

ADVANCE Program for Inclusive Excellence

Advancing women, transforming the University, investing in a culture of inclusive excellence



Campus Service Inequality: A View from Annual Faculty Reports

The UMD ADVANCE Program engages in research to assess the current status of faculty work environments and to see if there are important differences by gender, race and ethnicity, and career stage. In this ADVANCE Brief we look at faculty campus service.

When reviewing the literature on faculty and campus service two somewhat contradictory findings emerge. First, many studies show women faculty spend more work time on campus service than men, and that this division of labor causes resentment, stress, and differential career progress for women faculty (Acker & Armenti, 2004; Barrett & Barrett, 2011; Bird, Litt, & Wang, 2004; Carrigan, Quinn & Riskin, 2011; Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Hart & Cress, 2008; Link, Swan, & Bozeman, 2008; Misra, et al. 2011; Park, 1996; Turner & Meyers, 2002; Winslow, 2010). Second, a few studies show no or few significant differences in the number of hours male and female faculty devote to campus service when controlling for rank, discipline, career stage, and institutional type (Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Mitchell & Hesli, 2013; Porter, 2007). Further, a review of the literature shows women are more likely to engage in kinds of campus service that are less prestigious, more time-consuming, and “token” (Misra et al, 2011; Mitchell & Hesli, 2013; Porter, 2007; Twale & Shannon, 1996).

According to the 2011 and 2013 University of Maryland Faculty Work Environment Surveys, women were less likely to report feeling in control of their campus service workload. In 2013, women also indicated that they were less able to say no to additional service activities without negative consequences. ADVANCE examined whether there

were differences between UMD tenure track faculty in campus service workload by gender and race using annual faculty reports from 2012 and 2013. The researchers used FAR settings and categorized service as occurring in one’s department, college, university, or another department/college and mentoring faculty. 98% of tenure track/tenured faculty service activity was captured via FAR report for the previous year. (Department Chairs and Deans were excluded.) Two years of campus service activity were analyzed to increase confidence in the results.

We report major findings here.

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN AMOUNT AND KIND OF SERVICE

Findings from 2012 revealed statistical differences in the number of female and male faculty who reported at least one campus service activity. Women faculty were more likely than men faculty to report campus service activity at the following levels:

- Department (72.4% of women vs. 64.6% of men)
- University (32.8% of women vs. 27.8% of men)
- Other unit (8.6% of women vs. 5.8% of men)
- Mentoring (10.3% of women vs. 6.7% of men)
- Across all levels combined (86.5% of women vs. 79.9% of men)

Gender was also a significant predictor of the number of service activities in 2012. Women were more likely than men to report a higher number of service activities at the following levels:

- Department (M=2.36, SD=2.28 vs. M=1.98, SD=2.25, respectively)
- University (M=0.76, SD=1.74 vs. M=0.53, SD=1.33, respectively)
- Other unit (M=0.14, SD=0.61 vs. M=0.08, SD=0.38, respectively)
- All levels combined (M=4.30, SD=3.65 vs. M=3.41, SD=3.34, respectively)

Results from 2013 data indicated that women were more likely than men to report campus service activities across all levels combined (89.6% vs. 83.9%, respectively). Gender was also a significant predictor of the number of campus service activities in 2013. Women were more likely than men to report a higher number of service activities at the following levels:

- Department (M=2.44, SD=2.45 vs. M=1.97, SD=2.04, respectively)
- All levels combined (M=4.51, SD=3.55 vs. M=3.64, SD=3.25, respectively)

RACE DIFFERENCES IN AMOUNT AND KINDS OF SERVICE

In the 2012 data, Faculty of Color were more likely than White faculty to report service activities at the other unit level (10.2% vs. 5.6%, respectively).

In the 2013 data, there were no differences in the number of Faculty of Color and White faculty who reported at least one service activity. Analyses revealed that White faculty were more likely than Faculty of Color to report a higher number of service activities at the university level (M=0.77, SD=1.61 vs. M=0.47, SD=0.86, respectively).

CRITICAL MASS OF WOMEN AND AMOUNT AND KINDS OF CAMPUS SERVICE

For data analyses, colleges were split up into three groups: those with 1-24% of women faculty (Group 1), those with 25-49% of women faculty (Group 2), and those with 50-74% of women faculty (Group 3). In 2012, women from Group 2 were more likely than men from this group to report service activities at the department, college, other unit, mentoring level, and across all levels. Women were also more likely than men from this group to report a higher number of service activities at the department (M=2.56, SD=2.44

vs. M=1.97, SD=2.39); university (M=0.78, SD=1.77 vs. M=1.49, SD=1.04); other unit level (M=0.17, SD=0.70 vs. M=0.07, SD=0.39); and across all levels (M=4.62, SD=3.84 vs. M=3.35, SD=3.44, respectively). In 2013, women from Group 2 were more likely than men from the same group to report a higher number of service activities at the department level (M=2.58, SD=2.66 vs. M=2.01, SD= 2.21, respectively), and across all levels (M=4.69, SD=3.87 vs. M=3.81, SD=3.58, respectively).

ALL SERVICE CONSIDERED: GENDER, RACE, RANK, CRITICAL MASS, AND TOTAL CAMPUS SERVICE

According to a regression model of 2012 data, gender and rank were found to be statistically significant predictors of the number of total service activities across all combined levels. Women faculty reported higher levels of service when controlling for other variables and Full Professors reported more service activity than Assistant Professors. The influence of gender or rank on the number of total service activities varied by critical mass. In 2012, within ranks, women reported more service activities than men at the associate level (M=4.94, SD=3.73 for women associates vs. M=3.80, SD=3.66 for men associates), and at the full professor level (M=4.96, SD=4.15 for full professor women vs. M=3.35, SD=3.32 for full professor men).

According to a regression model of 2013 data, gender, rank, and critical mass were found to be statistically significant predictors of the total service activities across all combined levels. Women faculty reported higher levels of service, Full Professors reported more service activity than Assistant Professors, and all faculty in Group 3 reported more service activity than Group 1 when controlling for other variables. In 2013, within ranks, women reported more service activities than men at the associate level (M=4.64, SD=3.43 for associate women vs. M=3.92, SD=3.53 for associate men), and at the full professor level (M=5.27, SD=4.00 for full professor women vs. M=3.59, SD=3.22 for full professor men). These findings are consistent with much research on the workload challenges faced by women associate professor faculty, overall and in research universities (MLA, 2009; Misra et al., 2011; Terosky, O'Meara, & Campbell, 2014).

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In 2012 the researchers found that women reported higher numbers of campus service activities than men at the department, university, other unit, and across all levels; in 2013 women reported higher numbers of service across all levels. Our findings in both 2012 and 2013 showed that faculty from colleges with more women faculty were more likely than faculty from colleges with smaller percentages of women to be engaged in college service. This holds true also for the number of reported service activities in 2013: the average numbers of college level service activities and service activities across all levels increased with the representation of women in colleges. Overall, regression analysis in both 2012 and 2013 reveal the salient role of gender, interacting with rank, as strong predictors of campus service participation. These findings are consistent with the general trend in the literature which finds women faculty spend more time on service, at least in research and doctoral universities, than men. This is an equity concern because it means male faculty may have more time to spend on research, which is given greater weight in the UM reward system.

This study raises implications for amending organizing practices that maintain inequity between men and women faculty in the amount and kinds of faculty campus service. A number of reforms can be put in place to ensure equitable workloads.

- Transparent dashboards or lists of service obligations can be developed within departments to ensure all faculty are sharing service workload.
- Planned rotations for all labor-intensive service roles can be put in place.
- Also, campus service can be given greater credit in merit processes so that those who are most engaged can be rewarded (O'Meara, 2014). The ADVANCE Program will work to support these efforts.
- The merit process can allow the entire faculty to see and vote on scores for teaching, campus service, and research so that below average campus service contributions are rated lower.

REFERENCES:

- Acker, S. & Armenti, C. (2004). Sleepless in academia. *Gender and Education* 16(1), 3-24.
- Barrett, L., & Barrett, P. (2011) Women and academic workloads: Career slow lane or cul-de-sac? *Higher Education*, 61, 141-155.
- Bellas, M. & Toutkoushian, R.K. (1999). Faculty time allocations and research productivity: gender, race, and family effects. *Review of Higher Education*, 367-390.
- Bird, S., Litt, J. S., & Wang, Y. (2004). Creating status of women reports: Institutional housekeeping as "women's work." *NWSA Journal*, 16(1), 194-206.
- Carrigan, C., Quinn, K., & Riskin, E.A. (2011). The gendered division of labor among STEM faculty and the effects of the critical mass. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 4(3), 131-146.
- Clark, S. M. & Corcoran, M. (1986). Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty: A case of accumulative disadvantage? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 57(1), 20-43.
- Hart, J. L., & Cress, C. M. (2008). Are women faculty just "worrywarts?" Accounting for gender differences in self-reported stress. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 17(1-2), 175-193.
- Link, A. N., Swan, C. A., Bozeman, B. (2008). A time allocation study of university faculty. *Economics of Education Review*, 27, 363-374.
- Misra, J., Lundquist, J. H., Dahlberg Holmes, E., & Agiomavritis, S. (2011). The ivory ceiling of service work. *Academe*, 97, 2-6.
- Mitchell, S.M. & Hesli, V.L. (2013, April). Women Don't Ask? Women Don't say No? Bargaining and service in the Political Science Profession. *Political Science & Politics*, 46, 2, pp 355-369.
- Modern Language Association of America. (2009). *Standing still: The associate professor survey. Report of the Committee on the Status of Women in the profession*. Retrieved from http://www.mla.org/pdf/cswp_final042909.pdf.
- Neumann, A. & Lapointe Terosky, A. (2007). To give and to receive: Recently tenured professors' experiences of service in major research universities. *Journal of Higher Education*, 78(3), 282-310.

Park, S.M. (1996). Research, teaching, service: Why shouldn't women's work count? *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(1), 46-84.

Porter, S. (2007). A closer look at faculty service: What affects participation on committees? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 78(5), 523-541.

Terosky, A., O'Meara, K., & Campbell, C. (2014). Enabling possibility: Women associate professors' sense of agency in career advancement. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 7(1), 58-76.

Turner, C. S. V., & Myers, S. M. (2002). *Faculty of color in academe: Bittersweet success*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Twale, D.J., & Shannon, D.. 1996. Professional Service Involvement of Leadership Faculty: An Assessment of Gender, Role, and Satisfaction. *Sex Roles* 34 (1/2): 117-26.

Winslow, S. (2010). Gender inequality and time allocations among academic faculty. *Gender & Society*, 24(6), 769-793.

TO CITE THIS BRIEF:

Corrigan, K., Kuvaeva, A., & O'Meara, K., (2015). Campus Service Inequality: A View from Annual Faculty Reports. College Park, MD: University of Maryland ADVANCE Program.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

Sandra Gordon-Salant, Betsy Beise, Alexandra Kuvaeva, and KerryAnn O'Meara initiated this project as part of creating the Service Dashboard.

All tenure track faculty can access information about campus service participation in their college by going to the ADVANCE Dashboard page at

<http://www.advance.umd.edu/dashboard-main>