups to which they aspire (Bess, 1978; Merton, 1957; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Also, the anticipatory socialization process may serve the function of aiding prospective members' rise into their desired group. This process may ease the adjustment after the individual gains group acceptance. For example, as graduate students become familiar with professional mores such as academic research and paper presentations, they become part of the culture to which they aspired. In addition, new faculty members also experience anticipatory socialization as they begin their academic careers. Accordingly, they may also act to redefine their professional culture as the process of socialization is not mono-directional. As new members are socialized into a new group or setting, they also begin to redefine the group to which they now belong (Tierney, 1988). For prospective members of the professoriate, this process accelerates during graduate school as students begin to anticipate the roles and behaviors they must emulate to succeed as faculty members. Consequently, as graduate students progress thorough their respective programs, they begin to acquire the values, norms, attitudes, and beliefs that are associated with their profession (Bess, 1978).

For future faculty members, graduate training serves as a significant force in socializing them into the roles and expectations of faculty life. How future faculty members interact with students and colleagues, choose conferences, and select journals and books are initially learned from their peers and mentors in graduate school (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Although these

aspects of anticipatory socialization are often viewed as beneficial, Tierney and Rhoads (1994) also cautioned that these elements might not transition into the culture of another organization. For example, the training community college faculty receive in graduate school may not prepare them for their new role. Regardless, new members of the professoriate will undergo continued organizational socialization as they move from graduate students to faculty members.

The Second Stage: Organizational Socialization

As faculty members move from graduate school to their new organizations they began to experience the process of organizational socialization. Organizational socialization is a cultural process that entails an exchange of patterns of thought and action. As a process, socialization is ongoing, but occurs most visibly when new recruits enter the organization (Schein, 1971). Therefore, as new faculty members enter the ranks of the professoriate they undergo organizational socialization in two phases: the entry phase and the role continuance phase (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994).

The initial or entry phase occurs as applicants are selected and continues through to their initial employment while the role continuance phase begins after the individual is firmly entrenched in the organization. During the entry phase, activities that occurred during the anticipatory phase of socialization are most dominant. For example, as community college faculty move into the entry phase upon their employment, the traits they have learned as graduate students are most often dominant. Therefore, the anticipatory stage coupled with the entry phase helps continue to create faculty members that already understand the demands of their tasks and the requirements of their performance (Van Maanen, 1984). As a result, new faculty are acclimated to disciplinary and professional norms prior to becoming faculty members. This transition can often be problematic. Tierney and Rhoads (1994) suggested that when

anticipatory socialization is consistent with the values of the new organization's culture, new faculty members will experience a socialization process that affirms the individual qualities that he or she brought to the organization. Conversely, if these values and mores learned during the anticipatory process are inconsistent with the culture of the new organization, the socialization process will be more transformative in nature. For example, entry into community college culture is often transformative as the research-intensive training received during graduate school is incompatible with the teaching centric culture inherent in two-year institutions. In this case, as new faculty members undergo transformation, they will incorporate the values of the new organization as they move through the entry process into the role continuance phase (Corcoran & Clark, 1984). Conversely, faculty who resist often have trouble as they move into the role continuance phase and ultimately may leave the institution..

Movement into the role continuance phase generally indicates that faculty are ready to attain the necessary academic and cultural skills needed to gain tenure. Although these skills such as conference presentations and initial publication efforts were instituted during the anticipatory phase, the continuance phase focuses these efforts toward academic tenure. In addition, tenured faculty also become socialized to the responsibilities of academic leadership. During this phase, faculty serve on committees and obtain academic roles that perpetuate and build upon the learned experiences of the anticipatory phase. While entry into the organizational phase may be reaffirming for faculty at research institutions, for faculty entering teaching-focused institutions the process of organizational socialization is often very different from the culture they experienced in graduate school. For example, while graduate school tends to prepare faculty for a life of research, faculty who embark on careers at community colleges are often unprepared for their new role. Accordingly, it is essential that institutional leaders

understand the importance of faculty socialization with respect to their own academic culture. When organizational members do not make their culture explicit to new faculty members, they assume faculty are all interpreting institutional culture in the same way (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Therefore, it is essential that faculty leaders and administrators understand the socialization process.

The Dimensions of Organizational Socialization

In order to foster a greater understanding of organizational socialization, Van Maanen and Schein (1979) proposed six tactical strategies for interpreting organizational socialization. These dimensions are useful in understanding the experience of faculty as they transition from one role to another. Specifically, these strategies offer insight into how the socialization process is experienced by both faculty members and their organizations. These dimensions include: 1) the collective versus individual; 2) formal versus informal; 3) sequential versus random; 4) fixed versus variable; 5) serial versus disjunctive; and 6) investiture versus divestiture.

Collective versus Individual

Collective socialization refers to the tactic of taking a group of individuals and putting them through a set of common experiences. Good examples of collective socialization can be found in military organizations, fraternal orders, business training, and graduate schools (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Conversely, individual socialization refers to the tactic of processing individuals in isolation from one another in order to produce a unique set of experiences. Apprenticeship programs, internships, and on-the-job training serve as examples where the individual is expected to learn organizationally-defined roles on their own (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). While faculty members can experience both aspects of this process, individual socialization more aptly describes the experiences of faculty in the vast majority of colleges and

universities. Faculty are generally hired on a departmental basis with little coordination across organizational boundaries. While some institutions provide campus-wide orientation and development programs, faculty experiences are generally individualized experiences (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). For example, while community college faculty may receive a campus-wide orientation, most often their transition from a research orientation will occur through interactions with individual faculty members. In addition to individual socialization, faculty are also confronted with both formal and informal aspects of the organizational socialization process.

Formal Versus Informal Socialization

Although faculty members undergo a process of formal socialization from graduate classes to institutional programs, it is often informal relationships and experiences that give rise to faculty expectations and beliefs. Formal socialization refers to a method in which a newcomer is essentially segregated from regular organizational members while being put through a set of experiences customized explicitly for the new recruit. For community college faculty, this process can involve the appointment of a mentor who serves to socialize new recruits to both college and departmental behaviors. While formal socialization is a component of faculty orientation, it may not always be the most effective. While faculty members undergo aspects of formal socialization, faculty socialization most often occurs through informal means (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Although faculty members attend college-wide human resources and development programs, they are most often socialized through individual relationships. Often, the tactics inherent in the informal socialization process put new recruits in a position where they select their own socialization agents. For example, new faculty members will often seek out members of the faculty who they deem experienced and successful. This selection is crucial as the success of the socialization process is largely determined by the relevant knowledge

possessed by the established faculty member (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Therefore, although there is a great deal of freedom afforded to recruits in the informal process, the recruits are put into a position where they must trust the knowledge base and instincts of their informal mentors.

As a result, aspects of individual and informal socialization are more powerful techniques in shaping behavior than the formal and collective modes because they involve practical, on-the-job training as well as mentoring by people who are already doing the work (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). In contrast, processes of formal socialization are often enacted by personnel whose credibility is lacking in the eyes of new recruits. Consequently, new faculty members are more influenced by the associations they make in their own departments rather than by overall socialization programs enacted by college human resource specialists. While informal policies are often the most attractive and convenient, formal processes can also be useful if given the proper time and attention.

Random Versus Sequential

Another tactical dimension in the organizational socialization process relates to a sequential versus random approach. Random socialization pertains to a progression of ambiguous steps, which lead to a targeted role (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). While the goal may be clearly stated, the steps needed to achieve the goal are undefined. Conversely, sequential socialization involves expressed and defined steps for achieving an organizational role. Sequential socialization is a more ordered course of action that is rooted in the formal and collective aspects of the socialization process (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Sequential socialization is most likely ordered within hierarchical boundaries. These boundaries are organized from the outset and are based on the assumption that higher level positions cannot be

fulfilled until lower level ones have been first satisfied. Inherently, known hierarchies preserve sequential socialization efforts to maintain the image of the hierarchy itself (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). A good example of the process is the way in which faculty are promoted and receive tenure. Although the process of promotion and tenure contain temporal aspects, they may also be the most difficult for newcomers to understand. While the sequential process may protect the position of hierarchies, it may not always give aspiring recruits a clear notion of the organization.

Recruits that encounter various socialization experiences randomly may be exposed to a more diverse group of views and perceptions associated with the next target role. The diversity associated with these experiences gives the aspiring recruit a better appreciation for the task that lies ahead. As a result, Van Maanen and Schein (1979) argued that an organization that wishes to groom innovative personnel should encourage a more ad hoc training process. This type of random socialization also benefits faculty members. Although the faculty tenure process exemplifies sequential socialization, their associations with informal mentors also illustrate the importance that random socialization has on the career of faculty members. Faculty members need this type of informal support because their ascent through the professoriate is often unsettled as faculty members undergo a professional socialization pathway that is both fixed and variable.

Fixed Versus Variable Socialization

The fixed versus variable socialization process refers to whether the timetable related to ascending through different organizational roles is set or variable (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Fixed socialization provides employees with the precise time that it will take to complete a given passage (Roth, 1963). As a result, while organizations may specify various career paths and

different timetables, all of these pathways will be temporally fixed. Fixed socialization can be viewed through the lens of secondary education as a student needs 13 years of schooling to obtain the status of a high school graduate. For higher education, pre-tenure faculty members experience fixed socialization as the tenure process is fixed in relation to accepted expectations (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994).

In contrast, variable socialization gives new recruits few indications as to when to expect passage into the next stage. As a result, upward mobility as it pertains to careers or professional schools are marked by a variable socialization process that contains many uncontrollable factors (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Obtaining a Ph.D. might be considered a type of variable socialization in that the process involves rites of passage that are often unclear and variable. Accordingly, transitions from one faculty role to another are generally a mix of both fixed and variable processes. While the tenure process may be fixed, a faculty member's passage from associate professor to full professor is more individualistic and variable (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994).

Serial Versus Disjunctive Socialization

A serial socialization process is one in which experienced members of the organization grooms newcomers who are about to assume similar kinds of positions within the organization. In contrast, a disjunctive process lacks the mentoring relationship of the serial process. Serial socialization involves experienced members serving as exemplars for new employees. This aspect of socialization is also most responsible for producing intergenerational stability patterns (Manning & Van Maanen, 1978; Rubinstein, 1973). As newcomers follow the patterns and behaviors of experienced organizational members, they perpetuate the culture of the organization that has preceded their arrival. Although newcomers often follow existing organizational mores,

they may also embark on a more disjunctive process of socialization. The disjunctive process does not reproduce organizational values due to a lack of supervision (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

Newcomers do not follow in the footsteps of their predecessors in a disjunctive socialization process (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Although the disjunctive process does not contain a high level of management and mentoring, this process is more likely to produce innovation as it is unencumbered by the existing viewpoints and values of the organization. However, while the serial process risks stagnation, it is often essential to the development of new faculty members. Although aspects of serial socialization are important, they are also problematic for underrepresented groups since issues of gender, race, and sexual orientation may make the mentoring process more difficult (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Accordingly, socialization as it pertains to these issues is important because the process can serve to embrace or marginalize the backgrounds and values of new organizational members. Van Maanen (1979) characterized the importance of this process as the final dimension of the organizational socialization process.

Investiture Versus Divestiture

Van Maanen's (1979) final socialization strategy concerned the degree to which the socialization process is constructed either to confirm or disconfirm the entering identity of new organizational members. Investiture is a process by which new organizational members incorporate the viability and usefulness of personal characteristics they bring with them to the organization. Organizations that employ this tactic do not wish to change the individual, but rather wish to take full advantage of the individual's uniqueness. As a result, these organizations wish to build upon the mores, attitudes, and values already possessed by new members (Van

Maanen, 1979). The process of investiture also affirms new organizational members' anticipatory socialization experiences. In contrast, divestiture is a socialization process that seeks to deny and eradicate personal characteristics and anticipatory socialization experiences. The divestiture process seeks to be more transformational as it strips away personal characteristics that are viewed as incompatible with established organizational philosophy (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). This process is essential to new faculty members as they reinforce or call into question their previous professional experiences and personal values.

Tierney and Rhoads (1994) contended that when newcomers take their first faculty positions, one of three institutional patterns may emerge. The institution may encourage and reinforce the previous experiences of new faculty members, the institution may serve as gate keepers in order to maintain the status quo, or they may take a transformative stance in an attempt to restructure the new faculty member's values and beliefs. Aspects of investiture and divestiture may occur at the same time. Organizations may accept aspects of previous anticipatory and organizational socialization that they deem desirable while simultaneously marginalizing the new faculty member's individual characteristics. As a result, dominant organizational norms, values, and beliefs are often reproduced. This aspect of organizational socialization is especially troubling to underrepresented groups as their personal characteristics and anticipatory experiences may be incongruent with the dominant values of the organization (Tierney, 1988; Tierney & Rhoads 1994; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). This process can also be daunting for community college faculty as they make the transition from graduate students trained at research universities to teaching focused faculty members. While the transition to new organizational norms may be troubling for community college faculty members, understanding how these strategies and dimensions impact community college faculty serves as useful tool,

elucidating the importance of how faculty socialization affects the work/life balance of community college faculty.

Socialization Agents and Community College Faculty

As potential faculty members make the transition from graduate student to faculty member, they are affected by both faculty members and peers (Austin, 2002; Becher & Trowler, 2001). In their study of graduate students, Bieber and Worley (2006) contended that the concept of faculty life is often formed before graduate school:

Once a script of an ideal faculty life was formed, it proved to be almost unshakeable and exhibited an immense staying power in our respondents' lives. The largely positive script of faculty life tended to be formed during the undergraduate years. Once established and modified to include our respondents' own image of self-as-faculty, this "script of an ideal faculty life" continued to exist relatively un-changed for the vast majority of our respondents, despite subsequent negative experiences or conflicting information encountered in graduate school. (p. 1032)

While students might find the socialization process in graduate school daunting, many of the disciplinary attributes that will define them as faculty members are cemented through contact with both peers and faculty mentors. Austin's (2002) research indicated that disciplinary context also plays a critical role in graduate students' socialization to the academic profession as relationships between faculty members and graduate students differ across disciplines. In addition, faculty members from different disciplines have different career and research expectations. Graduate students in the sciences, for example, more frequently participate in research teams while students in the humanities and social sciences have more one-to-one relationships with faculty members. Students in the sciences have more research assistantships

whereas graduate students in the humanities and social sciences frequently have more teaching assistantships. Teaching assistants in humanities or social sciences are more likely to teach sections on their own while teaching assistants in the sciences typically lead labs sections rather than teaching entire classes (Austin, 2002). Although graduate students' peers and faculty advisors represent an important part of the early socialization process, as potential faculty members move from recruitment to employment, their new colleagues assume a more prominent role in the socialization process. While there are new socialization agents as graduate students become faculty members, academic discipline and department still represent the most powerful influences in faculty culture (Tierney & Rhoads 1994).

In general, the academic department is at the center of the faculty recruitment and selection process (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Applications are reviewed at the departmental level and potential faculty candidates are required to make a presentation of their research or present a lecture that highlights an expertise in their academic discipline. As a result, the role of the discipline in the recruitment, selection, and socialization process highlights the influence of disciplinary culture. While disciplinary factors are at the forefront of the faculty hiring and socialization process, Tierney and Rhoads (1994) cautioned that institutional norms impact faculty life. The culture of an institution may differ from what faculty members have previously learned. Problems may arise when new faculty members who are oriented toward a research-focused disciplinary culture are hired at teaching-oriented institutions. For example, faculty who are socialized at research institutions may have trouble adapting to community college culture. As a result, because disciplinary culture is often the most powerful agent of socialization, new community college faculty members often rely on their departmental colleagues.

While collegial discourse and advice is often helpful, new community college faculty members often struggle to understand the values of their new culture. New faculty members are simultaneously learning how to adapt to the academic nuances of community college culture while also trying to understand the norms of institutional life. Although the socialization process is bi-directional, the influence of community college academic and institutional norms produce a culture that is unique to the community college setting. The resulting culture will give rise to issues and challenges that are often specific to community college faculty.

The preceding review of socialization literature and theory indicated that the process of socialization is an important component in understanding faculty life. Accordingly, this dissertation sought to gain a greater understanding of community college faculty work/life balance issues by implementing socialization theory to understand how aspects of community college culture and academic discipline affect the work/life balance of community college faculty. Understanding community college work/life balance issues through socialization theory could help explain work/life conflict in the community college setting. Concomitantly, understanding how faculty transition to their roles as community college instructors may give further insight into their work/life issues. As faculty move from graduate school into community college life, they are socialized into the norms of their new institutions. Furthermore, as faculty are socialized into their respective academic and institutional cultures, they often face work/life issues that are different from their four-year counterparts. As a result, this study sought to gain a greater understanding of community college work/life issues by employing a qualitative case study design discussed in the following chapter.

Chapter III: Methodology

While the predominance of work/life literature has focused on work/life balance issues as they pertain to research institutions (Mason & Goulden, 2002, 2004; Mason, Goulden & Frasch, 2009; Quinn, 2010; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989), this study sought to gain a greater understanding of how work/life issues affect community college faculty. Although a scant amount of research has focused on community college work/life issues (Perna, 2001; Saltee, 2008; Townsend & LaPaglia, 2000; Wolf-Wendel, Ward, & Twombly, 2007), the prevailing themes of these studies have often mirrored work conducted about four-year faculty. This is problematic because community colleges have their own unique culture that may serve to create work/life balance issues that are specific to their environment. While it is certainly important for work/life studies to continue to focus on issues such as gender, tenure, and policy at research institutions, the purpose of this dissertation was to gain a greater understanding of community college faculty work/life balance issues. While there have been studies on how discipline affects faculty life (Austin, 2002; Becher, 1987; Biglan, 1973; Clark, 1987; Ladd & Lipset, 1975; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994), little scholarship has focused on how discipline affects faculty work/life balance. Accordingly, in order to understand how issues of faculty socialization and academic discipline affect the ability of community college faculty to balance their personal and professional lives, the following purpose statement and research questions guided this study.

Purpose Statement and Research Questions

The purpose of this dissertation was to gain a greater understanding of community college faculty work/life balance issues. As a result, I sought to not only identify community college work/life issues, but I utilized Tierney and Rhoads' (1994) faculty socialization theory to help explain how aspects of community college culture created work/life balance issues that are specific to that environment. Further, I was also interested in investigating how socialization

theory may explain differences by academic discipline, particularly in terms of work/life balance issues. Accordingly, the following research questions guided this study:

1. What are the work/life issues experienced by community college faculty?
2. How do community college work/life balances differ by academic discipline?
3. How does socialization theory help explain the work/life balance issues experienced by community college faculty?
4. How are socialization theory, academic discipline, and community college work/life balance issues interrelated?

In chapter three, I outlined the methodology I used to understand how faculty socialization and academic discipline affect the ability of community faculty to balance their professional and personal lives. First, I summarized the research design and then detailed case study, the methodological approach utilized in this study. I discussed data collection techniques and data analysis procedures and concluded with a statement of reflexivity and a discussion of trustworthiness.

Research Design

To gain a greater understanding of community college work/life balance issues, I employed a qualitative case study approach. Qualitative inquiries are especially useful when researchers want to understand the meaning, situations, and actions from the participant's perspective. This focus on meaning is central to what social scientists refer to as an interpretive approach (Creswell, 2007; Geertz, 1973; Yanow, 2000; Yin, 1994). Qualitative research is most often interpretive in nature as it assumes that reality is socially constructed. As a result, researchers do not discover knowledge; they construct it (Creswell, 2007). This focus on interpretation and perspective is a key component of qualitative research as this approach does

not simply produce an account of events but rather focuses on the participants' perspectives of events or phenomena (Maxwell, 1992). Although qualitative researchers strive to understand the perceptions of their participants, the inductive nature of qualitative inquiry places the researcher in an interpretative role (Merriam, 2009).

As a result, the use of qualitative methods such as case studies often allows the researcher to understand complex events within the context that they occur (Yin, 2009). Although qualitative researchers can strengthen the reliability and validity of their findings through careful research design, they also acknowledge that universal truths cannot be easily found in the study of human affairs (Flyvbjerg, 2006; Merriam, 2009). Therefore, this study utilized a qualitative case study approach not in the interest of uncovering universal truths, but rather to discover knowledge and phenomena that are often context dependent (Flyvbjerg, 2006). It is this attention to investigating and interpreting bounded phenomena in their own context that makes case study an excellent design tool for understanding faculty work/life balance issues.

Furthermore, the complexity and specificity of community college work/life issues make a qualitative embedded case study approach ideal for examining how faculty socialization and issues of academic discipline affect faculty work/ life balance issues. While a holistic approach might foster an understanding of overall institutional work/life balance issues, an embedded case study design is more useful in understanding the nuances and contexts of faculty work/life issues as they pertain to academic disciplines. An embedded design allows for greater flexibility of design and acknowledges the subtleties of organizational structure, such as academic disciplines. As Yin (2009) argued, the use of the embedded case study approach “increases sensitivity to subunits” (p. 52). Subunits are smaller units of study focused on elements such as people or organizational divisions (Yin, 2009). This aspect of embedded case study is important as

researchers can study work/life issues at the individual, departmental, and institutional level. As a result, this study employed an embedded design in order gain a greater perspective of community college work/life balance issues. Furthermore, single case studies may also be appropriate if the case is representative or typical. As a result, this study utilized a single case study approach because the condition and circumstances at the site of data collection, Southern State Community College (a pseudonym), are believed to be similar to that of other comparable institutions.

Research Setting

Research was conducted at Southern State Community College located in the Southeastern United States. In this section, I provide demographic information concerning the college's size and mission, and since this study focuses on work/life balance, I also provide information that gives an insight into faculty life at Southern State. The college enrolls approximately 6,900 students at nine campus locations. Southern State was chosen because it has a mission typical of community colleges. While Southern State possesses the autonomy to act in the best interest of its students and community, the college is governed by a statewide organization known as The State Board of Higher Education (a pseudonym). The State Board not only governs the 13 community colleges within the state, but also oversees 6 universities and 27 technology centers. The college focuses on career and technical training as well as offers transfer pathways and associate degrees in the humanities, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences. In addition to traditional face-to-face classes, the college offers a wide range of online and web-inclusive classes. The college employs 136 full-time faculty in five academic divisions.

In order to be eligible to obtain a tenure track academic position at Southern State, potential faculty members must possess at least a Master's degree and have completed 18 graduate credit hours in the discipline they wish to instruct. For example, if an individual possesses a Master's Degree in English and wishes to teach speech at Southern State, he or she may do so provided he or she have taken 18 graduate hours in speech-related courses.

Once employed, tenure track faculty undergo a systematic process of promotion and tenure as outlined by both Southern State and The State Board of Higher Education. In general, faculty undergo a tenure and promotion process that moves faculty through the ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor and professor. Unlike most 4-year faculty, employees at Southern State, like most community college faculty, often begin with the rank of instructor unless they are awarded a higher rank based on previous experience. Each year faculty are required to compose and submit an evaluation which outlines the activities of the previous year. The evaluation is divided into categories specific to community college work such as instruction, service/outreach, scholarship/creative activities/research. While all of these activities are assessed yearly, a greater emphasis is generally focused on aspects of teaching and instruction. Accordingly, faculty are also eligible for tenure after five years of service. The promotion and tenure process takes into account yearly evaluations by a faculty member's departmental dean. In addition to the dean, faculty members are also asked yearly about the progress of their new colleagues.

As the faculty undergo this yearly process of evaluation, they are also building a portfolio for the promotion and tenure process. The promotion process begins at year three as individual faculty move from one faculty rank to another. For example, if a faculty member is eligible for promotion from instructor to assistant professor, the faculty member must compile a portfolio

inclusive of their activities from the prior three years. The portfolio is available for each member of the department to evaluate. Following a period of evaluation, the faculty members gather as a department to vote on their colleague's promotion each spring. This same process is used in the evaluation of tenure as faculty compile their tenure portfolio after their fifth year. While all members of the department can vote on promotion, only tenured faculty members are allowed to participate in the tenure vote.

Reflective of this systemic approach to tenure and promotion, Southern State, in conjunction with the State Board of Higher Education, also sets guidelines for course syllabi. While the state and the institution create guidelines that require syllabi to contain similar information in regards to goals, outcomes, and compliance statements, the specific goals and objectives of each class are formulated at the disciplinary level inclusive of faculty input. While course syllabi must contain specific components, the faculty are also given academic freedom to choose the best methods and styles to meet their learning outcomes and objectives. For example, while syllabi in the sciences may contain learning objectives that require their students to have a working knowledge of the periodic table, the way in which the instructor meets and assesses these requirements is largely up to the discretion of each individual professor. This instructional autonomy is also outlined by an institutional and statewide policy on academic freedom and responsibility.

In addition to promotion, tenure, and teaching requirements that are similar to other community colleges of Southern State's location and mission, the college also reflects other similar institutions in regards to its leave policies and programs. As a result, family work/life policies at Southern State tend to mirror national community college trends in offering few work/life policies (Hollenshead, et al., 2005). While 12 month employees earn leave based on

their employment classification, faculty members are generally on nine month contracts which do not provide annual leave, but do contain provisions for other leave based on illness or family emergency. Other leave encompasses family and medical leave in which employees can take up to 12 workweeks of leave during a 12 month period for specified family and medical reasons. These provisions meet the criteria set out in the Family and Medical Leave Act. The college also grants maternity leave for a period of up to four months for female employees. Sick leave may be used in these instances in addition to any annual leave accrued. The college also offers provisions for leave in relation to civic responsibility and bereavement without loss of pay.

As a result of the aforementioned policies and procedures, the faculty at Southern State served as a typical case for this study as they mirror the policies and procedure of other area intuitions governed by The State Board of Higher Education. In addition, Southern State's policies and procedures also consistent with other community colleges in the southeastern region. This facet is important as Yin (2009) asserted one aspect for choosing a single case study is in choosing a case that is representative or typical so that the lessons learned from the case are assumed to be informative to similar persons or institutions.

Since this study sought to also determine how both faculty socialization and discipline affect community college work/life balance, I selected a sample that is representative of both English and Natural Science. I selected these disciplines because they reflect the historical cultural divide between the sciences and the humanities (Biglan, 1973). The science faculty are a part of the Mathematics and Sciences division which contains 14 full-time science faculty. The English faculty are part of the Humanities division which also contains language and fine arts faculty. Currently the Humanities department contains 14 full-time English faculty.

While four-year faculty in these disciplines may focus on publication and research, faculty at Southern State average fifteen teaching hours per semester. In English, fifteen teaching hours equates to five classes per semester and in science a fifteen hour load may equate to three lecture classes plus three laboratory sections. In addition, Southern State faculty teach entry level science and English classes that are comprised of freshmen and sophomore students. For example an English faculty member may teach a combination of composition and literature classes, while a science faculty member may teach classes such as biology or chemistry in addition to instruction in the laboratory. The average class size at Southern State is approximately 22 students.

Participant Selection

Participants were selected through purposeful sampling. Purposeful sampling can help establish comparisons, illuminate differences between settings and individuals, and test known research or theories (Maxwell, 1996). Essentially, qualitative researchers use purposeful sampling to select individuals and sites that are crucial to their understanding of the phenomena. In case studies, researchers often choose samples that best represent the diversity of the case from multiple perspectives (Creswell, 2007). While many quantitative forms of research require a more randomized approach to data collection, qualitative researchers generally opt for purposeful selection that is criterion-based (Maxwell, 1996; Patton, 1990). In addition, purposeful sampling is used to capture the heterogeneity intrinsic in the population. The purpose of gaining heterogeneity is to ensure the research conclusions represent the entire range and variation of the population, rather than only a small subset of the population. In order to achieve maximum variation (Lincoln & Guba, 1989), researchers first need to identify the relevant dimensions of variation in their research population.

Once faculty members from these disciplines were identified through the college's faculty directory, I sent out an email soliciting their participation (Appendix A). Participants were contacted through specific faculty listservs and through campus referrals. All of the faculty who responded were interviewed for this study. I confirmed faculty participation via email and through follow up phone conversations. In order to gain an inclusive picture of how community college work/life balance is affected by discipline, I interviewed eleven full-time faculty who had a least one child. Five of the faculty were from the English department while six of the faculty members represented the sciences. Interviewing faculty with these designations ensured homogeneity across the sample by focusing on relatively equal numbers of faculty members from both science and English who are parents of at least one child. Interviews took place until the point of saturation was reached (Creswell, 2007).

Description of Participants

The participants included five males and six females. One male and four female English faculty members were interviewed, while four males and two females represented the science faculty. One of the science faculty members identified as African American, while all five English faculty identified as Caucasian. All participants had at least one child. Six of the participants had earned Master's degrees and five faculty members possessed a doctorate. In regards to academic discipline, three of the science faculty and three of the English faculty had doctoral degrees.

The average length of faculty service was 17 years. Only one of the faculty members had less than ten years of service. Ten of the faculty members had served between 9 and 27 years. Six of the participants had completed over 20 years of services, and one had logged over 25

years as a faculty member at Southern State. A description of the participants (using pseudonyms) is presented below in Table 1.

Table 1

Description of Faculty Participants

Pseudonym	Discipline	Gender	Race	Highest Degree Earned	Longevity
Bob	Science	Male	Caucasian	Master's Degree	21years
Judy	Science	Female	Caucasian	Master's Degree	4 years
Leo	Science	Male	Caucasian	Doctorate	9 years
Mary	Science	Female	Caucasian	Master's Degree	24 years
Norm	Science	Male	African America	Doctorate	21 years
Oswald	Science	Male	Caucasian	Doctorate	12 years
Patty	English	Female	Caucasian	Master's Degree	22 years
Sally	English	Female	Caucasian	Master's Degree	27 years
Tim	English	Male	Caucasian	Doctorate	14 years
Velma	English	Female	Caucasian	Doctorate	17 years
Zoe	English	Female	Caucasian	Master's Degree	21 years

Data Collection Methods

This study utilized individual semi-structured interviews and document analysis as the primary means of data collection. Prior to data collection, I secured permission to conduct the research through both the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville and the Office of Institutional Research at Southern State Community College.

Interviews. Interviews were conducted at Southern State Community College. To brief the potential participants on the scope of the study, prior to each interview participants were sent an initial e-mail containing an informed consent form (Appendix B) and information confirming the time and place of the interview. Before beginning the interview, I discussed the parameters of the study and had each participant sign an informed consent form.

While conversation is the most basic mode of human interaction, the research interview is not simply a conversation between equal partners. In a qualitative interview, knowledge is produced socially through the interactions of the interviewer and interviewee. The production of knowledge rests upon the interviewer's personal judgment and skills as an interviewer. As a result, researchers must not only be knowledgeable of the subject matter, but they must also possess keen qualitative interviewing skills (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). While interviewing is ubiquitous across qualitative inquiry, interview formats and structures are ultimately shaped by the qualitative designs they serve.

Interviews are often the most important sources of information in case study research. They are essential because most case studies concern human affairs or behavioral events (Merriam, 2009). Well-informed interviewees can provide valuable insights and offer information that helps researchers identify other relevant sources of evidence. While ad hoc and serendipitous data collection are intrinsic in human study, case study interviews are generally scripted conversations that allow researchers to pursue a consistent line of inquiry. Even though

case study interviews rely on interview protocols, these interviews are designed to allow participant and researcher interaction (Yin, 2009). Throughout the interview process, the researcher follows a line of inquiry while simultaneously asking open-ended conversational questions that might prompt further conversation. Often, these open-ended conversational questions produce the most insight (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009; Yin, 2009).

The interview protocol used in the conduct of the study included 13 open-ended questions designed to gain greater information about community college work/life issues (Appendix C). Before beginning data collection, I piloted the interview protocol on three of my community college faculty colleagues to determine if the questions were sufficiently clear. My colleagues indicated the questions were clear and easily understandable. Sample questions included: “How did you decide to pursue a career in your academic discipline?” and “In what ways did your academic training prepare you for life at a community college? And, in what ways did you not feel as prepared?” The design of these questions was intended to produce responses that focus on faculty work/life issues, yet allow enough flexibility to prompt a dialogue between the researcher and the participants. The aim of the use of these semi-structured interviews questions was to give rise to a symbiotic and conversational relationship that is at the core of qualitative methodology and this study.

The interviews took place at a mutually agreed on site and lasted for approximately one hour. All of the participants agreed to be recorded and each interview was digitally recorded and transcribed. All participant information will remain confidential and pseudonyms were used to protect participant identities. While interviews served as the main source of data for this case study, I also relied on document analysis as a method of contextualization and discovery.

Documents. While document analysis might seem very different from interviewing, both methods serve the same purpose (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Documents serve to preserve conversations, arguments, ideas, and perspectives. In case studies, documents are often used to corroborate and augment evidence from other sources. Documents help researchers verify spellings, confirm names of organizations, and validate interviewees' assertions. Researchers can also use documents to add background and contextual information to their studies (Yin, 2009). For this reason, it is often best for practitioners of case study to use document analysis to help bolster and contextualize their research, while relying on other methods such as interviews to form the basis of their findings. The use of varied data collection methods not only gives the researcher a greater understanding of the phenomena, but multiple data sources also give rise to increased internal validity.

Although interviews served as the primary source of data collection, document analysis was conducted to gain insight into the institution's organizational and demographic composition. I used information collected from Southern State Community College's Office of Institutional Research website in order to gain an understanding of the institution. Specifically, I looked at documents that highlight the overall demographics of the institution as well as documents that pertain to the college's academic departments. I used the college's website to look at faculty teaching load hours and service requirements in order to gain a better understanding of faculty workload by discipline. Additionally, I reviewed family leave policy documents to gain a better understanding of formal leave programs offered by Southern State.

Table two summarizes the methods that were implemented in the study. The table also indicates the targeted groups, frequency of data collection, and timeframe in which research and analysis occurred.

Table 2

Research Methods Used

Method	Targeted Group	Frequency	Timeline
Interviews	6 Science faculty members	One 60 minute interview	August 2012-December 2012
Interviews	5 English faculty members	One 60 minute interview	August 2012-December 2012
Document analysis	College and departmental websites, syllabi, leave policies	Complete	August 2012-December 2012

Data Analysis

Data analysis is the process of making sense out of the data. Through this process, the data are consolidated and interpreted to gain an understanding of what people have said and what the researcher has witnessed and read. Data are constantly compared for similarities and differences. As categorization leads to more focused coding, the analysis of data moves from a descriptive to more theoretical levels, leading to a saturation of the material by the coding process (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). The challenge is to construct categories that capture reoccurring parts in the data. Furthermore, it should be clear that the concepts derived from the data have a life of their own apart from the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Merriam, 2009).

I employed inductive and deductive approaches in order to both discover patterns from the data obtained through interviews and documents to answer the research questions. Informed by my use of socialization theory as it pertains to community college faculty, academic discipline, and work/life balance, I constructed concept-driven codes in order to answer the research questions contained in this study (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). While I used codes derived from the theoretical framework and my research questions, I also constructed codes that were data-driven. For example, a code derived from the theoretical framework was “family atmosphere.” A data-driven code was “very little personal time.” Using qualitative data analysis techniques, I coded the research and identified patterns and consistencies.

After the interviews were transcribed and documents collected, I used the software program ATLAS.ti to record the codes. I first used open coding techniques to recognize patterns in the interviews and documents (Merriam, 2009). The open codes were derived from both the data themselves and from the theoretical framework of socialization. I read through each interview multiple times and highlighted patterns and key phrases in the interviews. I next used the auto coding feature found in ATLAS.ti to quickly recognize patterns as I moved to the next iteration of coding. While I utilized ATLAS.ti mostly in the first phase of data analysis, the program was also useful during composition as information and faculty quotes could be quickly identified and sorted by using the quotes function contained on the ATLAS.ti toolbar.

After initial open coding was completed, I began the next iteration of coding. Through this process of axial coding, I grouped the initial codes into categories (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Categorization served to identify patterns and provide insight into the lives of the participants. These developed categories aggregated into themes, which answered the posed research questions. Throughout each phase of analysis, data from the interviews and documents

were constantly compared (Merriam 2009). As these patterns developed throughout several iterations, they served to answer the research questions while providing greater insight into the work/life balance issues of community college faculty (see Appendix D). This iterative data analysis process was used to analyze data from both documents and interviews.

Trustworthiness

I established trustworthiness through triangulation, member checking, and rich, thick description. While qualitative researchers do not strive to capture an objective reality, they do employ strategies that increase the credibility of their findings (Merriam, 2009). One of the most well-known strategies for increasing the internal validity of a qualitative case study is through triangulation. Triangulation allows researchers to use multiple sources of data to cross-check and reference their findings (Denzin, 1978). I relied on data source triangulation by collecting data from both interview and primary source documentation in order to corroborate facts and phenomenon (Yin, 2009). For example, I checked faculty load hours as reported in the faculty handbook versus the information reported by the participants in the interviews. I also utilized member checking, or follow-up interviews, in order to strengthen internal validity. After the completion of preliminary data analysis, I conducted follow-up interviews to help increase the validity of the findings. Follow-up interviews are an excellent means of achieving internal validity through triangulation as researchers can conduct follow-up interviews that validate their earlier findings (Denzin, 1978; Patton, 1990). I spoke with both members of the science and English faculty regarding the findings of this study. No discrepancies were uncovered during member checking as the faculty agreed with the findings. These conversations were also beneficial as the conversation further reinforced the inclusion of discipline as a key component in the study of work/life balance as the faculty again reiterated many of their disciplinary differences. Finally, in order to increase the transferability of my findings, I utilized rich, thick

description. The use of thick description increases transferability by employing a high level of description about the setting, participants, and findings of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Statement of Reflexivity

As a researcher and community college faculty member, my own experiences coupled with my research philosophy shaped this study. My ontological, epistemological, and axiological views are most aligned with the constructivist paradigm (Creswell, 2007). Ontologically, constructivism holds that reality is a social construction (Morgan & Smircich, 1980). Constructionists contend that human beings do not discover knowledge because knowledge is a construction of the mind (Schwandt, 2003). Humans constantly invent concepts and models to make sense of their experiences. As new information is gained through experiences, humans continually modify their constructions to make sense of the world (Schwandt, 2003).

Epistemologically, constructivists adhere to the notion of subjectivity. Inherently, the knower and the known are inseparable. Knowledge is only formed as the researcher interacts with others (Creswell, 2007). Axiologically, constructivist inquiry is value-bound, as values are intrinsic in the contextualization of any given study (Schwandt, 2003). Consequently, as a social constructionist, I recognize that my beliefs and experiences as a community college history professor coupled with those of my participants are an inherent part of this study. Additionally, my experiences as a husband and a father served to shape this study.

As a community college instructor, I experienced the transition from a research-focused graduate education to a teaching-focused community college environment. While this transition was often difficult, I was consistently aided by my administration and my colleagues. They provided me with the information and the support that I needed to better understand life as a

community college instructor. While I transitioned into a community college faculty member, I also began a family of my own. Again, my colleagues were a source of tremendous support as I navigated the early stages of fatherhood and an academic career. The experiences I gained as a community college faculty member not only piqued my interest in community college faculty issues, but have also motivated the selection of socialization as a theoretical framework in order to gain a greater understanding of the origins of community college work/life issues. As a result my own socialization experiences prompted me to use socialization theory to investigate work life issues from a disciplinary perspective.

Additionally, my experiences as a husband, father, and Ph.D. student have motivated me to delve deeper into faculty work/life issues. My own experiences in balancing work, family, and academics prompted me to examine the work/life literature more closely. As I assessed the relevant literature on work/life balance, it became evident that the problems and causes of community college work/life issues were largely understudied. So motivated by my experiences as a community college faculty member with a family, I endeavored to learn more about two-year faculty. While I strived for objectivity, my experiences as faculty member certainly impacted the construction of the framework, research questions, and interview protocol contained in this study.

Limitations

This study is limited to the departmental design employed by Southern State. While Southern State is typical to that of other community colleges, the academic and departmental structures of Southern State may vary from other institutions of the same size and mission. Finally, faculty perceptions might differ from one institution to another. Faculty at other institutions might not have the same challenges as the faculty in this study in relation to

institutional culture and demographic composition. This study is also limited to the participants interviewed and the truthfulness of their responses.

Delimitations

This study is delimited to a purposeful sampling of full-time community college faculty employed in English and Natural Science at Southern State. As a result, these findings may not be generalizable beyond the chosen research site and population. While the results of this study may not be applicable faculty outside of Southern State, it may serve to inform and improve overall community college practice and policy

In summation, as the preceding chapter indicates, this study utilized a qualitative case study to understand how faculty socialization and academic discipline affect the ability of community college faculty to balance their professional and personal lives. In chapter four, I discussed the findings of this research.

Chapter IV: Findings

The findings suggest Southern State faculty members struggled with issues of time demands, family and workload. While these issues served as work/life balance inhibitors, the way in which these work/life stressors affected the faculty differed by academic discipline. Six science faculty and five English faculty detailed their work/life balance issues. The English faculty were more influenced by exhaustive paper grading while the science faculty more often struggled with the time intensive nature of teaching and working with students in the sciences. Regardless of discipline, the faculty felt supported by their colleagues and deans as they acclimated to community college life. The faculty described how they were most often familiarized to faculty life through informal interactions with their colleagues that were both affirming and supportive. However, while the faculty felt supported as they transitioned into community college life, they were adopting behaviors that often created work/life balance issues specific to community college work. As Tierney and Rhoads's (1994) theory of socialization suggests, the formation of faculty culture is bidirectional. The faculty were adopting traits they may eventually pass on to future faculty members, thus reaffirming a culture that is both specific to community college life and detrimental to the work/life balance of its faculty. In this chapter, I first delve into the work/life issues experienced by community college faculty and continue by investigating how these issues are affected by academic discipline. I conclude the chapter by discussing how socialization theory can help explain the work/life issues experienced by community college faculty.

Time Demands, Family, Workload and Work/Life Balance

While the faculty interviewed represented different backgrounds and academic disciplines, three major themes were derived that served to explain the work/life issues of

community college faculty. As participants recounted their struggles in attending to professional and family duties, they consistently alluded to issues associated with time demands, family, and academic workload. Invariably, these interrelated themes often created work/life stressors.

Time Demands

Documentation mined from the Southern State website detailed how faculty are supposed to divide their time. Faculty on average are required to spend 30 hours a week on campus with 15 hours of that time dedicated to instruction. Faculty are required to hold one office hour per day and be on campus an additional ten hours per week. The remainder of their 37.5 hour week may be spent at the professor's discretion. While these requirements create a basis for faculty work, faculty often found it difficult to manage and balance their time.

Participants discussed how time demands impacted their ability to strike a balance between their professional and personal lives. As one faculty member put it, "you are always feeling like you are split in two when you need to be in two places at one time." In this section, I first detail how time demands impacted the academic lives of the faculty members and continue with an examination of how time demands impacted faculty's personal lives.

All eleven participants, regardless of gender or academic discipline, discussed a lack of time to accomplish both academic and personal tasks. Velma, an English faculty member, noted that her biggest challenge as a faculty member was the issue of time. "It takes time not only to grade, but to do class preparation, which for me in English means reading and even rereading works of literature." While this study focused on faculty from two distinct disciplines, the issue of time impacted each professor. Judy, a science faculty member, also explained her issues with the demands on her time:

I spend a lot of time even outside of work [corresponding with students]. I will get an email, “you know, I live an hour from here and I can't come to school, could we talk over the phone on Wednesday?” Well, I am not even at school, but I will say, “Yes, I will call you from home, you know, what time is good, could you do it at 9:30 after my kids go to bed?”....Also about 10 or 10:30, I sit down, I start answering e-mails again, because I have an online class.

Judy's dilemma was not uncommon among the participants as the demands of instruction, preparation, and student interaction challenge their ability to complete their tasks in a given workday

Zoe, an English professor, echoed Judy's thoughts about how it is often difficult to balance her time between the classroom, her students, and grading.

I get here about 8:30 and sometimes there is a student waiting. If there is not a student, I'm copying something before class. I have class at 9:30 and then another class at 11:00. There's 10 minutes in between where I try to run around, take a quick break and go back to the room and set up equipment or whatever. Then I have about thirty-five minutes in [my office] before the next class, and I try to grade like I was grading those papers to get as many as I possibly could for that group while trying to find some handouts I was going to use.

Zoe's frustrations with her hectic schedule illustrated how the demands associated with her position constantly leave her short of time. While time demands often cause much distress, Mary, a science professor expressed dismay as she tried to balance her perfectionism, professionalism, and personal life:

I never have enough time, never have enough time. I don't have enough time to do – I kind of guess I will have to take that back. I don't have enough time to do everything the way that I think it ought to be done. I have to finally say it's good enough because I have to have some time for myself.

Mary's sentiments are reflective of her colleagues as she discussed how she could not possibly accomplish all of her tasks to her satisfaction. Each faculty member interviewed spoke about how they were often against time demands as they conducted their academic duties. As a result, academic responsibilities often invaded home life.

In addition to long hours spent attempting to complete all of their academic responsibilities, the participants often lamented about the precious little time left for family activities. The inability to compartmentalize work from the family environment was a prevalent concern among participants. Nine out of the eleven faculty expressed unease over the amount of time they were able to devote to family activities. Most often, the faculty commented on how work invaded their home life. Judy highlighted this conflict in detail:

I probably spend too much time at home on my school, because like seriously when I am home, as soon as I get home, after everybody is taken care of, what do I do? I get my laptop out; make sure I am not missing an e-mail. My kids have complaints, you know, "can you not just watch one TV show and not have your laptop out, you know, and be talking to your students?" or "I wish you couldn't talk to your students so much, you don't have to help them so much," that you know, especially my daughter understands because she would really like that kind of attention.

Judy's comments reflect the difficulty faculty face in balancing their time between their students and their kids. Often this balance leaves the faculty members with little to no personal time.

Sally, an English professor, discussed the same experiences as her colleague in finding any time to herself. She described how she attempted to gain a few moments of personal time while attempting to care for her children:

I got here [to the office] earlier in the morning. Then, I would be home by the time the bus was there and try to help [my kids] with their homework. Both my boys played soccer and so there were a lot of soccer practices and games. Then it was back for dinner or sometimes that was flipped. Then I'd, you know, make sure they were in bed, maybe had an hour that was mine in the day. Sometimes I felt lucky to have that hour.

Both Judy and Sally's comments highlighted the struggle of not having enough quality time with family, but in also not having any personal time. Their comments also indicated the children were often aware of their parents' struggle to balance their workload with their family obligations. This struggle over time demands, work, and family was a consistent theme throughout the interviews as faculty members are faced with the task of trying to be both good parents and professors.

While time demands are an overriding factor in the ability of the faculty to balance work and family, the love and devotion to both family and work remained consistent throughout interviews. Tim, an English professor, explained the love he has for his profession as time demands often force him to achieve his task off campus while at home:

There are not enough hours in the day. There just aren't. If you are diligent about wanting to be prepared for every class... and I have a tendency to over prepare for everything because I have this fear of not being ready for something. It is not uncommon to work 60 hours a week or more. When you factor in the amount of time not on campus, but the amount of time that I am writing or reading or researching as part of a lesson plan,

making the lesson plan, I mean the hours are incredible. No, I don't mind doing it, mind you. I am not complaining. I love it. I thrive on it.

Oswald, a professor in science, also described how he has to carefully manage his time because in addition to being a good community college professor, he strives to be an attentive father:

You have to do what you have to do to be a good community college professor and you have to carefully manage your time because otherwise you're not going to be there for your kids, especially during the teenage years when they're going through more. You don't want to be too tired so you don't – to be a dad is probably the most important thing to me.

Tim and Oswald's comments accentuated a common work/life balance theme. Faculty need to balance work and family life in ways that make them feel prepared and fulfilled both professionally and personally. As the participants began to discuss their family lives, it became clear their struggle to become more family-centered was a consistent concern.

Family Responsibility and Work/Life Balance

Each participant discussed the problematic nature of balancing family with the demands of work. Issues such as children, caregiving, and the faculty members' significant others were constant sources of both joy and stress. Coupled with the time conflicts discussed earlier, each faculty member described the pain often associated with trying to fulfill family obligations in the face of increasing faculty demands. Often these demands challenged the ability of the faculty member to provide care for their children. Each of the eleven faculty members, to varying degrees, spoke of the challenges of caring for children while attending to his or her faculty responsibilities. While all 11 faculty commented on time and family issues as inhibitors to work/life balance, the women were slightly more adamant about the issues of caregiving. All six

females indicated caregiving issues, while three of the five males discussed issues specific to caregiving. Patty described one of her greatest struggles was attempting to balance her job and her children's activities. She discussed a time when she had to choose one of her son's events to attend:

I remember I had to make a choice. I could either go to his match where he would qualify for say the regional. I think that was it. He was at district. It looked like he had a good chance at going on to the regional, but then if he was successful at [the district level] he would go on to whatever the next higher one[level] was and I could not do both.

Patty's dilemma was not uncommon among the faculty. While classes are in session, it is difficult to take time off work and still meet the demands of the classroom. Patty was not alone in this regard. Zoe described how sometimes she was able to balance her work schedule around her son's events and at times she had to choose between work obligations and her children's activities, "He was sad several times when he was in elementary school and middle school when there would be an assembly. I wasn't able to make it, and sometimes I could, depending on my classes." Norm, a science professor, also discussed trying to coordinate his professional and family responsibilities:

There were times when we couldn't – I couldn't do things. There was a program where my daughter's high school came first in the state and [got] to move on to the Nationals Day. I was invited to go as a chaperone, but I couldn't go.

While these issues are telling, they are not often isolated. Tim, a longtime community college faculty member, lamented he would have trouble just giving one instance in which his role as a father and faculty member conflicted. "There have been times when a student really needed me and at the same time when my family needed me and it was a tug of war. There have been

multiple instances.” Tim’s comments reflect a constant pull between being present for both family and students. As the faculty described their struggles in balancing their work and family duties, they consistently recounted the difficulty in providing care for their families.

As faculty members discussed their roles as parents and faculty, their roles as caregivers also became focal points of the interviews. As Zoe described her struggle to balance caregiving and work, she recounted her difficulty as her son transitioned from daycare to school, “as long as he was in the daycare, I could work a little later. When he got in school and I needed to pick him up, it really was hard sometimes to drop everything and go get him.” Another faculty member, Mary, discussed trying to balance a career as an educator and a mother. She described an instance where her child was injured while she was at work:

It wasn’t long after I started working. I was here when my daughter had an accident in school and she broke her leg. I was in class and they couldn’t get in touch with me in class so my neighbor took care of my own girl, took her to the emergency room, sat there with her while she got her cast on. I felt like I was the worst mother in the world for not being able to be there with her, and she needed me. I understand that she cried and cried for me.

Although Mary was in class and unreachable at the time the accident occurred, she still felt a sense of conflict. This sense of professional obligation and personal conflict was a recurring theme as faculty consistently found it difficult to balance caregiving with their roles as professors. Velma explained the preparation needed to act as both a caregiver and a professor as she described her workday:

A typical day for me would start 5, 5:30 in the morning. I’d probably grade an hour or so, get kids up, fed, lunches made, off to school. I would then come in and teach my

classes, maybe attend a committee meeting in the afternoon, while trying to squeeze in class preparation, that sort of thing. Then I would pick up the kids from school.

While the other faculty members primarily detailed caregiving in relation to children, one faculty member also discussed how she cares for her aging parents. Judy, a dedicated mother, is also providing much of the care for her parents. She described how she starts her day by caring for her mother:

I get her set before I leave because there is a period of two hours before somebody comes that can help with her. So after I get her set, get all her pills out and her clothes out for the day and everything set, then I can leave. Then I go to school and I have my classes and my office hours...students are always in there.

Judy's circumstances indicated that not all caregiving issues are focused on children. In addition to working as a faculty member, she spent a significant amount of time helping care for her parents. While Judy was the only faculty member who discussed providing care for her parents, others discussed their difficulties in balancing both caregiving and academia with their responsibilities as husbands and wives.

In addition to providing care, the participants also described their struggles in maintaining a relationship with their significant other. Velma detailed her conflict in trying to provide for her family, spouse, and her students:

Ideally it's the...putting enough time into my work so that I feel that I am being productive, that I feel I'm as prepared for my students in the classroom and have as much energy as possible to deal with their questions and concerns and issues that come up, yet having enough time in my personal life to be the wife, the mother that I wish to be, the friend that I wish to be, and to have enough time away from my work so that when

Monday morning comes around, I'm not thinking, "Oh my gosh, I have to do this another week."

Velma's comments highlighted the struggle faced by faculty who are trying to simultaneously fulfill the roles of professor, parent, and spouse. Oswald, a professor in the sciences, also discussed the difficulty in being a good professor, husband, and father as he described his penchant for being absorbed academically.

I have an obligation and responsibility to my students that they learn. I have a responsibility to [Southern State Community College] to be the best professor I can. I also have an obligation to my wife and my kids that I'd be a good father and a good husband, and I don't get so absorbed in my work that they're neglected either.

Mary also described her struggle to maintain a good relationship with her husband, "As far as balance goes, I don't think I probably spend enough time with my husband doing things that he wants to do because I'm in my own little happy world. And he seems to be too." While Mary's comment indicated she and her husband have achieved some level of contentment despite her work/life challenges, one faculty member commented how she has a difficult time trying to get her spouse to understand the nature of her work. Zoe summed her struggles up, "my husband is [saying] all the time, 'Well, what you are doing that you can cut out?' Like there's one exercise that I cut out." Zoe's comment suggested that while work, family, and time demand issues impact the faculty's personal relationships, it may be difficult for spouses to understand the nature of faculty work.

While many of the faculty members discussed their dismay in not finding enough time to be with their significant other, several commented on how their spouses were supportive of their

career and family needs. Patty explained how her husband ran his own business and also helped care for the children:

I don't know how I would have done it if my husband had not been a self-employed proprietor. His office is in our house, so when the kids come home from school, he is there. I don't know how we would have done it really if it hadn't been for that. I mean, I really don't. I cannot begin to think about. you know he would pick them up right from school. It was very wonderful. You know parenting was important to us and he was really a hands-on dad.

Bob, a science professor, also described how he and his wife worked in tandem to provide for their daughter, "I had night classes, but my wife would drop her off at ballet and I'd meet her there. So I still had that flexibility." Although Bob and Patty detailed how their spouses aided in their ability to balance their career and family responsibilities, overall the interviewees expressed concerns over time and family in relation to their ability to balance their personal and professional lives. In addition to the amount of time each faculty member spent caring for his or her family, the faculty described that workload was also an inhibitor of work/life balance.

Workload and Work/Life Balance

Each of the eleven participants described how workload issues reflective of instruction, grading, and college service affected his or her work/life balance. Tim, an English professor, described how his workload ebbs and flows depending on when his assignments are due. "Workload is horrifyingly bad at times. It just depends on when papers come in, but the teaching load at [Southern State] is five classes." Velma reiterated Tim's statements, but also frames her workload in terms of college service as she discussed her work with the general education committee:

The workload has been greater at some points than others depending on what sorts of projects we're working on. But it's the one committee [General Education Committee] I guess I have felt for me is the most important committee work I could do because I come from a liberal arts background, went to a small liberal arts college and I believe very much in that component of education. The Gen Ed Committee is the one that deals most intimately with that.

Velma's statements reflected the nature of community college work. Not only are faculty expected to regularly teach five classes, they are also required to serve on academic committees and councils while also meeting with students about their papers. While teaching is certainly at the forefront of the workload issue, Velma detailed how other aspects of service are important. A review of the faculty handbook revealed community college faculty are promoted and receive tenure through a combination of teaching performance and college service. While college service may be crucial to tenure, the faculty most often alluded to challenges of their workload.

Sally also discussed the sometimes overwhelming nature of the community college workload in emphatic terms, "The workload. Absolutely. The five classes." She continued to explain the challenges of her job:

So I'm getting all kinds of questions and office visits, phone calls, and questions after class. Like I said, I'm currently teaching classes, and doing the required [student] conferences. I'm having to get their papers graded, their second essays graded so that I can have two papers to look at during their conferences. And that's just the basics. It's just the workload is extreme.

Tim, Sally, and Velma all had different takes on the nature of their workload, but their responses suggested the myriad of professional responsibilities incurred by each faculty member creates stressors that affect their ability to complete all of their tasks.

Although several of the faculty members discussed the support provided by their families, overall participants felt as though they were unable to maintain a healthy balance between their personal and professional lives. The faculty detailed how even though they loved their work, the demands of the job often left little time for the needs of the family. These themes of time demands, family, and workload clearly indicated although the faculty expressed love and dedication for their profession, the constant pull from both job and the family often left them discontented. As previously evidenced, each of the faculty alluded to various workload stressors that impacted their work/life balance. As I will discuss in the next section, these stressors often varied by academic discipline.

Work/Life Balance and Academic Discipline

According to the Southern State faculty handbook the average teaching load for faculty is 15 hours. Although the teaching load does not substantially differ quantitatively among the English and science faculty, there were other notable differences by discipline. While faculty in the sciences felt as though teaching was one of their biggest challenges, the English faculty most often spoke about how the amount of grading was central to the work/life issues they faced. In this section, I contrast work/life balance issues by academic discipline. I first discuss the grading workload issues experienced by the English faculty and continue with a discussion concerning the rigors of teaching science at a community college. I conclude with a brief summary about the impact these issues have on the ability of community college faculty to balance their personal and professional lives.

The English Faculty

As all five of the English faculty members detailed their struggles, the amount of grading assignments was one of the most discussed topics. Velma described how her heavy grading load is her biggest impediment to achieving a better work/life balance:

The biggest challenge that I have is the grading load. The grading load is probably also the biggest challenge for my work/life balance. The grading load is the beast. It's the beast. It's an important part of the job but doing it for five English classes particularly when it's five, sometimes six composition classes just eats up my time, eats up my energy. Disproportionately, I think I struggle to get class preparation done as well, which is why I actually spend a fair amount of the summers [preparing]. That's when I do course redesign and even some class prep. Because I know, once the grading starts coming in, it's just fighting off one avalanche after another. That I think is the biggest, biggest single issue.

As Velma highlighted, each English faculty member expressed dismay over the amount of grading required. While the faculty also mentioned the time necessary for instruction, planning, and college service, these comments were dwarfed by the faculty's response to the intensive amount of grading.

While Velma described her immense grading load, she did try to find some levity in her plight. As we spoke, she recounted how she infused grading into watching her kids' sporting events:

I remember my kids laughing that they had actually helped me onto my career because of the sports they chose. Because when my son was rowing and you know, you station yourself some place on the course by the river. You get to cheer for him a good 15

seconds as the boat goes by and then I'm back to grading papers. My daughter ran cross country so at most she'd make two loops around me and there'd be you know, two stretches of 15 seconds[when] I was cheering for her and she would go around and I'd be grading.

As with all of the English faculty I interviewed, the grading of papers invaded their personal lives as the professors often took large amounts of work home. As Sally pointed out, she often felt as though it affected her family. While she joked about her son's reaction to all of the work, she also spoke about the stress associated with trying to parent and grade at the same time:

Sometimes I would snap at my children. If they were here they would tell you about the only time that they ever got snapped at was when I would say, "Can't you see I'm grading?" And then my older son would claim that he always got grounded during finals, because I was busy and didn't have time to be more patient.

Although Sally tried to find some levity, her remarks are indicative of the pressure the English faculty felt from both work and at home as they wrestled with the grading workload.

Velma also commented about her struggle to have family time while also attempting to stay caught up with grading English assignments. Often the commitment to having family time meant that grading would continue well into the night:

We were pretty careful about having family dinners together. When the kids were younger, maybe checking over some homework, things like that, putting them to bed and then I'd grade another couple of hours. And it has been more often than not that I spend the bulk of one, sometimes two weekend days grading papers. Perhaps [I would grade] in bits and pieces early in the morning and while the kids were involved in something else, late [in the] evening.

While the faculty commented on the amount of grading they completed at home, many wished their students could understand the time involved in grading their assignments. As the participants explained, the stresses of grading are compounded by students who do not understand the time-intensive nature of grading essays and papers. Zoe explained this frustration in an imagined conversation with her students:

“Please don’t ask me if I have your papers graded. I may have a hundred essays in one week.” If I were to spend 15 minutes, that’s 25 hours a week of grading [for] just that one assignment beyond the prepping and everything else and the other class. Still, I had a student yesterday; three times she asked me if I had her paper. She’s like, “Well, did other people in the class get it? Or are you going to have it Tuesday?” She doesn’t know that I was grading until my eyes crossed.

Later in the conversation, Zoe again discussed the stress associated with trying to provide constructive feedback to so many students:

And then that’s the discouraging part when [they] say, “Do you have my paper? Do you have my paper?” I thought I made two classes really happy. The third class, made some of them happy. I don’t think they have any concept of what I do. Part of you gets a little apologetic.

Even in the face of grading pressure, Sally discussed her joy in teaching, and the contrast that is inherent between the classroom and the grading, “Yes, sometimes I come back from class and think, ‘Oh that was fun! I can’t believe they pay me to do that!’ And then I look at the papers and ‘Oh yes, that’s when I get paid.’” Sally’s exuberance toward her teaching was echoed by her colleagues. While they loathe the amount of grading that comes with teaching composition, the

faculty spoke fondly about their jobs. As both the joy and pain of teaching flowed from the faculty, ultimately they sought some understanding regarding the challenges of their discipline.

Patty, a faculty member who spoke of the love that she has for her college, profession, and discipline, summed up the challenge of the being an English faculty member:

English teachers, I think, are particularly challenged to have balance in their work and life responsibilities. I do not think people really understand what is involved in the grading of so many papers that students write. It takes a long time to grade one paper. As a matter of fact, because the time constraint [of grading] were so challenging, I actively avoided teaching some English classes because I just did not want to have to devote so much of my time to grading those papers. I think it would be a big benefit to faculty who teach English to maybe consider four classes as a full load for them, because it just cuts into your family life very intrusively. We know that we are going to be doing some things at home on our own time, if you will, but the English part when you are taking a set of essays that will repeat again, again, and again is just not really fair. I have heard some people they are little bit more accepting of it than others in the sense that they will just say, “well I know that I need to give students the feedback.” I don’t think that is a fair expectation to ask anybody who has the job if part of that means working every night till daytime or most of the weekend. I just don’t think it is a fair expectation.

While lengthy, Patty’s discussion of grading and workload gave credence to faculty issues such as teaching hours and grading. As English faculty at Southern State are required to regularly teach five classes, they struggle with the amount of grading required for each class. Invariably, the amount of grading affects their work/life balance. Though all of the English faculty members detailed how grading was one of the biggest inhibitors to achieving work/life balance, the

members of the science faculty spoke more often about the challenges of teaching and the time required to both teach and work with students.

The Science Faculty

While the science faculty were not as adamant about their instruction in relation to work/life balance, they did talk at length about the time necessary to instruct frequently underprepared students for careers that often relied on a healthy knowledge of science. They lamented how the time and instruction needs of their students often impacted their ability to balance their professional and personal lives. Judy discussed the difficulties of teaching science to students who often struggle in other academic areas:

Just helping them to understand because a lot of them have an [underprepared] background when they come to us. They don't have [any experience]. We are doing pH problems and it's like they have no idea what I am talking about.

Judy's comments about the time intensive nature of teaching science to community college students were echoed by her colleagues. In addition to discussing the challenges of teaching community college students, Mary outlined the challenges associated with her teaching and her teaching load:

The teaching load is very hard. Most of the time, I teach in like over 18 hours. The most challenging thing, I think, is just having to explain scientific explanations to students who have no background in science. It's amazing to me how little background that they have. The biggest challenge that I would see is that our students come from backgrounds that are so varied. Some students come back from having a different career. Some of our students are right out of high school. Some of them have been out of high school for more than 20 years and have never had any higher education. There are so

many different background and capabilities of different things that people bring to school with them that is hard to teach any class that is so diverse in background, culture, and attitudes.

As Mary emphasized, it is often very time consuming to teach students who have varied backgrounds and preparedness levels. Leo also commented about the time it take to prepare students to do well in science:

So when they come to school, they want to take a course, it takes a lot to get them motivated, to get them to study, try to do well. That's a problem because some of them, you can't really help them. I mean, no matter what you do in tutoring, outside help and all, you may or may not help some, but some of them balance such a big load of stuff on their plate that it's just not easy.

Leo's quote underscored the challenges of teaching community college students who are often attempting to balance work, family, and school while maintaining a full class load. These challenges coupled with their efforts to stay afloat academically make it difficult for both the students and the instructors. Leo's colleague Oswald concurred that his greatest challenge is in helping his students. He spoke about the difficulty and time needed to prepare students for the sciences. He also spoke about the effort needed to get students to not only understand academic concepts, but also to be able to relate them to their everyday lives:

The challenge is they take the class because they had to take it to get their degree and they come out with an attitude like "I'm not going to like science. I'm not good at it." It's a daily thing in the back of my head that I got to get these people, as many people interested in this as possible, so they see that this has something to do with their everyday lives, their kids' lives, their grandchildren's lives, the country, the economy.

Oswald's comments emphasized many of the challenges of community college instruction. With so many community college students coming to college for practical experience and career training, science faculty are challenged to get their students to grasp the theoretical as well as the practical applications for science.

While the science faculty discussed the challenges and time factors associated with instructing science, they also mentioned the joy associated with spending time helping their students do well. Bob spoke about his experiences with students whom he guided through the sciences. While Bob commented that, "the biggest frustration is just that there are students who are coming in less prepared," he also discussed the joy in helping student achieve their goals. "You know, for that student who says you know, 'I would have failed chemistry had you not spent that two hours in the help sessions every week, meeting with me and answering all my questions.'" Bob's comments illustrated the challenge and joy of working with such a diverse base of students. While working with the students is often rewarding, it is also very time consuming.

As with the English faculty, the science professors enjoyed their work, but they also grappled with the time intensive nature of their discipline. However, the science faculty were not overwhelmed with grading as much of their time was spent instructing and assisting their students. In addition, the science faculty also spent a great deal of time in their office and at home answering student questions and concerns. While the English faculty commented on the challenges of teaching often underprepared students, overwhelmingly they cited the immense graded load as more problematic.

Although the two faculty groups experienced some level of work/life stressors, the source of stress is often very different. Discipline makes a difference in the type of work/life issues

experienced by community college faculty. While English faculty spent long hours grading assignments, their science counterparts spent the majority of their time planning for instruction and meeting with students. While the faculty in both disciplines mentioned the time they spent with students and other aspects of college service, clearly the grading workload for English professors and the time intensive nature of imparting science knowledge were the two largest workload issues experienced by participants.

Learning the Ropes: Socialization into Community College Life

While the first two sections of this chapter focused on faculty work/life issues and how they varied by academic discipline, the last part of the chapter will focus on how faculty are socialized into the norms of the community college. The faculty were acclimated to community college life through both an anticipatory and organizational process inclusive of both formal and informal processes (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). While the faculty indicated they were more influenced by informal means of socialization, the formal socialization process also emerged as important. Variations by academic discipline were also a contributing factor to both the process of socialization and work/life. Regardless of the socialization process, faculty overwhelmingly discussed the transition to the teaching-centered focus of the community college. As I will discuss in chapter five, the socialization to community college norms in relation to both culture and discipline often give rise to work/life balance issues that are prevalent among community college faculty.

Anticipatory Socialization and Community College Faculty

Each professor commented on how graduate school prepared them academically, but they often felt most challenged getting accustomed to the teaching schedule and the needs of community college students. While the faculty varied by level of degree attainment, their level

of education did not make a significant difference in their attitudes toward their graduate training. In other words, whether faculty members had a Master's degree or a Ph.D., each struggled with adjusting to life at a two year institution. Their attitude toward their training is telling because as discussed in chapter two, one of the biggest challenges of community college instruction is acclimating to the college's culture. Mary explained her experiences in graduate school as compared to her current role, "I don't think my academic training prepared me for teaching at all." She continued, "Most of my professors were the typical lecture professors. I had a lot of big classes where the only contact that I had with anyone was through a TA. That had a lot to be desired." Mary's comments underscored the transition community college faculty face as they move from their graduate training into a more teaching-centered culture.

Like Mary, Judy described how her experiences as a graduate student informed her beliefs about teaching at a community college:

You are still at heart a student. I kind of teach that way, because I always think I remember what it was like when I was a student. It was a few years ago, but I remember what I thought helped me and what didn't help me and what attitudes that I found annoying or even, you know, hurtful in other professors and I just said, "okay, I am learning about [the material], yes, I want to copy them, no." I don't want to copy them, and just how they approach the students and their style and methods.

While Judy felt as though she did not receive good training in graduate school as far as teaching, she did try to make it into a positive experience by focusing on the type of instructor she wanted to be. Oswald explained that although the community college environment is different, he felt as though he received some good training in graduate school. He also commented on the how

teaching at a community college presents unique challenges for which graduate school did not prepare him:

I guess it prepared me because I have to know the material I'm covering. I got to see some other great teachers and professors. I learned how they care about their students, what types of professors inspire students in the things that they did, and how they got their students to learn. Also, the material, I needed to know the material before I could teach it myself.

Oswald also discussed the challenges of now teaching a group of learners who differ from those frequently found at four year universities.

I guess certain things you don't get out of school. You have to deal with students and know about the different kinds of students. Some people have different problems. Single mothers going back to school, 18-year-olds who don't know what they want to do, those kinds of things a graduate school does not really prepare you for.

Again, Oswald's comments reiterated the differences between community college instruction and most graduate training. Leo, a professor in the sciences, concurred with Oswald's assertions about how teaching at a community college creates a unique set of challenges due to learning needs and academic background of the students. He also spoke about having to adjust his expectations as he began teaching at a community college:

That's the problem we see in community college students. They don't want to put in the effort. They're not well disciplined. They think things just fall in their lap....you tend to have a higher expectation because you're in college. You say, "Hey, I did it you know, so can you." So [then] I said, "Well, maybe not." You know, you did it, but that doesn't

mean everybody else can. So then you have to adjust your expectation at a community college.

As Leo's comments illustrated, though his students are not often prepared, he still expects them to perform to the best of their abilities. His observations illustrated how the anticipatory process affect community college faculty as they transition to community college life. Both Leo's and Oswald's comments also highlighted how faculty are not often prepared to teach community college students as they leave graduate school. Bob reiterates this lack of preparedness, but he also provides insight into the anticipatory process as he transitioned to a community college from teaching at a secondary school. While Bob had some high school teaching experience before he came to Southern State, he described the transition from graduate school to a more teaching-centered environment as challenging:

[I had] no preparation whatsoever. And even whenever I became a graduate student, I was a TA and we had no training whatsoever as far as preparation for teaching. So you know you get a master's degree in the field and then they throw you into a classroom. I was lucky because I love teaching and I had the four years with high school students. I thought I just, I'd gone to heaven when I came to [Southern State] because you know, no more hall duty, no more bus duty, all those things like that. But as far as my master's degree courses preparing me for being thrown into a classroom, there was no preparation whatsoever. The teaching part of it, you know, you're thrown to the wolves.

Bob's reflections revealed that while he did teach in secondary education, he still had an adjustment period as he began teaching at a community college. Conversely, Patty, who has a background in education as well as English, explained her previous experiences in a different

light as she thought her previous teaching experience was extremely helpful in making the transition to community college work:

I had experience teaching English. I actually taught speech. I taught psychology, sociology, and reading....I taught Title 1 students. I had quite a background in terms of students from the 7th to 12th grade range when I came to the college because I was in academic development. I was still working with kind of the same levels with the high school students. I was trying to bring them up to college level, so that was very similar.

While Patty's background in education gave her a greater sense of community college work, the majority of the professors discussed how they thought graduate school did not prepare them for the realities of community college life. While prepared academically, participants became acclimated to community college life through interactions with their colleagues.

Organizational Socialization

While entry into the organizational phase may be reaffirming for faculty at research institutions, for faculty entering teaching-focused institutions, the process of organizational socialization is often very different from the culture they experienced in graduate school. The faculty all commented on their transition from the anticipatory stage experienced in graduate school to the organizational stage as they became new community college employees. A review of the faculty handbook revealed formal evaluations are provided at the departmental level and are imbedded in the process of evaluation, promotion, and tenure. While the faculty members acknowledged some level of formal training as all of the faculty receive a formal mentor as they begin instruction, all eleven of the participants felt as though most of their socialization into community college life occurred by informal means through interactions with colleagues,

department chairs, and deans. Mary explained how valuable the connections she made with fellow faculty member were as she began life as a community college faculty member:

I don't think that I could have made it without the mentoring that I got from my colleagues, and not only the mentoring, but the encouragement. The camaraderie, the stories that they would tell me about the things that they've been through. Otherwise, I think I would have felt like I was the only person that ever went through some of these hard times. I probably would have felt like it was my fault, so that was very important. And then I had one particular faculty member who was my major mentor, not an official position, but he was just always there to help me do whatever I needed to do. And his passion for teaching and his love of his students, all of this and you know I aspired to be like him. He was very collegial and wanted to help everybody, so [he] also came to be a model of someone that I would like to emulate.

Mary's experience explained how informal mentoring is crucial as faculty members make the transition to community college life. Through this transition, they experienced both group mentoring and individual mentoring from senior faculty members. Bob's experiences mirrored that of Mary's as he explained how he was helped by colleagues as he began to design his courses specifically focused on community college students:

You know we met [other faculty] and you say "Okay, you know, okay, I'm having trouble teaching this topic. Okay?" [They would say,] "Here's the handouts I use in my class. Here's an approach I use." They would give me instructions on how to test and everything. How to fit things into your schedule. If you're not careful you can get sucked into a vortex of grading continuously.

Bob's comments underscored that other faculty are key in the socialization process and acclimation to serving as community college faculty. The process also serves to form strong bonds among the faculty and staff. Patty explained how the informal process created a family-like bond as she describes her devolvement as a faculty member:

I don't remember a lot of formal training. The year I was hired, they hired many new people and of course with academic development there were a lot more math people than there were the humanities people coming on board, and the humanities we were just like a family, we really were.

Tim also described how the helpful nature of his colleagues created close connections among the faculty. He spoke about how his early misgiving abated as he began to gain support from what he describes as a very "tight knit" bunch:

When I first started, especially, they were extremely helpful. I think of the shock at the very beginning because of seeing the problems with the lack of preparedness that our students were confronting and confronting with us, kind of freaked out a little bit. My colleagues calmed me down. They helped me to learn to accept it, but at the same time making it very clear that we could not lower our requirements or expectations simply because we didn't get perfect students. They really helped me walk through that.

They've always been willing to help not just in terms of sharing syllabi and handouts and philosophies and things like that. They have always done that, but they have always been willing to step in if I needed someone to cover a class for me or something like that. We are a pretty tight-knit bunch and they are a great support system.

The collegial and family atmosphere Tim described highlights the affirming bonds produced as informal socialization creates not only colleagues, but a sense of family who understand the

stresses associated with community college faculty life. As these bonds were formed, Tim also acquired and absorbed the culture inherent in community college life.

Although the participants focused primarily on the informal nature of socialization, the faculty also spoke highly of the formal processes as well. Even as departmental deans played a formal role in the socialization of new faculty, the faculty also described how their deans also often “stepped outside of the box” to create a welcoming supportive atmosphere. While every faculty member commented on how informal contact with their colleagues was invaluable, Southern State also has a formal process of evaluation. Ten out of the eleven faculty members spoke positively about their deans and the evaluation process. Often this process was inclusive of a formal faculty mentor. Leo, a science professor, explained:

It was a help because when we originally started, we had a mentor. He helped me a lot. You know, as far as letting me sit in his classes, seeing what he covers, how he covers things. That was a big help. It was a great influence.

Zoe also discussed the importance of the mentoring process. She felt as though the often spread out nature of community college campuses necessitated a good mentoring program:

Through the years, we’ve had varying stages of having mentors with people and I served as a mentor two or three times. I think at our community college, we’re spread out in so many campuses. I think that it becomes important even if we don’t see somebody personally, we are able to email and ask questions. I’ve had really good colleagues that have been good to shoot ideas off from.

Patty, who recounted the family nature of her socialization experiences, also detailed her more formal socialization experiences positively as she discussed her experiences and the help she received from her departmental dean:

The dean was very active, very encouraging. He had very high expectations. I do remember trying to rise to his level of expectations. I was always a little bit nervous, right at the end of the semester [and at] the end of the year. He was always looking to see how much gain had our students [made] and what was the improvement level. You know, we had goals we were trying to reach.

Like Patty, Sally discussed that the support she received from her dean early on had a lasting effect. Sally described how her dean, in addition to providing formal feedback, was also very supportive. She emphasized an instance where he gave her a coffee cup after she completed a formal faculty evaluation:

I felt very supported by the deans. I remember very early on going into, oh I don't know, a meeting, a feedback evaluation meeting. It was one of my first years here. I was carrying a cup of coffee and dropped it. It shattered on the floor and I looked down at it and thought, "I'm nervous." Until I saw that coffee on the floor, I didn't realize that I was nervous. But the interview, you know, the evaluation went very well and the dean gave me a new coffee cup, which I still have. I felt very supported... and I don't know, small things like that.

Sally's experience with her dean mirrored the family atmosphere mentioned by her colleagues. Her experience also illustrated how whether by informal or formal means, faculty at Southern State largely feel supported by their deans and colleagues.

Conclusion

The participants largely felt their experiences were positive as they entered the ranks of the community college professorate. Almost all felt support from the administration, but most often times the faculty enthusiastically discussed how their colleagues provided informal support

as they navigated their way through the first few years. Additionally, the faculty spoke of the family atmosphere of their departments. While the faculty spoke glowingly about their colleagues' graciousness and willingness to help, this process may also lend itself to the manifestation of work/life balance issues as many of the norms associated with community college work are transmitted through the organizational socialization process at the departmental level. Ultimately, these newly learned behaviors may create stressors that contribute to community college work/life imbalance.

The findings suggested community college faculty suffer from work/life issues associated with time demands related their workplace and families. Although the work/life issue are the same for all of the faculty members, the causes differed by academic discipline. The English faculty were more affected by the pressures of grading, while the science faculty were more impacted by the demands of teaching and instruction. While the English and science faculty may have different work/life stressors, they were all socialized to departmental norms through mostly informal means. As I will discuss in chapter five, while the manifestation of faculty work/life issues may differ by academic discipline, socialization theory can help explain the perpetuation of community college specific academic norms which create powerful academic cultures that often exacerbate community college work/life issues. As a result, I will detail how socialization theory, community college work/life issues, and academic discipline are interrelated and how these interrelated issues serve to highlight a greater understanding of work/life imbalances as they pertain to community college faculty.

Chapter V: Discussion and Conclusions

As discussed throughout this dissertation, previous research on faculty work/life balance issues has predominantly focused on faculty at four-year institutions (Mason & Goulden, 2002, 2004; Mason, Goulden & Frasch, 2009; Quinn, 2010; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004) and much less research on the work/life issues of community college faculty (Lester & Bers, 2010; Saltee, 2008; Wolf-Wendel, Ward, & Twombly, 2007). Additionally, while previous research has focused on understanding the impact faculty socialization and academic discipline have on faculty culture (Austin, 1990; Becher, 1984, Becher & Trowler, 1987, 2001; Biglan, 1973; Clark, 1987; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Tierney, 1990; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994), there appears to be none that examines how socialization theory and academic discipline and culture impact community college work/life balance issues. To fill this gap, this study sought to gain a greater understanding of community college work/life balance issues. Accordingly, this study addressed to answer the following questions:

1. What are the work/life issues experienced by community college faculty?
2. How do community college work/life balance issues differ by academic discipline?
3. How does socialization theory help explain the work/life balance issues experienced by community college faculty?
4. How are socialization theory, academic discipline, and community college work/life balance issues interrelated?

The results from this study indicated that while community college faculty experienced many of the same work/life issues as their four-year counterparts, they also experience work/life issues that are shaped by community college work. Although all faculty experienced work/life

issues related to time demands associated with family and workload pressures, the manifestation of their work/life issues varied by academic discipline. The English faculty experienced work/life stressors due to their grading workload, while the science faculty indicated teaching and instruction more often affected their work/life balance. Regardless of discipline, the faculty spoke at length about their socialization and transition to community college specific norms. Invariably, while the faculty were acclimated to community college life, they were adopting behaviors and work/life stressors they in turn impart to other faculty members. As a result, this bidirectional socialization process perpetuates a culture detrimental to faculty work/life balance. In this chapter, I will discuss the results related to each research question. As I answer each question, I will incorporate other relevant literature in order to contextualize these findings. I will conclude with a discussion highlighting the implications of this study and with recommendations for future research.

Question 1: What Are the Work/life Issues Experienced by Community College Faculty?

Work/life balance is defined as an equal distribution of work and life, where people are equally engaged and satisfied with both work and family roles (Greenhaus, Collins, & Shaw, 2003). As detailed in chapter two, college faculty members often struggle to obtain a healthy work/life balance as the demands of both their personal and professional life make it difficult to maintain a fulfilling balance. While some research suggests faculty often migrate to two-year institutions in order to achieve a healthy work/life balance (Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006; Wolf-Wendel, Ward, and Twombly, 2007), the results of this study indicated community college faculty suffer from many of the same issues as their four-year counterparts. Previous studies have established faculty at research institutions often struggle to maintain a balance between their personal and professional lives. Although they experienced work/life issues related to time

demands, caregiving, and workload (Drago & Williams, 2000; Mason & Goulden, 2002, 2004; Quinn, 2010; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004), the sources of these work/life stressors are different from those of community college faculty. Prior studies indicated the greatest inhibitors of work/life balance among faculty at four-year institutions predominantly concern research, publication, and tenure (Drago & Williams, 2000; Mason & Goulden, 2002, 2004; Quinn, 2010). However, as I will discuss in the next section, community college work/life balance issues are more related to teaching and instruction. Additionally, while previous research indicated college faculty may gravitate toward community college work in order to strike a healthier work/life balance, this study revealed community college faculty while, largely unencumbered by publication and research, also face work/life balance issues (Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2006; Wolf-Wendel, Ward, & Twombly, 2007).

The findings are also consistent with previous works that highlighted gender differences in regards to faculty work/life balance and caregiving (Drago & Williams, 2000; Finkelstein & Schuster, 2001; Hochschild, 1989; Mason & Goulden, 2004; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2004). While all 11 of the faculty in this study experienced work/life balance issues, all six of the female faculty members commented on how issues specific to caregiving impacted their ability to balance their personal and professional lives as opposed to only three of the five males. While the female faculty discussed issues specific to caregiving, all of the participants in this study expressed concerns regarding their ability to balance their personal and professional lives.

The faculty cited time demands associated with family life and academic workload as key inhibitors to achieving work/life balance. The faculty also described how they attempted to negotiate time with their spouses and families, while trying to also devote time to teaching, student interaction, and grading. For example, Judy, a science faculty member spoke about how

her work at home often spills over into her personal life while Zoe, an English professor, discussed how the time demands associated with teaching and grading often left her with little personal or family time. These findings are consistent with previous studies (Lester & Bers, 2010; Sallee, 2008) that argued community college faculty members experience work/life issues and must often choose between their personal and professional lives.

While Sallee's (2008) participants reported feeling less supported by their administration and by a lack of work/life policies, the participants in this study did not cite the overall lack of institutional work/life policies as problematic. While Southern State's dearth of work/life policies are consistent with work completed by Hollenshead, Sullivan, Smith, August, and Hamilton (2005) who found community colleges often lag far behind other institutional types in instituting work/life policies, none of the participants spoke at length about the lack of policies. Even as the participants discussed issues generally associated with work/life balance such as caregiving, they did not focus on a lack of institutional support. For example, Judy, a science professor, discussed at length the challenges of caring for her aging parents while balancing her academic schedule. While Judy described her role as caregiver and faculty member, she did not speak extensively about institutional policy. In fact, Judy, like many of the other faculty members, spoke more often about the support they received from their colleagues and deans. Although all 11 of the faculty detailed their work/life balance struggles, the way in which these issues were manifested in the lives of the faculty differed according to academic discipline. In the next section, I address how the manifestation of work/life issues varied by discipline and how the expression of disciplinary norms created a powerful culture that ultimately contributes to work/life balance issues.

Question 2: How Do Community College Work/life Balance Issues Differ by Academic Discipline?

While little to no attention has focused on work/life balance issues as they relate to community college culture and academic discipline, the prevailing research on academic discipline indicates the importance of understanding academic discipline as it related to community college culture (Austin, 1990; Becher, 1984, Becher & Trowler, 1987, 2001; Biglan, 1973; Clark, 1987; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Tierney, 1990). While all 11 faculty members experienced work/life issues, the stressors that led to their work/life imbalance differed by academic discipline. English faculty most often cited grading as an inhibitor to work/life balance while the science faculty most often cited the time associated with teaching and working with students. These findings are consistent with previous work by Twombly and Townsend (2008) who found community college work is often shaped by heavy teaching loads and the need to serve diverse student populations. The faculty interviewed for this study consistently pointed to issues regarding teaching loads and to the diversity of their student learners as affecting their ability to balance work and family. For example, Velma, an English teacher, reflected on how she not only teaches five classes, but how she found it difficult to keep up with her grading load. Sally, another English faculty member, agreed with Velma's assertions about teaching English at a community college and added that she thought the teaching and grading load was "extreme."

The science faculty also described their academic workload, but focused more on the time they spent teaching and working with students who often come to college underprepared. For example, Judy discussed the difficulties she has in helping students with a poor science background understand the intricacies of scientific problems and experiments. Mary, another faculty member, concurred with Judy as she detailed the challenges of teaching several sections

of lecture and lab, while also meeting with students individually. Another science faculty member, Leo, underscored the challenges of working with students who have been out of school for some time and are balancing their own work/life issues. Leo also stated one of his greatest challenges was teaching these students who have such diverse learning backgrounds. While these findings again mirror community college research (Lester & Bers, 2010; Perna, 2001; Sallee, 2008; Townsend & LaPaglia, 2000; Wolf-Wendel, Ward, & Twombly, 2007) they also underscore the importance of understanding discipline specific traits (Austin, 1990; Becher, 1984, Becher & Trowler, 1987, 2001; Biglan, 1973) and the faculty cultures they create.

The comments of both the science and English faculty not only reflect their struggles with their workload, but also highlight how discipline-specific attributes often affect their ability to balance their personal and professional lives. For example, each English faculty member discussed how he or she often worked at home to try and stay caught up with their grading. Velma spoke about how she arrived home in the evening and rushed to take care of her family's needs so she could start grading again. Sally, another English instructor, discussed how she graded her papers while she watched her son's sporting events, and Zoe discussed the difficulty of attending to both the needs of her students and her own children. The science faculty also recounted their struggles in balancing their work and family lives. While Judy discussed trying to balance caring for her parents while fulfilling her responsibilities as a science teacher, Norm spoke about his efforts to balance the demands of science instruction with the needs of his daughter.

The stories from both the science and English faculty illustrated the specific nature of community college work/life issues and how many of their work/life balance stressors are specific to community college work. The findings also indicated these stressors are specific to

and differ by academic discipline. This aspect of the study parallels Austin's (1990) assertions about the relationship between faculty and their academic discipline as she contended discipline most often defines faculty members. Furthermore, research indicates each discipline uniquely outlines research questions and methods, the relationship between teaching and research, and work relationships between scholars (Austin, 1990; Becher & Trowler, 1987, 2001; Biglan, 1973). These concepts learned in graduate school, however, are generally not all pertinent to community college faculty. As the faculty in this study demonstrated, while the values incorporated into academic and disciplinary culture validate faculty behavior at research universities, they are dissimilar to community college work and culture where teaching rather than research is the dominant institutional commitment (Austin, 1990). In addition, as community college faculty adopt the traits of their new surroundings, they are also adopting work/life stresses that are specific to community college work as defined by their academic disciplines. This study reaffirms the assertion made by Tierney and Rhoads (1994) that as graduate students become faculty members, academic disciplines and departments still represent the most powerful influences in faculty culture. Accordingly, in the next section, I will discuss how socialization theory can help explain the creation of and perpetuation of community college culture and how this culture gives rise to work/life balance issues experienced by community college faculty.

Question 3: How Does Socialization Theory Help Explain the Work/life Balance Issues Experienced by Community College Faculty?

This study utilized Tierney and Rhoads' (1994) conceptualization of faculty socialization to explain how community college culture fosters work/life issues that are specific to two-year faculty. Their theory continues earlier work focused on socialization and culture by Merton

(1957), Clark (1987), Van Maanen and Schein (1979), Becher (1987), and Tierney (1988). In previous work, Tierney (1988) developed a framework for understanding colleges and universities as cultures by pointing to the importance of understanding the socialization process at the local level. This localized approach is important as the findings suggest the acclimation to community college norms create faculty work/life issues specific to that environment. Tierney and Rhoads (1994) also emphasized the importance of the faculty in the socialization process as they viewed the process of faculty socialization from a cultural perspective where organizational socialization is a bidirectional, mutually adaptive process between the organization and the individual whereas both the organization and the faculty are shaping the culture. This process shapes faculty culture at both an institutional and departmental level. Concomitantly, both institutional and disciplinary culture affects faculty work/life experiences. This experience is different for community college faculty as teaching is the dominant institutional norm. For example, although the faculty agreed the socialization process experienced in graduate school oriented them to disciplinary norms, they also commented they were not fully prepared for the challenges specific to community college life.

Socialization to a new role consists of two significant stages: anticipatory and organizational socialization. Anticipatory socialization pertains to how potential members adopt the attitudes and attributes of groups to which they aspire to belong. Potential faculty members generally experience anticipatory socialization to both professional and disciplinary norms largely during graduate school (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). During anticipatory socialization, potential faculty members are often acculturated to a set of norms that may not necessarily match the culture of their new organization (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). This fact is key to understanding the early socialization process of community college faculty.

The community college faculty interviewed for this study detailed how inconsistencies often emerged as they entered the organizational phase of faculty socialization and discovered the values they learned in graduate school were incongruent with their new surroundings. Many faculty discussed that while graduate school prepared them academically, they were not prepared for the teaching intensive nature of community college life. Oswald commented about how graduate school did not prepare him for the diverse learning backgrounds of community college students and how it took a great deal of time and effort to teach to such a wide array of students. His colleague, Bob, expressed a lack of preparation as he left graduate school, as he discussed how his teaching assistantship in graduate school left him ill prepared as he entered the community college faculty ranks. While these stories demonstrate a disconnect between life as a university professor and life at a two-year institution, they also illustrate the change faculty undergo as they move into community college life. As faculty leave the anticipatory phase of graduate training and enter the organizational phase at their new institution, they are socialized into community college norms that often create work/life issues unique to community college faculty. The faculty are also acclimated into a culture they eventually also disseminate, thus giving rise to the bidirectional process outlined by Tierney and Rhoads (1994). The transition toward community college norms is often a stressful process for new faculty as they encounter new socialization agents who impart a different culture from the one they experienced in graduate school.

As the faculty progressed through the organizational phase as outlined by Van Maanen and Schein's (1979) dimensions of socialization they experienced the different dimensions of the socialization process. As detailed in Chapter two, the six dimensions include: 1) the collective

versus individual; 2) formal versus informal; 3) sequential versus random; 4) fixed versus variable; 5) serial versus disjunctive; and 6) investiture versus divestiture.

For example, while the faculty experienced group socialization in graduate school the organizational phase of their training was mostly individual through independent faculty relationships. They also experienced dimensions that were more orderly and sequential and less random. Random socialization pertains to a progression of more ambiguous steps, while sequential socialization involves a series of expressed steps. The faculty experienced the tenure process as sequential because the steps to achieve tenure are clearly defined. In addition, the faculty also experienced socialization dimensions that were both fixed and variable. While some aspects of the participants' socialization experiences such as tenure adhered to a fixed time limit, many aspects of their organizational socialization such as committee leadership progressed at a more variable rate. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) asserted that fixed socialization refers to socialization as defined, while variable socialization contains many uncontrolled factors. Also, Van Maanen and Schein (1979) contended that faculty also experience socialization by either a serial or disjunctive process in which disjunctive socialization indicates a lack of a mentoring relationship. For example, the faculty experienced a more serial pattern of socialization as they acquired the norms of the institution and their discipline. Additionally, the findings also indicated the informal socialization process was most dominant as the faculty acquired the norms of their institution and discipline. As I discuss in the next section, these informal relationships served as the most dominant dimensions in the socialization process.

While the faculty highlighted some formal means of socialization, most often informal socialization processes were discussed as the most dominant and affirming experiences. These findings are consistent with the previous literature that suggested informal relationships are

largely responsible for transmitting faculty culture (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994; Van Maanen & Schein 1979). For example, Mary discussed how she built a connection with her fellow colleagues through informal chat sessions and hallway discussions. She detailed how her colleagues were invaluable as she transitioned into community college life. Her fellow faculty member, Bob, discussed how his colleagues helped prepare him to teach community college students by sharing not only advice, but also instruction on testing and grading community college work. Patty described how the consistent help and camaraderie among the faculty gave her a feeling and sense of belonging and family. Similarly, Tim stated the sense of family helped him cope with the transition to community college work as he spoke about how the faculty helped him get over the “shock” of teaching a diverse group of learners. The experiences of the faculty at Southern State are consistent with the assertions made by Van Maanen and Schein (1979) who contended that informal socialization is often the most dominant. In addition, while the faculty alluded to a degree of formal mentoring, they also gave instances where traditionally formal agents served in a more informal capacity. For example, one faculty member Sally, discussed how her dean encouraged and assisted her beyond the requisite formal evaluations.

As participants’ experiences revealed, new faculty members are more influenced by the associations they make in their own departments rather than by institutional development and initiatives. As discussed earlier in this chapter, while faculty are most often identified by their academic disciplines (Austin, 1990; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994), they are also mostly socialized at the departmental level through informal means while adapting to the realities of community college faculty life. As I will discuss in the next section, these associations may unwittingly transfer the disciplinary attributes that often lead to community college work/life balance issues.

Question 4: How Are Socialization Theory, Academic Discipline, and Community College Work/life Balance Issues Interrelated?

The findings indicated community college work/life balance issues, academic discipline, and socialization theory are interrelated. As faculty are socialized toward community college-specific academic and disciplinary traits, they are also adopting the behavioral patterns that can cause stress between their personal and professional lives. This process begins in the organizational stage, as many traits learned during the anticipatory phase are merged with the values and mores consistent with community college instruction. The findings also revealed the importance of academic discipline in this process. As new faculty are socialized, the main agents in the organizational socialization process are contained within their disciplines (Austin, 1990; Becher, 1984, Becher & Trowler, 1987, 2001; Biglan, 1973; Clark, 1987; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Tierney, 1990). For example, the faculty recounted how their colleagues helped them as they transitioned from the anticipatory process inherent in graduate school through the organization phase as they became acclimated to community college life. As discussed in chapters one and two, as graduate students enter higher education, they become accustomed to the organization's norms and values. In essence, they are unlearning the behaviors absorbed in graduate school and adopting those more specific to the community college. Invariably, socialization agents at the community college are retransmitting the disciplinary cultures and mores, which are perpetuating some of the same traits that led to work/life stressors for both the English and science faculty.

In the case of this study, the faculty are so focused on gaining the attributes necessary to thrive as a community college faculty members, they are largely unaware of the adoption of traits that may impact their ability to balance their personal and professional lives. This phenomenon

emphasizes the importance of understanding community college work/life issues through a cultural lens. Even as the faculty found it difficult to transition to community college norms, they were adopting the often discipline-specific behaviors that impeded their work/life balance. While the science faculty discussed teaching and student interaction and the English faculty most often discussed grading as the root cause of work/life stressors. Additionally, they all alluded to the transition to community college work and the academic advice they garnered along the way. Invariably, these departmental relations highlight the intersection between discipline, socialization, and work/life balance issues as these interactions create a strong bidirectional influence and culture which often serves to create work/life balance issues unique to community college faculty. In the remainder of the chapter, I will offer some implications for practice and suggestions for future research based on the findings of the study.

Implications for Practice

While policies are important, it is vital they are derived with faculty input. Effective institutional change will only occur if faculty are allowed to help shape college culture. Problematic, however, is that faculty members often become organizationally socialized to unhealthy norms and standards. Accordingly, it is important that faculty are educated about work/life issues and their root causes so they do not consistently transmit the discipline specific cultural stressors that often inhibit their work/life balance. As the literature on discipline (Austin, 1990; Becher, 1984, Becher & Trowler, 1987, 2001; Biglan, 1973; Clark, 1987; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Tierney, 1990; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994) and this study indicate, broad institutional reforms must start with departmental changes that are not only policy driven but also culture shifting and reaffirming. Since the academic department is the main contact point for community college faculty, department-driven policies are a crucial first step in helping faculty

members with their work/life issues. As a result, it is paramount for departments to engage in dialogues concerning the causes of work/life issues are affecting their faculty. Consequently, faculty need to be aware of how departmental culture may serve to heighten work/life stresses, because as Tierney and Rhoads (1994) indicated, culture is a bidirectional process. Therefore, a more informed faculty can help redefine their departmental culture to be sensitive to work/life stressors.

As these departmental dialogues take place, both deans and faculty members will be well positioned to promote departmental and institutional policies that directly address the root causes of work/life imbalances among their faculty. As a result, I recommend the following four initiatives:

1. Reduce the teaching loads of the faculty. As addressed in this study, institutions and departments need to be aware of the impact of teaching loads. Community colleges might consider reducing teaching loads for faculty who are also engaged in large amounts of college and community work. This is especially true of faculty who teach entry-level courses comprised of large student numbers. While these reductions may serve as initially costly as institutions have to hire additional instructors to teach courses, reductions in course loads may not only ease faculty work/life issues, but also may provide for enhanced instruction and greater student success and faculty retention, which ultimately saves money for both the institution and the state.
2. Develop stronger formal mentoring programs and formal orientations within academic departments. Two-year institutions might consider focusing on the influence formal and informal faculty mentors have on their departmental and institutional culture by instituting more formal faculty mentoring and orientations.

These mentors would be able to provide faculty assistance in making the transition to community college life, while also stressing the pitfalls common among two-year faculty. Since the academic department is the main contact point for community college faculty, department-driven mentors are a crucial first step in helping faculty members with their work/life issues. While mentoring efforts at the departmental level may prove useful, faculty mentors and mentees must also guard against perpetuating harmful departmental and institutional cultures. In order to prevent the perpetuation of an incongruent faculty work/life balance culture, departmental programs might work in tandem with work/life coaches at the institutional level.

3. In conjunction with the mentoring programs at the departmental level, human resource departments could develop orientation programs that address the issues of work/life balance. These orientations could begin at initial employment, but continue throughout a faculty member's employment as a way to not only support new faculty, but to also assess departmental and institutional policies. These programs might be run by work/life coaches who serve to both mentor new faculty and assess the effectiveness of the departmental programs. Ideally, this assessment would serve to both evaluate and improve departmental mentoring in an effort to help create and reaffirm a positive departmental and institutional work/life culture.
4. Develop work/life policies. While faculty-driven work/life balance initiatives are key to creating a healthy work/life culture, institutional policies must also be created. Community colleges could institute such policies as daycare facilities and extended leave time for childbirth and caregiving. Also, given that workload is an inhibitor of work/life balance, community colleges could work on creating more flexible

scheduling practices. Flexible scheduling would allow faculty members to teach unbalanced teaching loads, thereby offering faculty some amount of relief in planning for caregiving and personal time. Ultimately, it is also essential these new policies have the support of leadership. In creating policies that are both institutional and departmental in nature, a redefinition of culture will be created that permeates the institution. As a result, a more work/life positive bidirectional culture will be perpetuated and maintained as the institution more positively affects faculty culture and faculty culture more positively impacts institutional culture.

Recommendations for Future Research

While this study indicated the importance of understanding the effects of discipline and culture on the work/life balance of community college faculty, future studies may garner more insight into the effects of disciplinary and institutional culture on community college work/life balance. Based on the findings, the following are suggestions for future community college work/life balance research:

1. Replicate this study at the same site using different academic disciplines to further analyze the effects of discipline on community college work/life balance issues.

While this study found differences in work/life issues among science and English faculty, additional research could include a host of academic disciplines in order to discern if other departmental factors contribute to community college faculty work/life imbalances.

2. Replicate this study at different community colleges using like academic departments and compare the data between institutions. Comparing data between institutions would allow researchers to gain a greater understanding of how the nuances of

different academic departments might affect community college work/life balance.

The result may be different at other institutions due to location, student population, or faculty culture. While the disciplines may be the same, studying different institutions may help draw distinctions between institutional and academic cultures that ultimately impact community college work/life balance.

3. Use different community college sites and departments and contrast the findings with the results of this study. Using different sites and populations would allow researchers to compare and contrast work/life balance issues at community colleges that may have much different student populations, missions, and cultures. This approach would also allow further research to be conducted in the areas of departmental and institutional socialization in order to investigate if faculty from other colleges experience anticipatory and organizational socialization in the same manner and if these processes causes different work life stressors and issues.
4. Conduct a longitudinal analysis using the same institution and academic departments to gain a greater understanding of the effects of socialization theory, academic discipline, and work/life issues on subsequent new faculty hires. This approach would allow researchers to track faculty and further investigate the role of organizational socialization. The results would be useful given the faculty would be interviewed at different career and life stages.

Conclusion

The conclusions in the study are consistent with the prevailing literature on socialization theory and discipline. The findings suggest that while community college faculty have work/life balance issues, the causes of these issues differ by academic discipline. Given that many of these

behaviors are learned as faculty members make the transition to community college life, socialization theory helps explain the manifestation of work/life issues experienced by community college faculty. Specifically, this study highlights the importance of faculty socialization in regards to discipline and culture.

This study also highlights difference between the manifestation of community college work/life issues and those from their four-year counterparts. Community college faculty are more influenced by issues such as teaching and grading, workload, and the diversity of student preparedness. Additionally, faculty often face an abrupt reorientation as they are socialized to community college norms that may give rise to work/life stressors not evident during their graduate training. In summation, while four-year faculty certainly face the stresses of publication and tenure, researchers should not ignore the growing ranks of community college faculty who face not only unique instructional challenges, but also face challenges as they try to maintain a healthy balance between their professional and personal lives.

References

- American Association of University Professors. (2001). Statement of principles on family responsibilities and academic work. Washington, DC: Committee on Academic Freedom.
- Anfara, V. A., Brown, K. M., & Mangione, T. L. (2002). Qualitative analysis on stage: Making the research process more public. *Educational Researcher*, 31(7), 28-38.
- Austin, A. E. (1990). Faculty cultures, faculty values. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *Assessing academic climates and cultures* (pp. 61-74). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 94-122.
- Bailey, J. (2008). Work and life balance: Community college occupational deans. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 32(10), 778-792.
- Baldwin, R. G. (1990). Faculty vitality beyond the research university: Extending a contextual concept. *Journal of Higher Education*, 61(2), 160-180.
- Barnett, R. C. (1999). A new work-life model for the twenty-first century. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 56(2), 143-158.
- Becher, T. (1984). The cultural view. In B. R. Clark (Ed.), *Perspectives on higher education: Eight disciplinary and comparative views* (pp. 106-126). Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Becher, T. (1987). The disciplinary shaping of the profession. In B. R. Clark (Ed.), *The academic profession: National, disciplinary, and institutional setting* (pp. 271-303). Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Becher, T. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual inquiry and the culture of disciplines*. Bristol, PA: Open University Press.

- Bess, J. (1978). Anticipatory socialization of graduate students. *Research in Higher Education*, 8(4), 289-317.
- Bieber, J. P., & Worley, L. K. (2006). Conceptualizing the academic life: Graduate students' perspectives. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(6), 1009-1035.
- Biglan, A. (1973). The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57(3), 195-203.
- Clark, B. R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. New York, NY: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among the five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K. (1989). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Drago, R., Colbeck, C., Stauffer, K. D., Pirretti, A., Burkum, K., Fazioli, J., et al. (2005). Bias against caregiving. *Academe*, 91(5), 22-25.
- Drago, R., & Williams, J. (2000). A half-time tenure track proposal. *Change*, 32(6), 46-51.
- Finkel, S. K., & Olswang, S.G. (1996). Child rearing as a career impediment to women assistant professors. *The Review of Higher Education*, 19(2), 129-139.
- Finkelstein, M. J., & Schuster, J. H. (2001). Assessing the silent revolution: How changing demographics are reshaping the academic profession. *AAHE Bulletin*, 54(2), 3-7.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245.

- Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley and Sons.
- Gerten, A. M. (2011). Moving beyond family-friendly policies for faculty mothers. *Journal of Women and Social Work*, 26(1), 47-58.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between work-family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(3), 510-31.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Parasuraman, S. (1999). Research on work, family, and gender: Current status and future directions. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 391-412). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1989). *The second shift: Working parents and the revolution at home*. New York, NY: Viking Press.
- Hollenshead, C. S., Sullivan, B., Smith, G. C., August, L., & Hamilton, S. (2005). Work/family policies in higher education: Survey data and case studies of policy implementation. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 130, (Summer), 41-65.
- Jacobs, J. A. (2004). The faculty time divide. *Sociological Forum*, 19(1), 3-27.
- Kuh, G. D., & Whitt, E. J. (1988). *The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Lester, J. (2009). Architect for research on gender and community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 33(9), 725-730.
- Lester, J., & Bers, T. (2010). Hiring and recruiting female faculty. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 152, (Winter), 41-48.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Mason, M., & Goulden, M. (2002). Do babies matter? The effect of family formation on the lifelong careers of academic men and women. *Academe*, 88(6), 21-27.
- Mason, M., & Goulden, M. (2004). Do babies matter (part II)? Closing the baby gap. *Academe*, 90(6), 10-15.
- Mason, M., Goulden, G., & Frasch, K. (2009). Why graduate students reject the fast track. *Academe*, 95(1), 11-16.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1992). Understanding and validity in qualitative research. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62, 279-299.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McMillan, H. S., Morris, M. L., & Atchley, E. K. (2011). Constructs of the work/life interface: A synthesis of literature and introduction of the concept of work/life harmony. *Human Resource Development Review*, 10(1), 6-25.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

- Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Morgan, G., & Smircich, L. (1980). The case for qualitative research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 5(4), 491-500.
- Morris, M. L., & Madsen, S. R. (2007). Advancing work–life integration in individuals, organizations and communities. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 9(4), 439-454.
- Obama, M. “National Science Foundation Work/Life Balance Speech.” White House, Washington, DC. 26 September 2011. Address.
- O'Quinn, L., & Corry, M. (2004). Factors which motivate community college faculty to participate in distance education. *International Journal on E-Learning*, 3(1), 19-30.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Perna, L. W. (2001). The relationship between family responsibilities and employment status among college and university faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 72(5), 584-611.
- Perrone, K. M., Wright, S. L., & Jackson, Z. (2009). Traditional and nontraditional gender roles and work-family interface for men and women. *Journal of Career Development*, 36(1), 8-24.
- Quinn, K. (2010). Tenure clock extension policies: Who uses them and to what effect? *NASPA Journal about Women in Higher Education*, 3(1), 182-206.
- Quinn, K., Lange, S., & Olswang, S. G. (2004). Family-friendly policies and the research university. *Academe*, 90(6), 32-34.
- Quinn, K., Lange, S. E., & Riskin, E. A. (2004). *Part-time tenure track policies: Assessing utilization*. Paper presented at the 2004 WEPAN Conference, Albuquerque, NM.

- Reddick, R. J., Rochlen, A. B., Grasso, J. R., Reilly, E. D., & Spikes, D. D. (2012). Academic fathers pursuing tenure: A qualitative study of work-family conflict, coping strategies, and departmental culture. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 13(1), 1-15.
- Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2000). *Heeding new voices: Academic careers for a new generation. New pathways working paper series, Inquiry #7*. Washington, DC.: American Association for Higher Education.
- Sallee, M. W. (2008). Work and family balance: How community college faculty cope. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 142, (summer), 81-91.
- Sallee, M. W. (2012). The ideal worker or the ideal father: Organizational structures and culture in the gendered university. *Research in Higher Education*, 53(7), 782-802.
- Sax, L. J., Hagedorn, L. S., Arredondo, M., & Dicrisi, F. A. III. (2002). Faculty research productivity: Exploring the role of gender and family-related factors. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(4), 423-446.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2003). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructionism. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues* (pp. 292-331). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Sorcinelli, M. D., & Near, J. P. (1989). Relations between work and life away from work among university faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 60(1), 59-82.
- Stake, R. E. (2005) Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed, pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 59(1), 2-21.

- Tierney, W. G. (1990). *Assessing academic climates and cultures*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Tierney, W. G. (Ed.). (1991). *Culture and ideology in higher education: Advancing a critical agenda*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Tierney, W. G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 68(1), 1-16.
- Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Tierney, W. G., & Rhoads, R. A. (1994). *Faculty socialization as cultural process: A mirror of institutional commitment*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 93-6. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Townsend, B. (1998). Women faculty's satisfaction with employment in the community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 22(7), 655-661.
- Townsend, B., & LaPaglia, N. (2000). Are we marginalized within academe? Perceptions of two-year college faculty. *Community College Review*, 28(1), 41-48.
- Twombly, S., & Townsend, B. (2008). Community college faculty: What we know and need to know. *Community College Review*, 36(1), 5-24.
- Trower, C., & Gallagher, A. (2008). Why collegiality matters. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(11), A50-A51.
- U.S. Department of Education. Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. (2008). *Community College [Data File]* Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/analysis/2008-sa02f.asp>

- Van Maanen, J. (1976). Breaking in: Socialization to work. In R. Dubin (Ed.), *Hand-book of work, organization, and society* (pp. 67-130). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Van Maanen, J. (1978). People processing: Strategies of organizational socialization. *Organizational Dynamics*. 7(1), 18-36.
- Van Maanen, J. (1984). Doing new things in old ways: The chains of socialization. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), *College and university organization: Insights from the behavioral sciences* (pp. 211-247). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In B. M. Staw (ed.). *Research in organization behavior: An annual series of analytic essays and critical reviews* (pp. 209-264). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2004). Academic motherhood: Managing complex roles in research universities. *Review of Higher Education*, 27(2), 233-257.
- Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2005). Work and family perspectives from research university faculty. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 130, (Summer), 67-80.
- Williams, J. (1999). *Unbending gender: Why family and work conflict and what to do about it*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wolf-Wendel, L., & Ward, K. (2006). Academic life and motherhood: Variations by institutional type. *Higher Education*, 52(3), 487-521.
- Wolf-Wendel, L., Ward, K., & Twombly, S. (2007). Faculty life at community colleges: The perspective of women with children. *Community College Review*, 34(4), 255-281.
- Yanow, D. (2000). Seeing organizational learning: A cultural view. *Organization*, 7(2), 247-268.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Appendices

Appendix A

Sample of recruitment email

Dear Participant,

I am a doctoral student in Higher Education Administration at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville and a faculty member at Pellissippi State. I am conducting a doctoral dissertation on community college work/life balance issues. Specifically, I seek to gain a greater understanding of how faculty socialization and academic discipline might also affect faculty work/life balance.

The purpose of this email is to invite you to participate in this study. While some research has focused on the work/life balance issues of four-year faculty, there has been little research conducted about community college work/life balance issues. My study aims to fill that gap. The study is open to all full-time faculty members in Natural Science or English who have at least one child.

You are invited to participate in an in-depth, open-ended interview that will last approximately one hour that is designed to gain a greater understanding about community college work/life balance issues. The interviews will take place at a location near campus agreed upon by the participant and the researcher. With your permission, the interview will be recorded and transcribed. Your confidentiality will be protected through the use of pseudonyms. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may withdraw from the study at any time. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed, your data will be destroyed.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concern regarding this study. I can be reached by email at dkey1@utk.edu.

Sincerely,

David Key

Appendix B

Informed Consent

Consent Form for Participation in a Research Study
Southern State Community College
INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT
[Investigating Work/Life Balance Issues]

INTRODUCTION

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by David Key about work/life balance issues. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you have been identified as a faculty member in Natural science or English at Southern State Community College. You must be at least 18 years of age to participate. Your participation is voluntary.

You should read the information below, and ask questions about anything you do not understand, before deciding whether or not to participate. Please take as much time as you need to read the consent form. You may also decide to discuss your decision to participate with your family or friends. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and be given a copy of this form.

The purpose of the study is to gain a greater understanding of community college work/life balance issues.

INFORMATION ABOUT PARTICIPANTS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE STUDY

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you would be asked you to do the following:

Complete one interview about your work/life experiences. Interviews will last between 45 and 60 minutes and will be audio recorded. If you do not wish to be recorded, you may still opt to participate in the study. You may also be asked to respond to an email or participate in a follow-up phone interview regarding the themes which arose from your interview.

All interviews will be audio recorded with digital technology. Recordings will be uploaded to the computers of the principal investigator Recordings will also be transcribed. Your named will not be used in any publication based on this study. All participants will be given pseudonyms. In addition, a pseudonym will be used to protect the name of the institution

_____ Participant's initials

BENEFITS

You will not benefit from this study. Society may benefit from the findings, which may be used by others to implement programs.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. Digital recordings and transcripts will be stored on a password protected computer system and will be available only to the researcher. All recordings will be destroyed after five years. When the results of the research are published or discussed in conferences, no information will be included that would reveal your identity. Participants and the employing institution will be protected through the use of pseudonyms. All data related to this study will be destroyed three years after the completion of the study.

CONTACT INFORMATION

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the Principal Investigator, David Key, at 1804 Swinford Court; Knoxville, TN 37922, and (865) 850-0551 or Doctoral Chair, Dr. Norma Mertz at the College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies 318 Bailey Education Complex 1122 Volunteer Boulevard Knoxville, TN 37996 (865) 974-6150. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, contact the Office of Research Compliance at (865) 974-3466.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed, your data will be returned to you or destroyed.

CONSENT

I have read the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study. I understand that I can still participate in this study, even if I do not wish to be recorded.

☐ *I agree to be audio-taped*

☐ *I do not want to be audio-taped*

Participant's signature _____ Date _____

Investigator's signature _____ Date _____

Appendix C

Interview Protocol

1. How did you decide to pursue a career in your academic discipline?
2. Why did you choose to work at a community college? How did you come to work here?
3. In what ways did your academic training prepare you for life at a community college? And, in what ways did you not feel as prepared?
4. How do the beliefs, attitudes, and expectations at this institution differ from the expectations you possessed in graduate school or at a previous institution?
5. Explain the role that your colleagues played in your development as a community college faculty member at this institution
6. Explain the role that your department dean played in your development as a community college faculty member at this institution?
7. What are some of the biggest challenges of working at a community college?
8. What are some of the biggest challenges about being an instructor in your discipline?
9. How would you define work/life balance?
10. Describe a typical day for me, starting from when you wake up in the morning to when you go to bed at night.
11. What are your biggest challenges as a parent and a community college faculty member?
12. Has your role as a professor and parent conflicted? If so, can you give an example?
13. Does your institution offer work/life or family leave policies? Have you utilized any of these policies/programs?

Please note that given the nature of qualitative research, additional questions may be posed as follow ups during interviews.

Appendix D

Code Mapping: Three Iterations of Analysis (Anfara, Brown & Mangione, 2002)

Code Mapping for the work/life issues experienced by community college faculty (Research Question 1)					
Third Iteration:					
	1: Time		2: Family		3: Workload
Second Iteration:					
1a	Personal commitments	2a	Children	3a	Grading
1b	Professional responsibilities	2b	Caregiving	3b	Teaching
		2c	Significant Other	3c	College Service
First Iteration: Initial Codes					
1a	Need time to look after parents	2a	Attending schools events	3a	Taking up so much time grading
1a	Making time for spouse	2a	Missing school functions	3a	Grading papers on the sofa
1a	Taking care of children	2a	Helping with Homework	3a	Most of my time is spent grading
1a	Very little personal time	2a	Defensive about family boundaries	3a	Please do not ask if I have your papers graded
1a	Always busy with activities	2b	Taking care of elderly parents	3a	A great deal of time spent giving feedback
		2b	The needs of my children	3b	Teaching focused
		2b	Need to attend to household	3b	A great teaching load
1b	Checking email	2c	not at the detriment of my family life	3b	I do love teaching
1b	Time spend correcting papers	2c	My wife works opposite hours	3b	Teaching is a rewarding challenge
1b	My scheduled is full of commitments	2c	My husband works long hours	3b	Lots of hours preparing to teach
1b	Busy running from place to place	2c	My husband start dinner without me	3c	Important committee work
1b	Busy preparing for my next class			3c	Other college and committee assignments
1b	Do not have down time between classes				

Code Mapping: Three Iterations of Analysis (Anfara, Brown & Mangione, 2002)

Code Mapping for the work/life issues and academic discipline (Research Question 2)			
Third Iteration:			
	1. English Faculty		2. Science Faculty
Second Iteration:			
1a	Grading	2a	Teaching
1b	College Service	2b	Student Meetings/Tutoring
First Iteration: Initial Codes			
1a	Biggest challenge to my work/life is the grading load	2a	Teaching load
1a	Grading at night	2a	Student preparedness
1a	Grading during family time	2a	Difficulty of Instruction
1a	Grading during family	2a	They have no idea what I am talking about
1a	Getting student to understand grading	2a	Retaining information
1b	Love for teaching	2a	Staying current
1b	Committee work	2b	A great deal of student meeting
1b	Challenge of teaching	2b	Email and student meetings
1b		2b	Student coming by for assistance

Code Mapping: Three Iterations of Analysis (Anfara, Brown & Mangione, 2002)

Code Mapping for work/life balance issues and socialization theory (Research Question 3)			
Third Iteration:			
	1. Anticipatory Socialization		2. Organizational Socialization
Second Iteration:			
1a	Graduate School	2a	Formal
1b	Previous Employment	2b	Informal
First Iteration: Initial Codes			
1a	They were not interested in me	2a	Dean at the top
1a	Prepared academically	2a	Consensus leadership
1a	Not interested in teaching	2a	Formal evaluation
1a	Working on research	2a	Formal Advisor
1a	Spending more time with teaching assistants	2b	More informal
1a	Working as a teaching assistant	2b	Informal meetings
1a	Research associate	2b	Family Atmosphere
1b	I taught high school	2b	Informal Process
1b	I used to work at a laboratory	2b	Informal discussions
1b	I worked as an adjunct faculty member	2b	Friendships
1b	Went into business	2b	Colleagues
		2b	Informal mentor

Code Mapping: Three Iterations of Analysis (Anfara, Brown & Mangione, 2002)

Code Mapping for socialization theory, academic discipline, and community college work/life balance issues (Research Question 4)					
Third Iteration:					
	1.Socialization		2.Academic Discipline		3.Work/Life Balance
Second Iteration:					
1a	Anticipatory	2a	English	3a	Workload
1b	Organizational	2b	Science	3b	Family
				3c	Time
First Iteration: Initial Codes					
1a	Graduate School	2a	Grading	3a	Teaching
1a	Previous Experience	2a	College service	3a	Grading
2b	Formal	2b	Teaching	3b	College Service
2c	Informal	2b	Student Comprehension	3b	Children
				3b	Caregiving
				3c	Personal commitments
				3c	Professional Commitments

Vita

David Key was born in Laurel, Mississippi. He earned his Bachelor of Arts in History at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville and his Master of Arts in History at East Tennessee State University in Johnson City Tennessee. He is currently employed at Pellissippi State Community College.