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Overview of Issue
The vast majority of studies shows significant gaps in time spent by women and men faculty in teaching, research, and service activities. This is problematic as spending less time on research and more on service and teaching can negatively impact a faculty member’s career advancement. While awareness of equity gaps and their consequences is increasing, the processes through which work is taken up, assigned, and rewarded unequally are still not well understood.

Main Findings

Studies found that female faculty engage in more campus service and teaching-mentoring related activities than their male colleagues and that these differences become more pronounced as faculty move along in their careers (Acker & Armenti, 2004; Carrigan, Quinn, & Riskin, 2011; Clark & Cocoran, 1986; Guarino & Borden, 2017; Link, Swan, & Bozeman, 2008; Misra, Lundquist, Holmes, & Agiomavritis, 2011; O’Meara, Kuvaeva, & Nyunt, 2017; Park, 1996; Winslow, 2010). These findings are consistent across different methods including national surveys of faculty (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Carrigan et al., 2011; Guarino & Borden, 2017; Link et al., 2008; Winslow, 2010), annual faculty reports (O’Meara et al., 2017), and time diaries (O’Meara, Kuvaeva, Nyunt, Waugaman, & Jackson, 2017).

Women of color face particular demands for unrewarded work as they are called upon to represent faculty of color and women. Studies have shown women faculty of color engaged in more mentoring and advising work and being asked to serve on more faculty searches and diversity-related committees than white faculty and male faculty of color (Griffin & Reddick, 2011; Joseph & Hirshfield, 2011; Stanley, 2006; Turner, González & Wood, 2008; Wood, Hilton, & Nevarez, 2015).

Moreover, the kinds of campus service that women engage in are often less prestigious, less promotable, more time-consuming, or “token” (Babcock, Recalde, Vesterlund, & Weingart, 2017; Misra et al., 2011; Mitchell & Hesli, 2013; Porter, 2007; Twale & Shannon, 1996).

Research suggests women may be committed to teaching and campus service in particular ways (O’Meara, 2016; Umbach, 2006; Winslow, 2010). Students have been found to have expectations that women faculty are more available to them than male faculty (Anderson, 2010). Studies find that women do not necessarily say yes or volunteer more often to engage in service but are asked more often to engage in service (Mitchell & Hesli, 2013; O’Meara et al., 2017).

Key Recent Studies


This study examined gender differences in how research university faculty spend their work time using a modified time diary approach. Associate and full professors in 13 universities recorded their work activities for four weeks. Consistent with previous research, this study found women faculty spend more time on campus service, student advising, and teaching related activities whereas male faculty spend more time on research. The study also found women receive more new work requests than men- on average 3.4 requests more than men in four weeks.
Men and women also received different kinds of work requests, with women receiving more requests to be engaged in teaching, student advising, and professional service than men.


Time is a valuable resource in academic careers. Empirical evidence suggests women faculty spend more time in campus service than men. Yet some studies show no difference when relevant variables are included. The primary source of data for most workload studies is cross-sectional surveys that have several weaknesses. This study investigated campus service inequality and factors that predict it at 1 research university using a novel and more comprehensive source of data - annual faculty reports. The investigation was guided by Kanter’s work on the role of power and representation and Lewis and Simpson’s rereading of Kanter’s work to focus on gender, power, and representation. The authors examined 1,146 records of faculty campus service during 2 years. In both years, women faculty reported more total campus service than men while controlling for race, rank, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), and the critical mass of women in a department. When considering levels of service, women reported higher numbers of service activities at the department and university levels. Women in male-dominated fields tended to have service workloads more like their peers and less like women in non-STEM fields. The article concludes with considerations regarding implications for organizing practices that maintain inequity between men and women in campus service.


This paper investigates the amount of academic service performed by female versus male faculty. We use 2014 data from a large national survey of faculty at more than 140 institutions as well as 2012 data from an online annual performance reporting system for tenured and tenure-track faculty at two campuses of a large public, Midwestern University. We find evidence in both data sources that, on average, women faculty perform significantly more service than men, controlling for rank, race/ethnicity, and field or department. Our analyses suggest that the male–female differential is driven more by internal service—i.e., service to the university, campus, or department—than external service—i.e., service to the local, national, and international communities—although significant heterogeneity exists across field and discipline in the way gender differentials play out.

**Equity Minded Strategies**

- Create greater awareness of workload inequity by collecting data on it and sharing it widely (e.g., through dashboard that show minimum, average, and high teaching, advising, and campus service workloads)
- Require rotations for time-intensive service roles, fair distribution of advising loads, and credit for faculty who take on more than their fair share through merit review processes
- Implicit bias training for faculty, department chairs, deans, and other institutional leadership on division of labor and how to mitigate bias
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