

# Journal of Diversity in Higher Education

## **Secret Service: Revealing Gender Biases in the Visibility and Value of Faculty Service**

Lisa K. Hanasono, Ellen M. Broido, Margaret M. Yacobucci, Karen V. Root, Susana Peña, and Deborah A. O'Neil

Online First Publication, August 2, 2018. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000081>

### CITATION

Hanasono, L. K., Broido, E. M., Yacobucci, M. M., Root, K. V., Peña, S., & O'Neil, D. A. (2018, August 2). Secret Service: Revealing Gender Biases in the Visibility and Value of Faculty Service. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000081>

# Secret Service: Revealing Gender Biases in the Visibility and Value of Faculty Service

Lisa K. Hanasono, Ellen M. Broido, Margaret M. Yacobucci, Karen V. Root, Susana Peña,  
and Deborah A. O'Neil  
Bowling Green State University

Although the demand for faculty service has increased substantially in recent years, the workload is not shared equitably among tenure-track faculty (Guarino & Borden, 2017; Pyke, 2011). Women faculty tend to spend more time on service activities than men, and they tend to perform important yet less institutionally recognized forms of service like mentoring, committee work, emotional labor, and organizational climate control (Babcock, Recalde, Vesterlund, & Weingart, 2017; Misra, Lundquist, Holmes, & Agiomavritis, 2011). Drawing from the theory of gendered organizations (Acker, 1990), this interview study examined how institutional gender biases impact the visibility and evaluation of faculty service across the tenure-track career trajectory. Our findings reveal how task-oriented forms of service tend to be more visible and valued than relationally oriented service. In addition to addressing a gap in the literature, our study presents practical recommendations to make service more visible, valuable, and equitable across faculty ranks and gender identities.

*Keywords:* career advancement, faculty, gender, race, service

Economic, organizational, and personnel shifts in higher education have increased the demand for faculty service (O'Meara, Kuvaeva, Nyunt, Waugaman, & Jackson, 2017). As an increasing number of federal and state funding formulas stress the importance of student enrollment and graduation rates (Dougherty et al., 2016; U.S. Department of Education, 2015), colleges and universities expect faculty to engage in more recruitment and retention activities (Berg & Seeber, 2016; Cohen, 2017; Sorcinelli, 2007). Addressing the escalating need to demonstrate the public benefit of higher education, many faculty are adding community outreach, service-learning, and civic engagement activities to their service records (McDonald, 2013). The rising requirement for service is particularly strong at regional universities and teaching institutions where faculty are expected to support student learning beyond the classroom. Furthermore, the burgeoning numbers of university administrators and greater demands for accountability have resulted in a dramatic increase in faculty service and committee work related to documenting, assessing, and reporting students' per-

formance and faculty productivity (Stearns, 2016). However, despite the elevated demand for faculty service, the tightening of university and college budgets has resulted in the reduction of tenure-track faculty lines and an increase in adjunct faculty with minimal service expectations (American Council on Education, 2012; Gappa & Austin, 2010). Collectively, these patterns indicate that tenure-track faculty members are experiencing increased service workloads. For example, Ziker (2014) reported that faculty spend approximately 17% of their work week in meetings (e.g., advising students and serving on committees) and 13% on e-mail. He also found that the combined amount of time dedicated to teaching *and* research consisted of only 40% of a faculty member's work week.

Although the demand for service has increased, the burden is not shared equally or equitably among tenure-track faculty (e.g., Guarino & Borden, 2017; O'Meara, Kuvaeva, & Nyunt, 2017). Researchers have noted significant gender differences in the quantity and types of service work faculty perform (Misra, Lundquist, & Templer, 2012; Pyke, 2011; Roser & Lane, 2002). Controlling for professional rank and race, cis women faculty tend to spend more time on service activities than cis men (O'Meara, Kuvaeva, & Nyunt, 2017). Moreover, cis men tend to pursue more leadership roles like committee chairs and editorships, whereas cis women tend to perform important yet less institutionally recognized forms of service like mentoring, committee work, emotional labor (i.e., regulating one's feelings and exerting extra energy to attend to others' emotional states), maintaining a positive work climate, and record keeping (e.g., Bird, Litt, & Wang, 2004; Park, 1996). Faculty of color—especially women of color—tend to perform more service labor than their White colleagues (Wood, Hilton, & Nevarez, 2015), and institutions of higher education frequently overlook the extra service demands and work of trans\* faculty and nonbinary people such as recruiting and mentoring minoritized students, advising student organizations that focus on social

Lisa K. Hanasono, School of Media and Communication, Bowling Green State University; Ellen M. Broido, Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs, Bowling Green State University; Margaret M. Yacobucci, Department of Geology, Bowling Green State University; Karen V. Root, Department of Biological Sciences, Bowling Green State University; Susana Peña, School of Cultural and Critical Studies, Bowling Green State University; Deborah A. O'Neil, Management Department, College of Business, Bowling Green State University.

This project was funded by BGSU's Building Strength Grant Program.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Lisa K. Hanasono, School of Media and Communication, Bowling Green State University, 306 Kuhlin Center, Bowling Green, OH 43403. E-mail: lisakh@bgsu.edu

justice issues, and serving on committees and university task forces related to diversity, equity, and inclusion (Pitcher, 2016). These service disparities have the potential to adversely affect the promotion and career advancement of cis women, nonbinary people, and faculty of color who are allocating their time and energy toward tasks that are not institutionally visible or valued, because unrewarding and excessive service can hinder research productivity and fuel occupational burnout (Lawrence, Ott, & Bell, 2012; Moore & Ward, 2010; O'Meara, 2002; Twale & Shannon, 1996).

Drawing from the theory of gendered organizations (Acker, 1990), the purpose of this study is to examine how institutional and interpersonal gender biases impact the visibility and valuation of faculty service across the tenure-track career trajectory. By exploring systemic and social gender biases, we aim to reveal discursive tensions in the ways that faculty define, communicate, and evaluate service activities. In doing so, we will address a dearth in the literature on faculty service and provide practical recommendations to render service more visible, valuable, and equitable in higher education institutions.

### Literature Review

In this section, we present our study's theoretical framework and the literatures regarding gender differences<sup>1</sup> in higher education institutions in faculty service. We argue that higher education institutions are gendered organizations with policies, practices, symbols, and structures that tend to privilege masculinized forms of service (i.e., activities that are task-oriented, competitively selected, leadership-oriented, and quantifiable) over feminized forms of service (i.e., activities that are relationally focused, collaborative, cooperative, and qualitatively rich). Moreover, we argue that this gendered privilege is embedded within institutional documentation practices, policies, and norms, such that masculinized forms of service tend to be more visible and more valued than feminized forms of service.

### The Theory of Gendered Organizations

Acker's (1990) theory of gendered organizations examines how pervasive gender inequities are produced and legitimized through institutionalized policies, communication patterns, organizational bodies, social structures, and divisions of labor. Acker (1990) argued that seemingly gender neutral organizations tend to perpetuate disparities in power that explicitly and implicitly advantage men over women. She explained: "The organization itself is often defined through metaphors of masculinity . . . organizations are lean, mean, aggressive, goal-oriented, efficient and competitive but rarely empathetic, supportive, kind, and caring" (Acker, 1992, p. 253). These metaphors reflect institutional values that privilege masculinized forms of labor like competitively selected leadership positions and task-oriented committee work.

Acker (1990) proposed that organizational practices produce "the gender segregation of work" (p. 140), including the differential distribution of women and men into distinct roles within organizations, the kinds of behaviors expected of each, and the ways those behaviors are valued. Acker (2011) noted, "Gender is embedded in hierarchical structures, jobs, divisions of labor, processes such as hiring and wage setting, in images of workers and managers, in interactions in the workplace, in work/family inter-

connections, and in individual constructions of identity" (p. 67). The outcomes of these practices and biases may result in organizational glass ceilings that hinder women and nonbinary faculty members' career advancement and implicitly perpetuate stereotypical expectations that burden service on gender minorities.

Acker (1990) called attention to five ways that organizations are gendered. Collectively, these practices can foster blatant and insidious inequities that disproportionately advantage cis men and reinforce traditional constructions of binary gender roles (e.g., men as strong, women as nurturing, and nonbinary people as invisible), subtly pressure organizational members to enact traditional gender roles, and normalize sanctions on those who do not conform to them. These dynamics shape people's gender performance and what they expect of others, including decisions about what kinds of positions each gender should hold, how they should speak, dress, and conduct themselves. Finally, contracts, staff handbooks, and other documents describing workplace rules and norms contain and reinforce traditional conceptions of gender (e.g., as we discuss later in this paper, seemingly "gender neutral" policies around parental leave actually benefit men more so than women [Antecol, Bedard, & Stearns, 2016]).

In short, Acker's (1990) theory provides a framework for understanding how organizations systemically privilege cis men and masculinized forms of labor over cis women, trans\* individuals, nonbinary people, and feminized forms of labor. Although the original articulation of this theory conceptualized gender in binary terms, it is important to consider how organizations' cisgendered structures, policies, and practices work in concert to further marginalize and render invisible the unique experiences, challenges, and needs of trans\* and nonbinary people (Bilodeau, 2009; Marine & Nicolazzo, 2014; Mintz, 2011). For example, Seelman (2014) noted that many institutional databases fail to "count" trans\* and nonbinary people's gender identities, because their demographic surveys and forms limit organizational members' gender options to "men" or "women." In addition, institutions often require over-complicated procedures and excessive paperwork for individuals who wish to change their names and/or gender in their organizations' databases, and many organizations' buildings fail to provide gender inclusive bathroom facilities, locker rooms, and lodging accommodations (de Jong, 2015; Seelman, 2014). These gendered assumptions and practices manifest across diverse organizations, including many institutions of higher education. In the next section, we explain how universities and college can be understood as gendered organizations.

### Universities and Colleges as Gendered Organizations

Despite changes to educational policies and legislation, such as the Equal Pay Act, Title VII, and Title IX, gender inequities persist at colleges and universities (Allan, 2011; Rose, 2015). Although cis women earn more undergraduate and master's degrees than cis men, they remain underrepresented as doctoral students, faculty

<sup>1</sup> Historically, the literature on gender in higher education has relied predominantly on a gender binary. In this article, we use gender binary language when the cited studies did not explicitly include nonbinary people. That said, we recognize the paucity of higher education research that goes beyond binary conceptualizations of gender and the need for more scholarship that examines gender along a spectrum of identities.

members, and university administrators (Cordova, 2011; National Center for Education Statistics, 2012, 2015b). While the number of cis women faculty in education, social sciences, and humanities has grown in recent years, the number of cis women faculty in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) remains disproportionately low (Barone, 2011; Renzulli, Reynolds, Kelly, & Grant, 2013). These gender disparities rise with academic rank, with cis men outnumbering cis women faculty as associate professors, full professors, senior administrators, and university presidents (American Association of University Women, 2015; National Center for Education Statistics, 2015b).

Beyond sheer representation, gender inequities persist through institutional policies and practices. Universities and colleges tend to pay cis women faculty less than cis men regardless of academic rank; the salary gap is particularly pronounced at prestigious research institutions (Porter, Toutkoushian, & Moore, 2008). Although researchers have found that quantitative and qualitative student course evaluations tend to systematically favor cis men over cis women and gender nonconforming people (e.g., Bachen, McLoughlin, & Garcia, 2009; Boring, Ottoboni, & Stark, 2016), most universities continue to rely on course evaluations to make key decisions regarding promotion, tenure, retention, and merit. Antecol et al. (2016) concluded that gender-neutral tenure clock stopping policies, albeit well-intentioned, helped pretenured cis men at a significantly higher rate than pretenured cis women. Berkovitch, Waldman, and Yanay (2012) reported that cis women were portrayed less frequently and prestigiously in universities' marketing and media publications. From photographs to articles, their analyses revealed that university publications tended to marginalize and omit information about cis women faculty and "in many photographs, the women . . . are presented only for the purpose of decoration" (Berkovitch et al., 2012, p. 264).

Given this collection of gender-biased policies and practices, Allan (2011) explained that institutional barriers continue to permeate higher education institutions that adversely affect cis women, trans\*, and nonbinary faculty, including glass ceilings that prevent individuals from rising to the rank of full professor and upper administrative positions—and discriminatory employment practices commonly referred to as "sticky floors" that detain faculty at the bottom echelons of a university's organizational hierarchy. Women faculty are more likely to experience sexual harassment, interpersonal intimidation, and social exclusion in the workplace than men (Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998; Dehdarirad, Villarroya, & Barrios, 2014). They tend to perceive the tenure and promotion process to be less equitable than men (Lawrence, Celis, & Ott, 2014), and cis women faculty tend to be the targets of negative implicit attitude bias (Jackson, Hillard, & Schneider, 2014).

Indeed, a large body of research reveals how universities and colleges are gendered organizations. Far fewer studies have examined the relationship between gender and faculty service. In the next section, we examine how the visibility and valuation of faculty service can be understood through a gendered lens.

### Gendering Service: Task-Oriented Versus Relational-Oriented Service

Along with research and teaching, service is one of the three main criteria for most tenure stream faculty members' career

advancement. From contributing to university committees, mentoring, advising, and participating in shared governance to leading academic organizations, reviewing scholarly articles, and coordinating community outreach projects, service consists of activities that utilize faculty members' professional expertise to support the missions and operations of their universities, disciplines, and communities (O'Meara, 2016). Service plays an integral role in the organizational maintenance and success of higher education institutions; however, it tends to be overshadowed by research and teaching criteria in the promotion and tenure process (Pyke, 2011; Ward, 2003). Park (1996) observed, "Though all faculty are expected to do some service, few (if any) faculty members have ever been denied tenure on the basis of insufficient service" (pp. 47–48). However, without faculty service, many important activities related to the recruitment and retention of students, program and personnel assessment, shared governance, university outreach, and faculty mentoring would dematerialize (Alger & Carrasco, 1997; Cramer, 2017).

**Service as a gendered continuum.** Neumann and Terosky (2007) explained, "Service has emerged, paradoxically, as necessary for the institutional welfare *and* unacknowledged in faculty work lives" (p. 284). Why does service tend to "count" less than research and teaching? Informed by Acker's (1990) theory of gendered organizations, we argue that service has been gendered into a more feminized form of labor and thus rendered less visible and valuable in higher education institutions than research and teaching. Instead of treating service through a binary lens of gender (i.e., situating all activities as feminized *or* masculinized), we contend that institutions and their members situate specific service activities along a gendered continuum of masculinity and femininity. Within the service domain, faculty labor tends to be perceived as a more feminized form of work; however, some types of service may be perceived to be more feminized than other service activities. This gendering process may burden women faculty with higher service loads than men.

To begin, researchers have found that women faculty spend a significantly larger amount of time on service than men. Misra et al. (2011) reported that, on average, women dedicated over 4.5 hours more than men toward university service activities each week, and they spent 6% more time on mentoring activities than men. Underrepresented minorities, including women and faculty of color, often spend more time on service to represent their gender, race, or ethnicity (e.g., as token members on search committees and diversity training programs) than faculty who are White men (Toutkoushian & Bellas, 1999; Ward, 2003). The gender differences in service are particularly pronounced at the associate professor level. Terosky, O'Meara, and Campbell (2014) attributed the slower career advancement of women associate professors to be partly due to the sheer quantity of midlevel administrative work, advising, mentoring, and university committee obligations that diminishes their research productivity.

Aside from quantitative discrepancies in faculty service, institutional and interpersonal biases further exacerbate the gender divide. Service can be conceived erroneously as "women's work" that often requires relational skills and abilities like emotional intelligence, social support, and collaborative communication (Park, 1996, p. 47). By imposing this gendered framework on service, then, women become the champions of this less valued form of labor (Kanter, 1977). The use of phrases like "academic



mothering” and “institutional housekeeping” instead of “academic advising” or “chairing an assessment committee” reveal gender biases about who is presumably responsible for the lion’s share of service (O’Meara, 2016). Pyke (2011) argued that “men do not face this structural pressure [to accept service requests] and are thus freer to ‘just say no’ and criticize faculty who do too much rather than too little service. The gendered university structure thus pushes and pulls women in entirely different ways than it does men” (p. 86). Indeed, women faculty are more likely to be asked to fulfill service duties than men, and women who decline these invitations risk political backlash or burdening their women colleagues with increased service demands.

When it comes to service, researchers have documented gender biases among students, too. Noy and Ray (2012) reported that women doctoral students are more likely to seek secondary advisors who are perceived to be more nurturing, caring, and supportive. Guided by gender biases, these students are more prone to ask women graduate faculty to serve in this capacity. Advising is an important form of service because it plays an instrumental role in reducing graduate students’ attrition and increases their odds on the job market; however, serving as a secondary advisor may be perceived to be less prestigious and institutionally rewarded than a primary graduate advisor.

**The (in)visible and (de)valued nature of service.** Although administrators and faculty tend to endorse the importance of service less in comparison with research and teaching, we argue that some forms of service are more visible and valued within an organization than others. Fletcher (1998) provided a viable framework for explaining this phenomenon. Drawing from Acker (1990), she argued that labor had been situated historically in two domains: a public sphere and a private sphere. In the public sphere, the “ideal worker” is assumed to be a man. Work is rationally reified and demarcated by precise increments of time, and a person’s labor is quantitatively measured, extrinsically rewarded, and monetarily compensated. On the other hand, the private sphere’s dominant actor is presumed to be a woman; work is reified emotionally, time is fluid, and a person’s labor is intrinsically motivated, unpaid, and mostly unquantifiable (Fletcher, 1998). As a type of historically masculinized organization, higher education institutions tend to operate on assumptions most closely tied to the public work sphere that privileges masculinized forms of labor (i.e., quantifiable, time-oriented, competitively selected, and task-oriented activities). In doing so, more feminized forms of labor (i.e., relational-oriented work) are less visible and valued.

More recently, researchers have critiqued the depiction of two distinct spheres (e.g., Holmes & Marra, 2004). Instead of situating the public and private spheres as two separate entities, it may be more productive to conceptualize them along a gender spectrum of masculinity and femininity. Although service activities tend to gravitate toward a more feminized type of labor, we contend that some forms of service are more task-oriented than relational-oriented. Moreover, we argue faculty tend to validate task-oriented service more than relational-oriented service.

**(In)visibility.** Fletcher (1998) explained that relational work consists of four categories of practice: preserving (e.g., shouldering jobs that are outside of a person’s explicit job description), mutual empowering (i.e., helping others through empathic mentoring and protecting individuals), achieving (i.e., engaging in relational maintenance and empowering oneself through reflection), and team building (i.e., collaborating with others). Many service activities incorporate these four practices. For example, mentoring students may include preserving (e.g., helping students who are not one’s official academic advisees) and mutual empowering (e.g., nominating students for high profile awards, thereby heightening their and one’s own visibility). Participating on a search committee demands practices like team building (e.g., collaborating with search committee members and administrators to ensure a successful job offer) and preserving (e.g., picking up job candidates at the airport). Although these tasks are important in supporting students’ success and hiring new colleagues, Fletcher (1998) argued that many relational-oriented activities “get disappeared” (p. 175). That is, they are not always reported or recorded on official institutional documents like curriculum vitae (CVs), merit worksheets, or tenure and promotion files. Fletcher (1998) explained, “If something was not quantifiable, it was assumed to be of no consequence and often was eliminated as a variable” (p. 175). Because many forms of service—especially relational-oriented activities like mentoring, advising, emotional labor, and managing a positive work climate—are difficult to quantify and may not directly result in clear forms of goods, services, or money, they often remain hidden from organizations’ formal records. On the other hand, service activities that are more task-oriented, such as serving as a faculty senator or chairing a university committee, are easier to measure and track; they are more likely to be visible in institutional records.

**(De)valuation.** Some forms of service may be quantifiable and task-oriented, but they might not be highly valued in higher education institutions. For example, a faculty member may write 50 letters of recommendation for undergraduate and graduate students; however, she or he may not necessarily report this information on his or her CV, annual report, or tenure documents to avoid being seen as a “bean counter.” Similarly, some faculty members may serve on a collection of small, unproductive committees. Although the committee work is reported on official documents, this form of service may not be appreciated or valued greatly in the promotion and tenure process.

## Research Questions

In this study, we explore how the visibility (i.e., its explicit acknowledgment or recognition) and valuation (i.e., the degree to which people and their organizations perceive it to be rewarding and important) of service can be explained through a gendered lens. Thus, we aim to answer the following research questions:

**RQ1:** How do task-oriented service and relational-oriented service differ in terms of their (a) visibility and (b) valuation?

**RQ2:** How do faculty members’ task-oriented and relational-oriented service activities differ by gender?

## Method

Qualitative approaches to inquiry are used when the intent “is to illuminate and better understand in depth the rich lives of human beings and the world in which we live” (Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2006, p. 2). The research team utilized a post-positivist paradigm, believing that we can gain an approximate understanding of reality through the identification of key themes across our participants’

experiences and stories (Creswell, 2013). Because this study's coauthors come from both natural and social science disciplines, post-positivism most closely reflects our shared epistemologies and ontologies. We believe that different people experience reality differently and that knowledge can be developed deductively and inductively (Creswell, 2013). Guba and Lincoln (1994) explained that "both qualitative and quantitative methods may be used appropriately with any research paradigm" (p. 105); this notion is supported by scholars like Crotty (1998); Creswell (2013), and Maxwell (2012). Creswell (2013) explained that qualitative research can be grounded in post-positivist epistemic and ontological assumptions.

We used a methodology known variously as qualitative description (Sandelowski, 2000, 2010) or generalized inductive methodology (Liu, 2016; Maxwell, 2005; Thomas, 2006), which in practical terms have few meaningful distinctions. Sandelowski (2000) described qualitative description as following "the general tenets of naturalistic inquiry" (p. 337), employing purposive sampling, "minimally to moderately structured open-ended individual and/or focus group interviews" (p. 338), and data analysis procedures based in content analysis that remains close to the data (as opposed to being highly theorized); such studies "offer a comprehensive summary of an event in the everyday terms of those events" (p. 336).

### Author Positionality

The authors of this paper are cis women faculty who at the time of data collection were at different stages of the tenure stream (i.e., three tenured associate professors, two tenured full professors, and one pretenure assistant professor) from different disciplines, including natural sciences, social sciences, business, and education. We hold a variety of racial, ethnic, sexual orientation, and disability status-related identities; men and nonbinary identified faculty members were not excluded from the research team but did not respond to the initial campus-wide solicitation to participate in the larger research group in which this study was developed. The interviews and data analysis were conducted by the first two authors. At the time of the data collection and analyses, one was a pretenure Asian American woman in communication and the other was a tenured White associate professor of higher education. Most of the time the interviewers differed from our participants across one or more aspects of social identity and/or rank and tenure-status. The additional authors participated in the conception and design of the study, reviewing the credibility of the findings, and the editing of this article.

### Context

Data were collected at a single Midwestern public university during the spring of 2015. The comprehensive university enrolls roughly 16,000 students and has a large range of master's programs and a limited number of doctoral programs. This location was chosen in part because studies of faculty service typically have been conducted at research extensive institutions (e.g., Misra et al., 2011), and we expected the role of service would be heightened at a public university with a stronger teaching focus and ties to the local and regional communities. In the two years prior to data collection, the faculty had voted to unionize and had implemented their first contract.

### Participants

After distributing e-mail invitations to all 227 tenure-stream faculty with appointments in the natural and social sciences and making campus-wide announcements soliciting participants, we conducted face-to-face interviews with 27 pretenured and tenured faculty (15 cis gender men and 12 cis gender women, based on self-identification) who volunteered for the study. No nonbinary or transgender faculty volunteered for the study, and to the best of our knowledge, there were no trans or nonbinary gendered faculty in the units included in the study at the time of data collection. This study is part of a larger project investigating service work among STEM and social science faculty; thus our sample was restricted to faculty in those disciplines.

Our participants included assistant professors ( $n = 3$ ), associate professors ( $n = 14$ ), and full professors ( $n = 10$ ) from a diverse scope of disciplines, including natural and physical sciences, social and behavioral sciences, and human development disciplines. The majority of our participants self-identified as White ( $n = 19$ ) and straight ( $n = 22$ ); all queer participants identified as associate ( $n = 2$ ) or full ( $n = 2$ ) White women. One participant did not identify their sexual orientation.

Our participants collectively are more racially diverse ( $\approx 30\%$  faculty of color) than the faculty as a whole and the faculty in the units from which we recruited participants ( $\approx 16\%$  faculty of color). We note an especially large representation of faculty of color who are full professors and an absence of early career participants of color. Detailed demographics of participants are included in Table 1. While recognizing the ways in which this erases important differences, to protect participants' identities, we combined faculty of color into single categories when race/ethnicity was considered in interaction with other demographic categories.

Table 1  
*Participants by Rank, Gender, and Race*

Rank	Women			Men			Grand total
	Faculty of color	White	Women total	Faculty of color	White	Men total	
Assistant	0	2	2	0	1	1	3
Associate	1	5	6 <sup>a</sup>	3	5	8	14
Full	2	2	4 <sup>a</sup>	2	4	6	10
Grand total	3	9	12	5	10	15	27

<sup>a</sup> Two White women associate professors identified as lesbian/bisexual/queer, as did two White women full professors.

ries. Of the eight participants of color, six were Asian or Asian American and two identified as Latinx.

### Data Collection

Qualitative description (Sandelowski, 2000, 2010) and generalized inductive methodology (Liu, 2016; Maxwell, 2005; Thomas, 2006) both frequently employ interviews as a primary or sole approach to data collection, as was the case in the subset of data used in this article (the larger study from which this analysis was drawn drew data from time logs and participants' CVs). Ranging from approximately 60 to 150 minutes, the first two authors conducted semistructured, face-to-face interviews in which we invited participants to define and discuss the role of service in their careers, departments, colleges, and university. Participants elected to complete their interviews in their own offices, a private conference room, or the interviewers' campus offices. With the permission of each interviewee, the authors digitally audio recorded each session and took detailed field notes. To protect participants' identities, pseudonyms are used throughout this manuscript. Participants were asked how they defined service, what kinds of service they engaged in, the impact of unit, college, and university policies and valuation of service on their activities, ways of documenting service, and what kinds of service were counted. We asked them about positive and negative service experiences, and we invited them to discuss how service affected their job satisfaction and career advancement. We asked what participants had observed and experienced regarding gender and other demographic differences in service. Finally, we asked participants for their recommendations regarding service. We also collected participants' listings of service activities and 2-week time logs from participants. Those data will be presented in a later paper.

### Data Analysis

After professionally transcribing the interviews from digital audio recordings, we cleaned the transcripts to remove all personally identifiable information and then utilized a grounded approach (Corbin & Strauss, 1990) to analyze our data, which consisted of 530 single-spaced pages of text. Specifically, after carefully reading and reviewing the transcripts, the first and second authors performed open coding in NVivo to iteratively generate categories and subcategories that were theoretically relevant to the visibility and value of different forms of service. Our process entailed identifying meaningful phrases in the data, clustering like data, labeling those clusters, organizing those clusters into larger categories (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014), primarily using descriptive and process coding. All initial categories rose organically from the data without the use of *a priori* codes. Finally, we drew on ideas from relevant literature to connect our categories and subcategories (Liu, 2016) to gendered assumptions, generating broad themes.

We employed memos to serve multiple functions in the analytic process, including to document patterns we observed, raise questions, and ask questions of the data (Birks, Chapman, & Francis, 2008). For example, we used memos to track initial, tentative patterns we were observing so we could further investigate the data to see whether the pattern was indeed present (examples include a memo reading, "Most people seemed to find whatever strategy

their unit used to assign service to be reasonably equitable/fair. It's the informal service that seemed problematic" and another stating "so the system of requiring college-wide votes for committees 'forces' us to choose among our peers; some of those assignments we deem to be onerous, time-consuming, or otherwise negative experiences. So, do we 'protect' some people and 'punish' others as we choose whom to vote for?"). We also used memos to communicate between researchers, track the addition of codes over the course of the study so transcripts coded early in the process could be reviewed to see whether patterns identified later were present in the earlier texts and to track our thought processes.

## Findings

### The (In)visibility and (De)valuation of Gendered Service

Our analyses revealed how institutional and individual gender biases influenced the visibility and perceived value of diverse service activities. When asked to identify and describe service, faculty tended to explicitly highlight masculinized examples of service that were task-oriented, quantifiable, and competitively selected (e.g., chairing a unit's merit committee for three years or acting as the editor of a prestigious journal) while omitting or downplaying examples of feminized service that were more relational-oriented, qualitatively rich, and collaborative (e.g., mentoring junior faculty, attending recruitment events, or helping students get jobs by writing letters of recommendation). We conceptualize these forms of hidden or invisible labor as "secret service." Moreover, participants frequently indicated that task-oriented forms of service were more highly valued in the tenure, promotion, and merit process than were relational-oriented forms of service. Our results are presented in the following sections.

### The Gendered Nature of (In)visible Service

Our analyses revealed how institutional and individual gender biases affected the visibility of faculty service. Specifically, participants discussed how relational-oriented service remained largely undocumented and unnoticed by faculty. They also explained how their gendered organization's policies, practices, and cultures perpetuated the concealment of certain forms of service. These findings are detailed below.

**Hidden relational work.** When asked to identify service activities that were (a) not recorded on formal documents like their CVs, annual reports, and tenure files or (b) absent from their colleagues' awareness, faculty frequently identified relational-oriented work like the provision of mentoring, career guidance, and social support to students and colleagues. Anastasia, a full professor who was a woman of color, explained, "What I cannot put down [on my CV] is the very fact . . . that people come to my office hours who are not in my class and who are not my Ph.D. advisees, who are not doing independent studies with me." Leah, a White woman associate professor, pondered, "I wonder how many letters of recommendations I've written . . . or how many manuscripts from some graduate students that I've [reviewed to support their careers] . . . that's the kind of thing you can't put on a check sheet." These forms of service supported students' success and careers, but they remain largely unnoticed and undocumented by their institution and colleagues.

Although faculty did not “count” these service activities toward their tenure, promotion, or merit cases, they often indicated that secret service commitments like mentoring students, emotional labor, and managing colleagues’ interpersonal conflicts were time-consuming and required a substantial level of energy and effort. For example, Rachel, a White woman at the rank of assistant professor, reflected on a time when she informally helped a student revise his article; the single mentoring session took two hours. Anastasia, a full professor and woman of color reflected that informal mentees “come and spend an hour—one hour there or 45 minutes—telling me about problems they’ve had with their TA supervisor, or with a class, asking me if I can help them get into some [research area]. And so, I can’t put that down as service . . . I can [document] my advisees, but I can’t put these students down [on my official merit, promotion, and tenure files].” Ray, a White man at the rank of assistant professor, volunteered to coordinate his department’s undergraduate internship program. He cited a variety of time-consuming relational activities that remained unrecorded:

[It] is important to maintain the relationships with [the students’ internship employers]. And so we’re doing a luncheon, just a ‘thank you’ luncheon coming up, and there’s gonna be 40 people probably invited . . . just a way to say ‘thanks’ for hosting our students, because we realize it’s not always an easy job and it actually adds work to their day to host an internship student . . . that’s not listed [on my CV].

Both informal and formal recruitment efforts (e.g., meeting with prospective students, faculty, and staff) also remained largely undocumented. When discussing one of her university’s formal recruitment fairs, a White woman named Star who was an associate professor explained, “You have to show your face, especially for small [departments]. You have to be [at recruitment events] . . . and to let people know you exist, to build bridges. But nobody thinks of it as service.” Through the processes of highlighting and hiding gendered service roles, institutions and individuals rendered invisible many feminized forms of service—even though these activities directly supported their university’s strategic goals related to the recruitment and retention of faculty and students.

While describing their own service activities, men and women faculty were more likely to identify their involvement in task-oriented and masculinized forms of service on formal documents like CVs and annual reports. For example, Judy, a White woman who was a full professor, indicated that she was the president-elect of a national academic organization. This leadership role was competitively selected, task-oriented, and highly visible. Sally, a White woman at the rank of associate professor, indicated that she was her department’s undergraduate program coordinator; this task-oriented role required her to propose curriculum changes. Although the inclusion of task-oriented service helped raise faculty members’ visibility in their professional fields and at their university, the exclusion of relational-oriented service resulted in a lack of awareness and appreciation for the hours of secret service performed by faculty and their colleagues.

**Institutional influence on (in)visible service.** Institutional policies, practices, and norms perpetuated the pervasive shrouding of secret service. Interviewees noted that departmental and institutional policies tended to define service in terms of more masculine-oriented activities, thus marginalizing and implicitly delegitimizing feminized types of service. David, a White man and

full professor explained, “Undergrads who want career guidance . . . none of it that isn’t institutionalized gets on the CV . . . If there’s no paperwork for it at the university level, then it’s not on [my CV or merit documents].” Faculty indicated that formal job titles, such as an academic advisor, were visible while informal labor like mentoring was not. A full professor and woman of color named Anastasia stated, “So when you start mentoring somebody, you kinda don’t think about those things. But two years after you’ve been mentoring them, they choose somebody else [to be their major academic advisor] . . . and the students don’t know the difference. They don’t know that this academic labor, mentoring [was time and energy intensive].” Although mentoring and relational-oriented work support students’ success, these forms of secret service did not advance faculty members’ careers and often demanded time that could have been channeled toward research or teaching activities.

These practices often reflected institutional policies, such as a department’s guidelines for merit or promotion. Jane, a woman of color who was an associate professor, said:

We have a new merit document from last year and . . . for the first time, [faculty] itemize things. In the past, it did not count as service, but I am gonna put it there because I’m gonna write a letter [of recommendation]. I’m gonna spend three to four hours on [the letter], right?”

In the aforementioned example, the new merit document afforded faculty members some valuable space to identify and explain a wider range of service activities, including writing letters for students. Prior to the codification of the new merit document, Jane and her department’s colleagues were not explicitly encouraged to include informal service commitments.

The university and department’s culture seemed to influence participants’ decision to document certain forms of service. Jeremiah, a White man at the rank of associate professor explained, “Any time people bring up some kind of counting system . . . many people in our department get super cautious and concerned about . . . bean-counting.” In this example, the participant perceived the required quantification of service to be problematic in his department’s culture. The concern about bean-counting illustrates a unique challenge for Jeremiah and his department’s colleagues who are contributing valuable time and energy toward the enactment of feminized forms of labor. Given the unit’s predominantly masculinized culture, feminized service is devalued to the point where organizational members consciously opt to not document it in their personnel files and merit forms. Jose, a man of color at the rank of associate professor, indicated that he did not include community service in his merit and promotion documents, because he perceived it was normative to only include university and professional forms of service. However, participants from other departments readily listed community service activities on their CVs. Across our sample, we found a remarkable degree of variation across departments in what service activities were considered appropriate to document.

In addition to undocumented service, another form of secret service included labor that went unnoticed by colleagues. These activities might be included on some forms and records, such as a merit worksheet, but typically were ignored or unrecognized by faculty members outside of a small circle of people (e.g., a merit committee). For example, Ray, a White man who was an assistant



professor commented, “When I tell other faculty in my department how many [committees] I’m on, they’re shocked. It’s like they . . . weren’t aware that I was doing all that.” Despite the large amount of time and labor that he contributed to these committees, people beyond his department’s merit committee and chair were largely oblivious of his extensive service work.

In another example, Judy, a White woman full professor, indicated that she was the academic advisor of 400 students. However, her college recently changed her official job title from “academic advisor” to “faculty mentor.” Despite the formal name change, her advising responsibilities remained the same, but from an institutional perspective, the title of a “faculty mentor” was more ambiguous and less meritorious. She explained:

I . . . just list “mentoring” and [how many] student I work with. The colleagues [with whom] I work close to realize this, but I have a two-hour meeting every week with these [students]. I’m not complaining. I’m also saying I do not think anyone that reads my vitae . . . would have a clue what [the mentoring labor] entails.

In sum, the gendered nature of the university, including its policies, norms, and practices, contributed to the hidden nature of service in general—especially relational-oriented work. Despite the institution’s tendency to devalue service, some faculty perceived this type of labor to be personally important and intrinsically rewarded. In the next section, we explain how some individuals defied institutional norms to embrace service.

### Valuing Devalued Service

Our analyses underscored faculty members’ beliefs that not all service activities were valued equally by their university and colleagues. Participants indicated that their institution tended to extrinsically reward task-oriented service more than relational-oriented service. When they shifted their focus from institutional assessments and extrinsic rewards to their own personal appraisals of service, however, many faculty embraced the intrinsic value of relational-oriented service.

**Institutional valuation.** We examined how masculinized and feminized forms of service differed in terms of their perceived worth. A valuation gap appeared between institutional and individual perceptions of service. From an *institutional perspective*, our participants frequently discussed the ways that service was undervalued. Compared with faculty members’ research and teaching, service “counted” proportionately less in tenure, promotion, and merit reviews. Citing campus news stories about faculty members’ research and teaching activities, along with a wide collection of formal faculty teaching and research awards, participants noted a lack of service-based awards and recognitions from their departments, colleges and universities.

Faculty indicated that some forms of visible service remained undervalued by their institutions, especially work performed by faculty of color. Jane, a woman of color who was an associate professor, observed that “students of color gravitate toward [faculty of color.] Students talk to [them] and this is not ‘counted’ in any service . . . Minority students, once they connect with a professor, they keep that connection whether they’re taking a class with [them] or not.” In addition to being asked to serve on extra search committees or diversity initiatives, faculty of color are asked more frequently to advise student organizations that focus

on race and culture. The same participant stated, “I’ve seen minority professors . . . there’s always a line outside their door because people—and they’re not even in the class—they want to talk to [my colleagues]. That is not ‘counted’ as service, but . . . everybody sees the traffic.” (We discuss this dynamic further in a subsequent section that examines the intersection of gender, race, and nationality.)

Institutional policies and practices often guided the appraisal of service. Ray, a White man at the rank of assistant professor, indicated that his department developed a point system to evaluate service in merit reviews. He explained:

So if you’re a reviewer for a journal, that’s a certain point. If you’re a committee member at the college level, at the university level . . . or in the community, then you get different points for that . . . you have to reach a certain point value.

However, faculty recognized that point systems often fail to account for the amount of time, emotional labor, and energy that are required by some service activities and not for others. For example, Ray described a situation where a person listed two committees. One committee met for 40 hours and the second committee met once each year for 30 minutes. Following his department’s point system, both committees would “count” equally in merit reviews. Similarly, a White woman participant who was an associate professor named Betsy indicated that her department lacked a mechanism to differentiate committee members who completed the majority of the group’s work versus members of the same committee who rarely showed up to meetings.

Although some departments had explicit rules and point systems to evaluate documented service, most units were more fluid and ambiguous in their rewards for service. A White man at the rank of associate professor named Jeremiah reflected on his department’s “open system” of evaluating service. He stated:

But there’s no criteria that [the department] specifically uses. You’re supposed to make your best argument, I guess, for what [service you’ve done], but the committee changes each year. The committee doesn’t see the ratings of the previous year. So you could do the exact same work service-wise and be rated higher or lower just depending on who’s [on] the committee and what they deem as being important.

In this example, Jeremiah expressed his frustration about the inconsistent valuation and appraisal of service activities. Generally speaking, task-oriented service tended to be worth more points than relational-oriented service, but he acknowledged that his colleagues and university lacked a reliable method of operationalizing and counting different service activities.

**Personal valuation.** On the other hand, individual faculty members differed in their personal valuation of service. Valuing the importance of both feminized and masculinized forms of service, participants discussed how serving on committees and helping others expanded their social networks, made them more visible on campus and in their disciplines, and prepared them for more advanced career leadership opportunities.

Some service activities fostered feelings of personal accomplishment and pride. For example, a White man who was a full professor named David reflected on his involvement in recruiting students and meeting with their families:

And parents of students . . . would later stop me in [local] grocery stores . . . and say, “Man, that was wonderful. I got a sense of the university. I got a sense of who the professors were. I got a sense of what the mission was, what students were here for.” And so it was exceptionally positive . . . And I volunteered [frequently], because there was such positive feedback.

Participants also discussed the intrinsic benefits of service, such as the satisfaction of making a positive impact on students and participating in the shared governance of their institution. While reflecting on his service experiences, a White man at the rank of associate professor named Angus said, “It’s the idea that I have positively influenced somebody and . . . it will contribute to their success, and it will make the world a better place.” Anastasia, a woman of color who was a full professor, talked about graduate student advising: “So the value I get from them is a sense of well-being from the people I’ve worked with, which I think is also value in our lives.”

That said, not all participants valued service. Some perceived it as an occupational obligation or waste of time. One man of color who was an associate professor named Peter simply stated, “Less service, more satisfaction.” Likewise, Betsy, a White woman who was an associate professor, disclosed, “Every hour I sign on for service is an hour I’m not writing an article, and that’s what really seems to matter for my [career] advancement.”

### Gender Differences in Service

Whereas the previous discussion focused on how the university placed greater value and visibility on task-focused (masculinized) service than relational (feminized) service, in this section we turn our attention to the gender of the person who is performing the service. Confirming studies featuring faculty participants at research-extensive institutions (e.g., Bird et al., 2004; Misra et al., 2011, 2012; O’Meara, 2016; Twale & Shannon, 1996), we found that women were far more likely to discuss performing relational service than were men. Eleven of the 12 women mentioned performing relational forms of service, whereas only seven of the 15 men made reference to enacting relational forms of service.

Jane, a woman of color at the rank of associate professor, said the following about one of her relational contributions:

I feel that it is part of my job to make time in my schedule to recruit and retain students in every way I possibly can. I left that [off of my CV], but I actually do try . . . to do my utmost, ’cause . . . I should do that. That’s what keeps the lights on around this place is students.

The same participant highlighted an undocumented aspect of her relational service, saying,

I do not put [my participation in my university’s formal recruitment fair] down, but there are people who do put that down. I attend our undergraduate commencement every semester. I think it’s important for our students to see you there and at the end. I do not know that I call that service. It’s just what you do, kind of the should do, what you should do piece.

The opposite pattern was evident in comments about task-related service. Nine of the 12 women discussed enacting task-focused service. Although a roughly equal fraction of the men referenced their own task-focused service, they spoke about it for approximately double the amount of time than women did. Collectively, our findings

indicate that women tend to perform a disproportionately larger amount of undocumented relational service than men. These forms of secret service can play a critical role in supporting students’ success and universities’ missions, but they tend to be invisible labor that fall between the cracks of higher education institutions’ reward systems related to promotion, tenure, merit, and organizational visibility. Extending this line of logic and connecting it back to the theory of gendered organizations, faculty—especially women and nonbinary people—who perform large amounts of secret service could be penalized inadvertently for channeling their time and energy toward feminized forms of service. All things held constant, gendered universities and colleges privilege and extrinsically reward faculty who engage in masculinized forms of service over feminized types of service.

### Service at the Intersection of Gender, Race, and Nationality

Gender was not the only variable that mattered in the value and visibility of service. Race and nationality arose often in participants’ comments about service. Piao, a man of color at the rank of full professor, discussed the role of race and gender in that White men were the ones in his unit who determined what kinds of service were rewarded, and they excluded work that was more often done by faculty of color. A woman of color at the rank of full professor named Anastasia talked about international graduate students who shared her country of origin:

These women would never choose me, a nonmale, to be their Ph.D. or M.A. advisor. There’s that kind of a dynamic that comes through ethnicity and race. Now, if they were my advisees, I would probably—they would be included. So, that kind of boundary making . . . I’ve actually openly said to them, “Here, you’re not my advisee. I get paid to do this kind of work, and this is actually my academic labor sort of thing. I’m sorry, I can’t do this.” So, they find—I find them coming to me through different venues. It’s like, “Can we go shopping on Saturday?” [Laughs] “I’m not your cool aunt.” You know?

This example illustrates how the faculty member’s gender, race, and nationality intersect to incur elevated service requests and emotional labor. As an international faculty member and a woman of color, Anastasia is simultaneously rendered invisible and hypervisible. On one hand, the graduate students’ racial and ethnic biases prevent them from viewing Anastasia as a legitimate advisor. On the other hand, the graduate students are drawn to Anastasia for informal mentoring purposes because they share similar gender, race, and nationality identities. Recognizing her university’s reward structures and the limited extrinsic benefits of secret service, Anastasia strategically constructed professional boundaries to protect her time and negotiate her service commitments to these students.

### Shared Awareness of Women’s Greater Relational Service

Both women and men were aware that women do more relational service. For example, a White woman associate professor named Leah said, “So, yes, I do think maybe I volunteer for more things . . . And I think that I see some of my women colleagues doing that more than men. I mean this is kind of an over-

generalization, but not really.” Recognizing the pervasiveness of gender biases, Anastasia explained:

But I think a lot of undergraduates go to the pretenure female faculty for mommies, and a lot of graduate students go to posttenure female faculty for mommies. I think that—it’s not that they do not go to the men, and there are a lot of men who nurture, so I’m not making any accusations about the men faculty. I just think that students do not think to ask some things they would ask of us as female faculty. And it’s not the fault of my male colleagues. I think I have wonderful male colleagues who would be approachable . . . but the students just . . .

This awareness of gender differences in relational service also was noticed by many of the men participating in this study. Capturing what many of the men said, a White man at the rank of associate professor named Angus noted:

I think the obvious default is the cultural expectation that women are nurturing, and so they—I think that stereotypes exist—well that’s not a stereotype . . . well that is a stereotype, they exist for a reason, and one of the reasons is that they’re perpetuated, and I think that the system continues to perpetuate that stereotype, and so I think that women tend to be expected [by students] to . . . play more in service . . . I mean that is the stereotype that service is serving, and that’s women’s work to some degree.

Particularly salient here is that the request for this kind of relational service is coming from students rather than solely from institutional expectations or from expectations of the faculty members themselves. That said, it would be inaccurate and unfair to only blame students for inequitable service requests and labor, as they are simply one part of a broader organization. Furthermore, we caution university and college leaders from assuming that cis women, trans\* and nonbinary people, and faculty of color should simply say “no” to extra service requests. Instead, we call for a structural shift in the ways that universities and colleges define, assign, and value diverse forms of service—and we invite administrators, cis men, and faculty in relatively privileged positions of power to work with minoritized faculty to dismantle policies and practices that widen gender disparities in the visibility and valuation of service.

## Discussion

As tenure-stream faculty answer the call to fulfill the service requirements of their universities, colleges, and communities (McDonald, 2013; O’Meara et al., 2017), it is imperative to consider how some forms of service are more visible and valued. Informed by the principles and framework of the theory of gendered organizations (Acker, 1990) and relational work (Fletcher, 1998), this study revealed the gendered nature of faculty members’ service activities. Specifically, our participants indicated that their departments, colleges, and university tended to recognize and reward service that was task-oriented, competitively selected, leadership-oriented, and quantifiable. At the same time, our participants noted that collaborative and supportive activities, such as mentoring, writing letters of recommendation, and recruiting students, often remained hidden forms of secret service. We also found that cis women and faculty of color tended to carry heavier service loads than White cis men. In this section, we explain how our study confirms existing findings from the literature and extends the

scholarship on faculty service and gender. We conclude by identifying directions for future research.

## Confirming Findings

Consistent with previous research (e.g., El-Alayli, Hansen-Brown, & Ceynar, 2018; Misra et al., 2011; O’Meara, Kuvaeva, & Nyunt, 2017; Ward, 2003; Wood et al., 2015), our study found that cis women and faculty of color tend to perform more service work than cis men, especially relational-oriented activities. The inequitable service load was observed by women and men, faculty of color, and White faculty, indicating that institutional members were aware of this problem. The persisting gender and racial disparities in service work places an extra burden of labor on the shoulders of women, trans\* individuals, nonbinary people, and faculty of color, which can adversely affect their research productivity, teaching, and career advancement (Lawrence et al., 2012; Moore & Ward, 2010). It can also incur emotional labor costs, foster feelings of professional burnout, and increase faculty members’ likelihood to leave their institution (e.g., Garvey & Rankin, 2018; Pugliesi, 1999).

Our findings reinforced prior research on gendered organizations (e.g., Acker, 1990), as we found that dominant institutional policies and practices continued to favor more task-oriented forms of service than relational work. The decision (not) to document service activities was strategic, meaning that faculty usually had a rationale for including or excluding service-related labor on their CVs, merit documents, and promotion files. These decisions were largely guided by gendered organizational policies, practices, and cultures. This institutionalized decision-making process, however, tended to reinforce the reporting of more masculinized and task-oriented forms of service while simultaneously hiding hours of faculty members’ relational work. Although relational work is important in supporting an organization’s mission and maintenance, it tends to be more fluid, less quantifiable, and not monetarily rewarded (Fletcher, 1998).

## Extending Findings

This study contributes to the higher education literature by explaining how service operates within institutional and interpersonal structures. A dearth of research continues to persist in the area of faculty service, particularly at universities that are not research extensive. Instead of focusing on individuals’ quantitative time allocations (e.g., Toutkoushian & Bellas, 1999), this qualitative study showed how service is systematically framed and embedded within a broader gender-biased system. By widening this study’s lens to examine how institutional and interpersonal gender biases influence the ways that service is communicated and evaluated, we reveal the need to recognize and reward the spectrum of relational-oriented service that continues to be taken for granted by institutions and individuals.

A closer look at our data revealed the valuation of service differed on institutional and individual levels. From an institutional perspective, service was undervalued. As service work universally constitutes a very small portion of a faculty members’ merit and promotion score, institutional policies and procedures continue to ignore the potentially valuable contributions of service work in recruiting and retaining students and faculty, promoting the uni-

versity's brand (e.g., through media interviews, community outreach projects, and professional organizations), and developing long-lasting relationships with alumni.

Despite this institutional devaluation, we found that most of our participants placed a high value on relational service. Although this may have been a factor of self-selection (faculty volunteered to participate in the study), cis women and men participants shared this pattern of finding meaning and value in their contributions to the success of students, peers, and institutional priorities. Thus, there was a tension between participants' personal definitions of valuable service and what the institution valued and rewarded. Given their general high appraisal of relational service, perhaps faculty members could work together to change institutional policies and practices to better value and more accurately count this form of academic labor.

In addition to revealing the valuation gap between the appraisal of service from institution and individual lenses, our study draws attention to feminized forms of service that are crucial to university missions, such as recruiting prospective students, that often remain undocumented and unrecognized in the higher education landscape. Moreover, relational-oriented service is imperative for improving retention, graduation, and job placement rates. Researchers have found that mentoring and social support from faculty can improve students' perceptions about campus climate and their likelihood to stay at a university or college (e.g., Porter, 2008; Vogt, 2008). Faculty can help students secure postgraduation jobs by writing letters of recommendation, serving as job references, and providing constructive comments on students' job application materials. As more state governments link universities' budgets to performance-based indicators related to the retention and graduation of students (Dougherty et al., 2016; U.S. Department of Education, 2015), the role of relational-oriented service may play an increasingly important role in supporting universities' bottom lines. Pragmatically, our study offers policy change recommendations and invites administrators and faculty to engage in a dialogue about more effective ways to recognize, talk about, and value diverse forms of service in higher education institutions.

Universities could make relational service more visible, and hence potentially more valuable, by asking faculty to document it on CVs and in merit, promotion, and tenure documents—and by weighing relational labor more heavily in career advancement decisions. For example, institutions could encourage faculty to specify how many (a) letters of recommendations they wrote in an academic year, (b) hours they spent meeting with students for mentoring and career preparation, (c) recruitment events they attended, and (d) faculty they mentored. Recognizing the importance of relational service, some universities now require formal evidence of mentoring to be included in faculty members' tenure and promotion files (e.g., Jaschik, 2015). Through changes in university policies and practices, institutions can reframe feminized forms of service as positive, meaningful, and valuable (Holmes & Schnurr, 2006; Monaghan, 2017a).

Our analyses underscore the importance of departmental cultures in framing the documentation and recognition of service. In general, faculty seemed more satisfied with departments that assigned formal service duties in a fair and transparent manner, and department chairs and program directors could engage in informal practices to ensure that important relational work does not, as Fletcher (1998) said, "get disappeared." Our participants identified

several strategies, such as asking committees to provide periodic reports; reserving time at faculty meetings for colleagues to share relevant information about service activities; highlighting faculty members' research, teaching, and service accomplishments in a weekly e-mail digest; and taking more time to learn about colleagues' work through informal conversations and networking. In their study on career advancement, Campbell and O'Meara (2014) found that the organizational climate at the department level was particularly instrumental in enhancing faculty's agency and ability to be productive. Therefore, in addition to top-down institutional reforms of policies, organizational change may be particularly influential at the department level.

Finally, there is a need to identify and transform organizational members' gender biases. Ramvi and Davies (2010) explained that many people still expect women to be "nurturing, emotionally expressive, communal, and care about others" (p. 446). Although some women may, in fact, harbor these traits, it is unfair to expect all women to fit this mold. When women do not meet organizational members' stereotypical expectations, they can be evaluated harshly (Holmstrom, Burleson, & Jones, 2005). Instead of trying to "fix" women to be more nurturing and burdening them with extra amounts of relational-oriented service, allies and organizational members should take a more active role in challenging gender biases and problematic institutional policies that perpetuate disparities in service labor.

Faculty should consider how they might prevent the exploitation of colleagues' relational work. Recognizing that women tend to spend a larger amount of time on service-related activities (Misra et al., 2011), department chairs and program directors can define service expectations, set boundaries on service assignments, and track service loads so that certain faculty members are not repeatedly asked to perform the lion's share of their unit's service, with particular attention paid to relational-oriented service activities. Making service assignments and activities more transparent can promote a more equitable distribution of labor (Monaghan, 2017b). Additionally, we need to help students recognize gender bias in the selection of advisors (Noy & Ray, 2012) and avoid asking more women than men faculty to perform informal advising and mentoring, or, at a minimum, seek ways to document and formalize those relationships. Graduate students in particular can be taught about the role of gender (and other social identities) in faculty careers in preparation for their own professional service, and be taught to be cognizant of how their requests for undocumented time may influence their informal advisors. Monaghan (2017b) explained:

Even if women are sought after more as advisers or are being asked to write more letters of recommendation or be on more committees, and even if they're volunteering for that service . . . we as a department are all going to try to fix this by making it our problem. (para. 5)

Thus, instead of burdening women faculty and students with the sole responsibility of diminishing gender inequities in service, it will be important for university leaders and men faculty to ensure a fairer distribution and valuation of service.

## Limitations and Future Directions

Recognizing this study's scholarly contributions, several limitations give rise to directions for future research. Most notably, our



data came from a relatively small sample of natural and social science tenure-stream faculty at one Midwestern university in the United States. Our sample did not include any nonbinary participants; this limited our ability to examine how service operates beyond cis men and women faculty. It is imperative for future research on gender and service to include the voices and perspectives of nonbinary faculty, as they face unique challenges in higher education (Nowakowski, Sumerau, & Mathers, 2016; Pitcher, 2016; Renn, 2010). To gain a broader perspective, future research should include the voices of tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty at diverse types of higher education institutions (e.g., community colleges, liberal arts colleges, research intensive universities, minority-serving institutions) and from a broader range of disciplines. Research about non-tenure-track faculty might be particularly illuminating, as these positions tend to be occupied more frequently by women and faculty of color (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015a), and more than 70% of all faculty jobs in the U.S. are nontenure track (American Association of University Professors, 2017). As the institutions of higher education restructure their organizations, redefine key personnel, and modernize their infrastructure (Ehrenberg, 2012; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006), it will be important to examine critically the evolving expectations and evaluations of faculty workloads and service.

Second, this study focused solely on the ways that faculty members experience and talk about service. To complement our findings, additional research could be conducted on the perspectives of personnel who are responsible for evaluating faculty members' service (e.g., administrators, chairs, directors, and members of institutions' promotion and tenure committees). Moreover, scholars could investigate gender biases by conducting a content analysis of official policies and documents that guide the reporting and evaluation of service like departments' tenure and promotion guidelines.

Third, we challenge scholars, administrators, faculty advocates and allies, and institutions to explore innovative ways to transform university policies and practices in ways that would render service more valuable and equitable. Institutions could enact policies that require chairs and directors to make service assignments in a more transparent manner. Tenure and promotion review committees could be trained to weigh relational-oriented service like mentoring more heavily, and faculty could work with administrators and unions to consider ways to extinguish superfluous committees.

Finally, we invite future research that takes an intersectional approach to the study of gender, service, and higher education. Our study revealed strong gender differences and some persistent racial disparities in the visibility and valuation of service. It is important to note, however, that service may operate uniquely across additional identity boundaries, such as ability, sexual orientation, academic rank, caregiver status, and discipline. Future research could reveal service disparities across demographic factors and explore how institutions and their faculty in more privileged positions, such as men, can work together to make service a more equitable part of faculty careers.

It is critical we remember that, as Pyke (2011) wrote, "Faculty service labor is not optional, nonessential, unskilled labor; rather, it is vital to the day-to-day and long-term operation of the university" (p. 86). It is imperative that we find ways to recognize and reward the multiple ways all faculty contribute to the success of our students, institutions, and disciplines.

## References

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, 4, 139–158. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/089124390004002002>
- Acker, J. (1992). Gendering organizational theory. In A. J. Mills & P. Tancred (Eds.), *Gendering organizational theory* (pp. 248–260). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Acker, J. (2011). Theorizing gender, race, and class in organizations. In E. Jeanes, D. Knights, & P. Y. Martin (Eds.), *Handbook of gender, work and organization* (pp. 65–80). West Sussex, UK: Wiley.
- Alger, J. R., & Carrasco, G. P. (1997). *The role of faculty in achieving and retaining a diverse student population*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/issues/diversity-affirmative-action/resources-diversity-and-affirmative-action/role-faculty-achieving-and-retaining-diverse-student-population>
- Allan, E. J. (2011). Women's status in higher education: Equity matters. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 37, 1–163.
- American Association of University Professors. (2017). *Trends in the academic labor force, 1975–2015*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from [https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/Academic\\_Labor\\_Force\\_Trends\\_1975-2015\\_0.pdf](https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/Academic_Labor_Force_Trends_1975-2015_0.pdf)
- American Association of University Women. (2015). *Women excluded from university hiring pool . . . again*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.aauw.org/2015/09/08/iowa-president-no-women/>
- American Council on Education. (2012). *State funding: A race to the bottom*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.acenet.edu/the-presidency/columns-and-features/Pages/state-funding-a-race-to-the-bottom.aspx>
- Antecol, H., Bedard, K., & Stearns, J. (2016). *Equal but inequitable: Who benefits from gender-neutral tenure clock stopping policies?* Bonn, Germany: Institute for the Study of Labor.
- Babcock, L., Recalde, M. P., Vesterlund, L., & Weingart, L. (2017). Gender differences in accepting and receiving requests for tasks with low promotability. *The American Economic Review*, 107, 714–747. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/aer.20141734>
- Bachen, C. M., McLoughlin, M. M., & Garcia, S. S. (2009). Assessing the role of gender in college students' evaluations of faculty. *Communication Education*, 48, 193–210. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634529.909379169>
- Barone, C. (2011). Some things never change: Gender segregation in higher education across eight nations and three decades. *Sociology of Education*, 84, 157–176. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0038040711402099>
- Berg, M., & Seeber, B. K. (2016). *The slow professor: Challenging the culture of speed in the academy*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto.
- Berkovitch, N., Waldman, A., & Yanay, N. (2012). The politics of (in) visibility: On the blind spots of women's discrimination in the academy. *Culture and Organization*, 18, 251–275. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2011.644669>
- Bilodeau, B. L. (2009). *Genderism: Transgender students, binary systems, and higher education*. Saarbrücken, Germany: Verlag.
- Bird, S. R., Litt, J., & Wang, Y. (2004). Creating a status of women report: Institutional housekeeping as women's work. *The National Women's Studies Association Journal*, 16, 194–206.
- Birks, M., Chapman, Y., & Francis, K. (2008). Memoing in qualitative research: Probing data and processes. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 13, 68–75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1744987107081254>
- Boring, A., Ottoboni, K., & Stark, P. B. (2016). Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness. *ScienceOpen Research*, 10, 1–11.
- Bronstein, P., & Farnsworth, L. (1998). Gender differences in faculty experiences of interpersonal climate and processes for advancement.

- Research in Higher Education*, 39, 557–585. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1018701722855>
- Campbell, C. M., & O'Meara, K. (2014). Faculty agency: Departmental contexts that matter in faculty careers. *Research in Higher Education*, 55, 49–74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11162-013-9303-x>
- Cohen, D. J. (2017, August 8). Why faculty members should not help with move-in day. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2017/08/08/downside-faculty-members-helping-students-move-essay>
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, 13, 3–21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00988593>
- Cordova, D. I. (2011). Moving the needle on women's leadership. *Gender and Higher Education Leadership*, 40. Retrieved from [http://archive.aacu.org/ocww/volume40\\_1/data.cfm](http://archive.aacu.org/ocww/volume40_1/data.cfm)
- Cramer, S. F. (2017). *Shared governance in higher education: Demands, transitions, and transformations*. New York, NY: State University of New York.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- de Jong, D. (2015). Transgender issues and BSW programs: Exploring faculty perceptions, practices, and attitudes. *The Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work*, 20, 199–218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18084/1084-7219.20.1.199>
- Dehdarirad, T., Villarroya, A., & Barrios, M. (2014). Research trends in gender differences in higher education and science: A co-word analysis. *Scientometrics*, 101, 273–290. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11192-014-1327-2>
- Dougherty, K., Jones, S. M., Lahr, H., Natow, R. S., Pheatt, L., & Reddy, V. (2016, October 6). Does performance funding work? *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2016/10/06/evaluation-whether-performance-funding-higher-education-works-essay>
- Ehrenberg, R. G. (2012). American higher education in transition. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 26, 193–216. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/jep.26.1.193>
- El-Alayli, A., Hansen-Brown, A. A., & Ceynar, M. (2018). Dancing backwards in high heels: Female professors experience more work demands and special favor request, particularly from academically entitled students. *Sex Roles*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0872-6>
- Fletcher, J. (1998). Relational practice: A feminist reconstruction of work. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 7, 163–186. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/105649269872012>
- Gappa, J. M., & Austin, A. E. (2010). *Rethinking academic traditions for the twenty-first century faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/Gappa-Austin.pdf>
- Garvey, J. C., & Rankin, S. S. (2018). The influence of campus climate and urbanization on queer-spectrum and trans-spectrum faculty intent to leave. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 11, 67–81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000035>
- Guarino, C. M., & Borden, V. M. H. (2017). Faculty service loads and gender: Are women taking care of the academic family? *Research in Higher Education*, 58, 672–694. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2>
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holmes, J., & Marra, M. (2004). Relational practice in the workplace: Women's talk or gendered discourse? *Language in Society*, 33, 377–398. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0047404504043039>
- Holmes, J., & Schnurr, S. (2006). “Doing femininity” at work: More than just relational practice. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 10, 31–51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-6441.2006.00316.x>
- Holmstrom, A. J., Burleson, B. R., & Jones, S. M. (2005). Some consequences for helpers who deliver “cold comfort”: Why it's worse for women than men to be inept when providing emotional support. *Sex Roles*, 53(3–4), 153–172. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-5676-4>
- Jackson, S. M., Hillard, A. L., & Schneider, T. R. (2014). Using implicit bias training to improve attitudes toward women in STEM. *Social Psychology of Education*, 17, 419–438. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11218-014-9259-5>
- Jaschik, S. (2015, July 20). Mentoring as tenure criterion. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/07/20/purdue-moves-make-mentoring-undergraduates-criterion-tenure>
- Jones, S. R., Torres, V., & Arminio, J. (2006). *Negotiating the complexities of qualitative research in higher education: Fundamental elements and issues*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Lawrence, J., Celis, S., & Ott, M. (2014). Is the tenure process fair?: What faculty think. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 85, 155–192.
- Lawrence, J., Ott, M., & Bell, A. (2012). Faculty organizational commitment and citizenship. *Research in Higher Education*, 53, 325–352. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11162-011-9230-7>
- Liu, L. (2016). Using generic inductive approach in qualitative educational research: A case study analysis. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 5, 129–135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jel.v5n2p129>
- Marine, S. B., & Nicolazzo, Z. (2014). Names that matter: Exploring the tensions of campus LGBTQ centers and trans\* inclusion. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 7, 265–281. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0037990>
- Maxwell, J. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *A realist approach for qualitative research*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- McDonald, D. (2013). Doing more with less: Five trends in higher education design. *Planning for Higher Education Journal*, 24, 1–5.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mintz, L. M. (2011). *Gender variance on campus: A critical analysis of transgender voices* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. ED533688.
- Misra, J., Lundquist, J. H., Holmes, E., & Agiomavritis, S. (2011). The ivory ceiling of service work. *Academe*, 97, 22–26.
- Misra, J., Lundquist, J. H., & Templer, A. (2012). Gender, work time, and care responsibilities among faculty. *Sociological Forum*, 27, 300–323. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1573-7861.2012.01319.x>
- Monaghan, P. (2017a, February 12). Making committee service count. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from [http://www.chronicle.com/article/Making-Committee-Service-Count/239165?cid=at&utm\\_source=at&utm\\_medium=en&elqTrackId=bc32e746248c48bd83651ab2d66e9926&elq=0aa1d401eacb442cb4faece6683cd5cb&elqaid=12596&elqat=1&elqCampaignId=5135](http://www.chronicle.com/article/Making-Committee-Service-Count/239165?cid=at&utm_source=at&utm_medium=en&elqTrackId=bc32e746248c48bd83651ab2d66e9926&elq=0aa1d401eacb442cb4faece6683cd5cb&elqaid=12596&elqat=1&elqCampaignId=5135)
- Monaghan, P. (2017b, February 12). Who's doing what, and who's getting what? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Who-s-Doing-What-and/239168>
- Moore, T. L., & Ward, K. (2010). Institutionalizing faculty engagement through research, teaching, and service at research universities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 17, 44–58.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *Degrees conferred by sex and race*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=72>

- National Center for Education Statistics. (2015a). *Chap. 3: Postsecondary education*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from [https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/ch\\_3.asp](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/ch_3.asp)
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2015b). *Race/ethnicity of college faculty*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61>
- Neumann, A., & Terosky, A. L. (2007). To give and to receive: Recently tenured professors' experiences of service in major research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 78, 282–310. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2007.0018>
- Nowakowski, A. C. H., Sumerau, J. E., & Mathers, L. A. B. (2016). None of the above: Strategies for inclusive teaching with "representative" data. *Teaching Sociology*, 44, 96–105. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0092055X15622669>
- Noy, S., & Ray, R. (2012). Graduate students' perceptions of their advisors: Is there systematic disadvantage in mentorship? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 83, 876–914. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2012.0036>
- O'Meara, K. (2002). *Scholarship unbound: Assessing service as scholarship for promotion and tenure*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- O'Meara, K. (2016). Whose problem is it? Gender differences in faculty thinking about campus service. *Teachers College Record*, 118, 1–38.
- O'Meara, K., Kuvaeva, A., & Nyunt, G. (2017). Constrained choices: A view of campus service inequality from annual faculty reports. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 88, 672–700. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.1257312>
- O'Meara, K., Kuvaeva, A., Nyunt, G., Waugaman, C., & Jackson, R. (2017). Asked more often: Gender differences in faculty workload in research universities and the work interactions that shape them. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54, 1154–1186.
- Park, S. M. (1996). Research, teaching, and service. Why shouldn't women's work count? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 67, 46–84. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2943903>
- Pitcher, E. N. (2016). Undone and (mis)recognized: Disorienting experiences of a queer, trans\* educator. In S. Miller & N. Rodriguez (Eds.), *Educators queering academia: Critical memoirs* (pp. 137–146). New York, NY: Palgrave-MacMillan.
- Porter, K. B. (2008). Current trends in student retention: A literature review. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, 3, 3–5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2007.09.001>
- Porter, S. R., Toutkoushian, R. K., & Moore, J. V. (2008). Pay inequities for recently hired faculty, 1988–2004. *The Review of Higher Education*, 31, 465–487. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/rhe.0.0014>
- Pugliesi, K. (1999). The consequences of emotional labor: Effects on work stress, job satisfaction, and well-being. *Motivation and Emotion*, 23, 125–154. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1021329112679>
- Pyke, K. (2011). Service and gender inequity among faculty. *PS, Political Science & Politics*, 44, 85–87. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1049096510001927>
- Ramvi, W., & Davies, L. (2010). Gender, mothering and relational work. *Journal of Social Work Practice*, 24, 445–460. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02650531003759829>
- Renn, K. A. (2010). LGBT and queer research in higher education: The state and status of the field. *Educational Researcher*, 39, 132–141. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X10362579>
- Renzulli, L. A., Reynolds, J., Kelly, K., & Grant, L. (2013). Pathways to gender inequality in faculty pay: The impact of institution, academic division, and rank. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 34, 58–72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2013.08.004>
- Rose, D. (2015). Regulating opportunity: Title IX and the birth of gender-conscious higher education policy. *Journal of Policy History*, 27, 157–183. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0898030614000396>
- Roser, S., & Lane, E. O. (2002). Key barriers for academic institutions seeking to retain female scientists and engineers: Family un-friendly policies, low number, stereotypes, and harassment. *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science*, 8, 161–189.
- Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing & Health*, 23, 334–340. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X\(200008\)23:4<334::AID-NUR9>3.0.CO;2-G](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X(200008)23:4<334::AID-NUR9>3.0.CO;2-G)
- Sandelowski, M. (2010). What's in a name? Qualitative description revisited. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 33, 77–84.
- Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Seelman, K. L. (2014). Recommendations of transgender students, staff, and faculty in the USA for improving college campuses. *Gender and Education*, 26, 618–635. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2014.935300>
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (2007). Faculty development: The challenge going forward. *Peer Review: Emerging Trends and Key Debates in Undergraduate Education*, 9, 4–8.
- Stearns, P. N. (2016). *Guiding the American university: Contemporary challenges and choices*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Terosky, A. L., O'Meara, K., & Campbell, C. M. (2014). Enabling possibility: Women associate professors' sense of agency in career advancement. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 7, 58–76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0035775>
- Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27, 237–246. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1098214005283748>
- Toutkoushian, R. K., & Bellas, M. L. (1999). Faculty time allocations and research productivity: Gender, race, and family effects. *The Review of Higher Education*, 22, 367–390. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/rhe.1999.0014>
- Twale, D. J., & Shannon, D. M. (1996). Professional service involvement of leadership faculty: An assessment of gender, role, and satisfaction. *Sex Roles*, 34, 117–126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01544799>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2015). *Fact sheet: Focusing Higher Education on Student Success*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/fact-sheet-focusing-higher-education-student-success>
- Vogt, C. M. (2008). Faculty as a critical juncture in student retention and performance in engineering programs. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 97, 27–36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2008.tb00951.x>
- Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wood, J. L., Hilton, A. A., & Nevarez, C. (2015). Faculty of color and White faculty: An analysis of service in colleges of education in the Arizona public university system. *Journal of the Professoriate*, 8, 85–109.
- Ziker, J. (2014). The long, lonely job of homo academicus. *The Blue Review*. Retrieved from <https://theblureview.org/faculty-time-allocation/>

Received May 5, 2017

Revision received February 9, 2018

Accepted March 20, 2018 ■