The Impact of Faculty Work-Life Factors on Faculty Service Morale

By Jessica K. Ezell Sheets, Cassie L. Barnhardt, Carson W. Phillips, & Peggy H. Valdés

This quantitative study examines how faculty service morale is related to faculty's social identities, organizational environments, and the three dimensions of faculty work-lives proposed by Johnsrud and Rosser (2002): professional priorities and rewards, administrative relations and support, and quality of benefits and services. Findings suggest that identity characteristics, organizational environments, administrative relations and support, and quality of benefits and service all play important roles in predicting faculty service morale.

TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE encompass the three domains of university faculty's work, yet service only marginally factors into most promotion and tenure decisions (Misra, Lundquist, Holmes, & Agiomavritis, 2011; Ward 2003). Service is also the least researched of the three domains of faculty work (Neumann & Terosky, 2007). The lack of consensus in defining what constitutes faculty service (Neumann & Terosky, 2007; Ward, 2003) complicates campuses' approaches to recognizing and rewarding service contributions (Lawrence, Ott, & Bell, 2011). Given the competing demands that faculty face, time spent researching and teaching is inversely related to time spent on service (Lawrence et al., 2011; Milem, Berger, & Dey, 2000), and increased time spent on teaching and service contributes to faculty producing fewer publications (Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999). Publishing fewer research products undermines a faculty member's ability to achieve tenure since research receives the most weight in promotion and tenure decisions (Misra et al., 2011).

Faculty service is the mechanism utilized to sustain and enact the principles of shared governance and academic quality in a university environment (Neumann & Terosky, 2007; Ward, 2003). Faculty service consists of activities such as participating in departmental and university committees and governing bodies, engaging in editorial and peer review processes, being involved in disciplinary societies, and working with external community partners or organizations (Neumann & Terosky, 2007;

O'Meara, Neumann, & Terosky, 2008). Among the various types of service, participation on campus committees can become especially problematic for faculty if it is inequitably distributed. Prior research has documented that women and people of color typically carry larger service loads than their male and white peers, respectively (Baez, 2000; Misra, Lundquist, & Templer, 2012). Ironically, with low professional recognition for service work in promotion and tenure decisions (Misra et al., 2011; Misra et al., 2012), the lack of professional advancement can end up disadvantaging precisely those individuals who are most engaged in the organizational processes essential to maintaining campus functions—for example, the faculty who confer on curriculum, policy, hiring, or admissions committees and internal funding panels. At its worst, unequal distributions of faculty service loads can perpetuate privilege and homogeneity among the upper faculty ranks since tenure and promotion rarely depend upon service engagement. To evaluate the role that faculty service has in creating an equitable campus environment, we ask: To what extent are faculty service loads related to faculty's identity characteristics versus aspects of faculty work-lives more closely within a campus's ability to control, such as professional rewards, administrative support, and benefits and services? In pursuing this question, we hope to provide campuses with a framework for considering ways they can foster equitable outcomes and promote participation in service across the organization.

Background Literature

Prior studies largely have found that the social identity characteristics of gender and race disproportionately influence faculty service loads, which in turn produce systematic, inequitable pathways to promotion and faculty career advancement (Baez, 2000; Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Guarino & Borden, 2017; Laden & Hagedorn, 2000; Misra et al., 2011; Misra et al., 2012; Mitchell & Hesli, 2013; Padilla, 1994; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Turk, 1981; Turner, 2002). Though a study by Porter (2007) found relatively few differences in service by gender and race, this study did not account for service effort occurring outside of a committee structure, such as community outreach, which may fall unduly upon faculty with minoritized backgrounds. Other studies have suggested that women disproportionately remain associate professors in part because their share of service is greater than that of men (Misra et al., 2011; Misra et al., 2012; O'Meara, Kuvaeva, & Nyunt, 2017). Women are also more frequently asked to participate in lower-status activities, such as university committee work, rather than professional service (Guarino & Borden, 2017; Misra et al., 2012; Mitchell & Hesli, 2013). Mitchell and Hesli's (2013) work highlights how women are less able to be selective about the kinds of service they engage in. Prior research also suggests that faculty of color carry disproportionately heavy service loads (Baez, 2000; Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Laden & Hagedorn, 2000; Padilla, 1994; Turner, 2002) and often experience a "cultural tax" (Padilla, 1994) when campuses call upon them to engage in unequal amounts of service, ostensibly to demonstrate a commitment to diversity (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Disparate service participation becomes a barrier for faculty of color in attaining tenure because it places greater demands on their time than it does for their white colleagues (Baez, 2000). In sum, research suggests that both the amount and types of service work that marginalized individuals are asked to engage in may differ from those with privileged identities.

Literature also suggests that differences in faculty service loads may be related to work environments. Studies have found differences in service participation according to discipline (Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000; Xu, 2012). Prior studies also have found that higher percentages of women in departments are related to lower resource allocations (Volk, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2001), that larger percentages of women entering fields are associated with pay declines (Levanon, England, & Allison, 2009), and that faculty service loads may be related to gender composition (Guarino & Borden, 2017). Research provides additional evidence that organizational position may be related to service engagement. Studies have found, for example, that professional experience, or rank, matters in service workload, with associate and full professors performing more service than assistant professors (Misra et al., 2012; Porter, 2007). While service has not been a major focus of studies of adjunct faculty, some studies suggest that adjuncts have sought participation in university governance, a specific type of service, sometimes as a means by which to secure employment security and benefits (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Jones, Hutchens, Hulbert, Lewis, & Brown, 2017; Kezar & Sam, 2014). Given that this participation is often uncompensated, it is unclear how adjunct faculty perceive such service.

Theory of Faculty Work-Life's Relationship to Faculty Morale

Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) proposed three dimensions of faculty work-life of significance to faculty members in advancement and retention: professional priorities and rewards, administrative relations and support, and quality of benefits and services. Professional priorities and rewards include the things that matter to faculty in performing their work as well as the intangible rewards they get from their work, such as autonomy and intellectual stimulation. Administrative relations and support consists of faculty's confidence in campus leadership, in leaders' commitment to advocating for faculty interests, in leaders' competence in obtaining support for faculty work, and in the system of shared governance on faculty's campuses. Finally, quality of benefits and services includes the tangible compensation and support faculty receive for their work as well as their working conditions. Salary, fringe benefits, access to research, teaching, clerical, and technology support are all included in this category. If faculty perceive inequities in how these resources are distributed, they may become demoralized. Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) found empirical support that faculty's perceptions of

their work-lives affected the attitudinal outcome of faculty morale, and that morale affected faculty's intent to leave (their current positions, their faculty careers, and/or their institutions).

Though Johnsrud and Rosser's (2002) model sought to explain faculty departure through understanding faculty morale and did not focus specifically on faculty service, other literature suggests that the three dimensions of faculty work-life proposed by Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) to affect faculty morale may also have an impact on faculty service morale. Aligning with Johnsrud and Rosser's (2002) dimension of professional priorities and rewards, in a qualitative study, O'Meara (2002) found that how service was regarded in faculty promotion and tenure decisions was related to institutional values and beliefs and the contradictions between espoused and enacted values. The degree to which faculty believe that their professional values are reflected in the campus's priorities and mission may therefore influence faculty service morale, though to our knowledge, this relationship has not been tested quantitatively in the literature to date.

Kezar (2004) concluded from a different qualitative study that administrative leadership, trust, and relationships played a larger role in effective governance than structures and processes. This finding corresponds to another of Johnsrud and Rosser's (2002) dimensions of faculty work-life, suggesting that administrative relations and support may play a key role in influencing faculty service morale.

Prior research also provides support for the importance of what Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) referred to as the quality of benefits and services faculty receive from the campus. Faculty perceptions of appropriate compensation and support may influence attitudes towards service load, role balance, job satisfaction, and retention. Salary may also affect faculty's overall job satisfaction (Shin & Jung, 2014; Hagedorn, 2000), though the relationship between salary and faculty perceptions of service is untested, to our knowledge. Job satisfaction may in turn influence work productivity and retention for faculty (Hagedorn, 2000; Mamiseishvilli & Rosser, 2011), suggesting that more satisfied faculty may become more productive, longer-term scholars. Previous research has found a negative correlation between the amount of time faculty devoted to service and faculty job satisfaction (Singell & Lillydahl, 1996) and has linked heavy service loads with faculty's emotional exhaustion (Lackritz, 2004). Further research is needed to uncover how the balance of faculty service with other responsibilities may contribute to shaping overall job satisfaction, which may in turn affect faculty burnout and retention. If marginalized faculty routinely carry greater service loads, as much of the literature suggests (Baez, 2000; Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Laden & Hagedorn, 2000; Misra et al., 2011; Misra et al., 2012; Mitchell & Hesli, 2013; O'Meara et al., 2017; Padilla, 1994; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Turk, 1981; Turner, 2002), this inequality in service has significant implications for the diversity of the professoriate.

Purpose

This study aims to understand the degree to which Johnsrud and Rosser's (2002) three dimensions of faculty work-life significant to faculty morale are also useful in understanding faculty's attitudes towards service, which we refer to as faculty service morale. Drawing from a large body of literature on faculty service and Johnsrud and Rosser's (2002) theoretical model, we propose a model to test the applicability of Johnsrud and Rosser's (2002) three dimensions of faculty work-life to the specific domain of faculty service morale. Our models test the relationships between faculty service morale and faculty's social identities and other demographic characteristics, faculty work environments, and the three dimensions of faculty work-lives categorized by Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) as professional priorities and rewards, administrative relations and support, and quality of benefits and services. Our study fills a gap in the faculty service literature by exploring the role that three major aspects of faculty work-lives play in contributing to faculty service morale. Results suggest important implications for faculty work productivity, retention of faculty, and systems contributing to or detracting from the overall diversity of the professoriate.

Methods

Measures and Sample

Our research site was a private, Catholic liberal arts college in a major city. The campus's participation in this study was a continuation of its

decade-long effort to improve campus climate and equity. The survey was developed collaboratively by the research team, the campus's diversity office, and the campus's faculty senate to ensure that it reflected the local campus context (Bergquist, 1992), relevant literature, and prior empirical work on campus climate. The instrument consisted primarily of closed-ended items with a few open-ended questions; 42 items measured respondents' attitudes and behaviors using Likert-type scales, along with demographic items (see Tables 1 and 2 for variables and response options). Attitudinal and behavioral items were designed to measure faculty's perceptions of campus leadership, opportunities for participation in shared governance, the campus's climate for diversity and inclusion, work-life balance on campus, and aspects of faculty work environments. In the spring of 2014, all instructional employees (1,149 people) were invited to participate in an electronic survey. Utilizing Dillman's (2000) total design method, over a three-week period, we sent up to three reminder messages to faculty to submit responses. We received 382 responses for a response rate of 33 percent. This sample was representative of the campus population based on sex, race/ethnicity, and age.

Of 382 participants, 306 provided responses for the balance outcome and 303 for the service outcome. In preparing our data for analyses, we performed listwise deletion, which reduced the sample size to 211 for the balance outcome and 207 for the service outcome. Although, admittedly, employing pairwise deletion would have offered greater statistical power by enabling us to preserve more cases, pairwise deletion is highly sensitive to any departures from data missing completely at random, and will produce biased estimates under these conditions; instead, listwise deletion is generally a better method for obtaining unbiased estimates (Allison, 2002). When employing logistic regression, as we did in our analyses, listwise deletion is particularly resistant to producing biased

estimates of slope coefficients and standard errors (Allison, 2002). To investigate whether listwise deletion was an appropriate choice for our study, we conducted missing data analyses. Chi-squared tests confirmed that there were no statistically significant patterns of missing data between sex or race—social

Table 1. Descriptive Summary Statistics for Balance Model

Faculty (N = 211)				
	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
Faculty of Color (White = ref)	0.28	0.45	0	1
Female (Male = ref)	0.44	0.50	0	1
Catholic (Not Catholic = ref)	0.29	0.46	0	1
Age	51.19	12.27	27	82
Years of Experience at Institution	12.01	9.99	0	52
Adjunct Faculty (Not Adjunct = ref)	0.16	0.36	0	1
Hard Subjects (Soft = ref)	0.19	0.40	0	1
Pure Subjects (Applied = ref)	0.47	0.50	0	1
Percentage of Female Faculty in College	44.68	16.87	21.05	82.35
Professional Priorities and Rewards*	2.75	0.68	1	4
Administrative Relations and Support*	2.65	0.73	1	4
Quality of Benefits and Services*	2.40	0.70	1	4
Balance Satisfaction Outcome	2.14	0.93	1	4

*Denotes scale where 1 = lowest assessment of measure and 4 = highest assessment.

Table 2. Descriptive Summary Statistics for Service Model

Faculty (N = 207)				
	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
Faculty of Color (White = ref)	0.28	0.45	0	1
Female (Male = ref)	0.44	0.50	0	1
Catholic (Not Catholic = ref)	0.29	0.46	0	1
Age	51.33	12.18	27	82
Years of Experience at Institution	12.17	10.02	0	52
Adjunct Faculty (Not Adjunct = ref)	0.15	0.36	0	1
Hard Subjects (Soft = ref)	0.19	0.40	0	1
Pure Subjects (Applied = ref)	0.47	0.50	0	1
Percentage of Female Faculty in College	44.72	17.01	21.05	82.35
Professional Priorities and Rewards*	2.75	0.68	1	4
Administrative Relations and Support*	2.66	0.73	1	4
Quality of Benefits and Services*	2.40	0.70	1	4
Service Satisfaction Outcome	2.34	0.91	1	4

*Denotes scale where 1 = lowest assessment of measure and 4 = highest assessment.

identity characteristics suggested by the literature to bias results—and our outcome measures. We also compared the percentage of respondents who were faculty of color and female in the total respondent group to our samples for each of our models and found that each of these percentages varied by less than two percent. Together, these analyses suggested that listwise deletion was an appropriate method for studying this data.

Analyses

Outcomes. Our outcomes of interest were two measures of faculty service morale: (1) agreement that faculty's balance of teaching, scholarship, and service was appropriate, and (2) agreement that the amount of service faculty were expected to perform was appropriate. Agreement was measured on a scale of one (strongly disagree) to four (strongly agree).

Covariates. We selected twelve covariates for regression modeling informed by the literature and theory described above and designed to test the applicability of Johnsrud and Rosser's (2002) dimensions of faculty work-life on our two measures of faculty service morale, controlling for identity-based, demographic, and environmental variables. Covariates included faculty's individual social identity characteristics (race, sex, Catholic affiliation, and age), the years faculty had been campus employees (institutional age), characteristics associated with faculty work environments—including characteristics of their organizational roles (adjunct dummy) and academic disciplines, and the gender composition of faculty's colleges (percentage female). While Catholic affiliation was not a salient identity variable in the service literature, we included it in our study because we reasoned that Catholic faculty working at this Catholic campus might have different, religiously influenced views about faculty service than non-Catholic faculty. Discipline-based variables utilized Biglan's academic subject classifications, identifying academic fields as hard (vs. soft) and pure (vs. applied). For our analyses, we coded the campus's academic departments according to prior uses of the Biglan framework (Biglan, 1973a; Biglan, 1973b; Simpson, 2015; Stoecker, 1993).

Independent Variables of Interest. Our covariates of interest consisted of three scales we created from survey items to represent Johnsrud and Rosser's (2002) three dimensions of faculty work-life: professional priorities and rewards (4 items, $\alpha = 0.74$), administrative relations and support (5 items, $\alpha = 0.85$), and quality of benefits and services (3 items, $\alpha = 0.71$) (see Appendix A). Each of these scales were coded on a scale of one to four, where one represented faculty's lowest levels of agreement that their work environments offered them what they needed in these areas and four represented the highest levels.

Ordinal Logistic Regression Models. We ran two ordinal logistic regression models to examine associations between the outcomes (balance and service) and independent variables. Ordinal logistic regression was appropriate because the outcomes were ordinal and categorical, but we could not assume that the distance between each response choice was equivalent. Likelihood ratio tests and Brant tests verified that neither model violated the parallel regression assumption.

Chi-Squared Tests. In addition to running ordinal logistic regression models to see whether the three dimensions of faculty work-life established by Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) were significantly associated with our two faculty service outcomes of interest when controlling for key social identity characteristics

Table 3. Comparison of Respondent and Sample Groups — Balance Model

Variable	% Respondents	*N* Respondents	% Sample	*N* Sample
Faculty of Color	29.72%	360	27.96%	211
Female	45.81%	382	44.08%	211

Table 4. Comparison of Respondent and Sample Groups — Service Model

Variable	% Respondents	*N* Respondents	% Sample	*N* Sample
Faculty of Color	29.72%	360	28.02%	207
Female	45.81%	382	44.44%	207

outlined in the service literature, we wanted to understand whether faculty with more marginalized identities held different assessments of their work-life experiences along the three dimensions. Because of our relatively small sample sizes, we were not able to do this by including interaction terms in our models. To explore this question further, we instead ran crosstabs with chi-squared tests between the social identity characteristics of being faculty of color and being female faculty and each of the three dimension scales: professional priorities and rewards, administrative relations and support, and quality of benefits and services.

Results

Ordinal Logistic Regression—Balance Model

Findings from the balance and service models are illustrated in Tables 5 and 6, respectively. In the balance model, four of five significant predictors were positive. Holding all else constant, being female contributed to a decline in the odds (OR = 0.40, $p < 0.01$) that faculty would regard their teaching, scholarship, and service as appropriately balanced. Other significant predictors were associated with increasing the odds that faculty would hold more positive impressions of their work being balanced. These predictors included being older in age (OR = 1.03, $p < 0.05$), being adjunct faculty (OR = 5.45, $p < 0.001$), and two of Johnsrud and Rosser's (2002) faculty work-life dimensions: administrative relations and support (OR = 2.06, $p < 0.05$), and quality of benefits and services (OR = 3.42, $p < 0.001$). Notably, Johnsrud and Rosser's (2002) third dimension, professional priorities and rewards, was marginally significant in this model (OR = 1.97, $p < 0.10$).

Ordinal Logistic Regression— Service Model

In the service model, all three significant predictors were positive. Age (OR = 1.04, $p < 0.05$) was the single significant identity characteristic;

holding all else constant, being older was associated with greater odds of feeling more positive about the amount of service faculty were asked or expected to perform. As in the balance model, being adjunct faculty was associated with more positive views about the amount of service expected of faculty (OR = 3.51, $p < 0.01$). Also, as with the balance model, results provided some support for the applicability of Johnsrud and Rosser's (2002) faculty work-life dimensions to studying faculty service morale. Perceiving higher levels of the quality of benefits and services received (OR = 3.65, $p < 0.001$) increased the odds that faculty would feel more positive about the amount of service requested of them (OR = 3.65, $p < 0.001$). Also noteworthy in this model were four variables with marginal significance. Being female (OR = 0.57, $p < 0.10$) was marginally associated with lower levels of satisfaction with the amount of service asked of faculty. On the other hand, serving as faculty in a "hard" academic field (OR = 2.02,

Table 5. Ordinal Logistic Regression Model - Balance Model

Faculty (N = 211)				
Variable	Coef.	Coef. SE	OR	OR SE
Faculty of Color	0.42	0.32	1.52	0.48
Female**	-0.92	0.32	0.40	0.13
Catholic	0.20	0.32	1.22	0.39
Age*	0.03	0.02	1.03	0.02
Years of Experience at Institution	-0.02	0.02	0.98	0.02
Adjunct Faculty***	1.69	0.45	5.45	2.46
Hard Subjects	0.16	0.38	1.18	0.44
Pure Subjects	0.04	0.32	1.04	0.33
Percentage of Female Faculty in College	0.00	0.01	1.00	0.01
Professional Priorities and Rewards^	0.68	0.36	1.97	0.71
Administrative Relations and Support*	0.72	0.35	2.06	0.71
Quality of Benefits and Services***	1.23	0.31	3.42	1.06

***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05, ^p < 0.10

Model Statistics

Number of Observations	211
Log Likelihood	-199.74
Degrees of Freedom	12
Likelihood Ratio Chi-square	136.24
Prob > Likelihood Ratio Chi-square	0.00
Pseudo R-square	0.2543

$p < 0.10$) was marginally associated with higher levels of satisfaction with service when compared to serving as faculty in a "soft" discipline. Finally, results provided further marginal support for the usefulness of Johnsrud and Rosser's (2002) work-life dimensions for understanding faculty service morale: perceiving higher levels of professional priorities and rewards (OR = 1.81, $p < 0.10$) and administrative relations and support (OR = 1.89, $p < 0.10$) were both marginally significant indicators that faculty would be more content with the size of their service loads.

Social Identity and Faculty Work-Life Dimension Patterns of Note

Findings from our additional crosstabs with chi-squared test analyses revealed several noteworthy relationships within our data. First, in both the balance and service models, faculty of color were significantly more likely to indicate higher assessments of the quality of benefits and services they received at the campus (mean difference of 0.16, $p < 0.05$, and 0.13, $p < 0.01$, respectively). Next, in both models, female faculty were significantly more likely to indicate lower assessments of their professional priorities and rewards from the campus (mean difference of -0.36, $p < 0.05$, and -0.37, $p < 0.01$, respectively). Finally, in the service model, female faculty were significantly more likely to possess lower assessments of their administrative relations and support within the institution (mean difference of -0.14, $p < 0.05$); in the balance model, this relationship was only marginally significant (mean difference of -0.11, $p < 0.10$).

Discussion and Significance

Campus Commitment to Equity and Inclusion

While individual identity characteristics, work environment characteristics, and Johnsrud and Rosser's (2002) faculty work-life dimensions surfaced as significant predictors in both ordinal logistic regression models, we found that, in contrast to most prior studies, being a faculty member of color was not a significant predictor in either of our

Table 6. Ordinal Logistic Regression Model - Service Model

Faculty (N = 207)				
Variable	Coef.	Coef. SE	OR	OR SE
Faculty of Color	0.40	0.32	1.49	0.48
Female^	-0.56	0.31	0.57	0.18
Catholic	0.32	0.32	1.38	0.45
Age*	0.04	0.02	1.04	0.02
Years of Experience at Institution	-0.03	0.02	0.97	0.02
Adjunct Faculty**	1.26	0.48	3.51	1.68
Hard Subjects^	0.71	0.39	2.02	0.79
Pure Subjects	-0.15	0.32	0.86	0.28
Percentage of Female Faculty in College	-0.01	0.01	0.99	0.01
Professional Priorities and Rewards^	0.60	0.36	1.81	0.65
Administrative Relations and Support^	0.64	0.35	1.89	0.66
Quality of Benefits and Services***	1.30	0.31	3.65	1.14

***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05, ^p < 0.10

Model Statistics

Number of Observations	207
Log Likelihood	-199.54
Degrees of Freedom	12
Likelihood Ratio Chi-square	120.94
Prob > Likelihood Ratio Chi-square	0.00
Pseudo R-square	0.2344

Table 7. Social Identity and Faculty Work-Life Dimension Patterns of Note

Identity Characteristic	Work-Life Dimension	Dependent Variable	Mean Difference
Faculty of Color	Quality of Benefits & Services	Balance	0.16*
Faculty of Color	Quality of Benefits & Services	Service Amount	0.13**
Female	Professional Priorities & Rewards	Balance	-0.36*
Female	Professional Priorities & Rewards	Service Amount	-0.37**
Female	Administrative Relations & Support	Balance	-0.11^
Female	Administrative Relations & Support	Service Amount	-0.14*

***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05, ^p < 0.10

models. Findings from our chi-squared tests, which indicated that faculty of color held higher levels of satisfaction with the quality of benefits and services received when compared to their white colleagues, may in part explain this phenomenon.

We assert that the campus's sustained commitment to improve its climate for equity also contributed to our lack of significant findings for race/ethnicity. A decade ago, the campus began to develop a set of initiatives aimed at increasing inclusivity towards its faculty. These initiatives started with the campus diversity office leading efforts to prepare a handbook for department chairs documenting campus policies, practices, and procedures. The handbook was coupled with routine training sessions for department chairs focused on addressing conflict and conducting faculty annual reviews – areas where equity and inclusion are of heightened importance. The diversity office also established ongoing department chair training to identify and address newly identified areas of need.

The campus has further pursued extensive efforts to support pre-tenure faculty, including developing a pre-tenure faculty handbook with year-by-year expectations, deadlines, and resources; this handbook was designed to maximize transparency and includes specific departmental-level standards of performance. The inclusion strategy for faculty also consists of offering pedagogy workshops for all tenure-track faculty in their second year that focus on interculturalism and teaching diverse learners. Senior faculty facilitators volunteer and are paired with more novice faculty to serve as liaisons between deans and department chairs.

With respect to compositional diversity and equity in the faculty ranks, the campus began conducting hiring summits. During these summits, all department chairs are periodically convened to review data on prior faculty searches, where they examine what occurred during faculty search processes, including the composition of search committees, content of job announcements, composition of candidate pools, and new hires. At the summits, the chairs evaluate the extent to which search processes have reflected the university mission and values (that include enhancing racial and ethnic diversity).

Other campus initiatives designed to improve inclusion have involved creating a formal network of minority faculty and staff that meet routinely to address professional issues such as recruitment and retention, deans hosting open-ended lunches and holding frequent listening sessions with faculty, academic programs sponsoring a week-long interdisciplinary forum on diverse perspectives and experiences, and the campus making high quality campus child care services available to faculty. Many of these faculty development initiatives were collaboratively pursued through partnerships between the campus diversity office, human resources, the teaching center, deans' offices, and the Provost's office.

Age

In both the balance and service models, identity, organizational position, and faculty work-life dimensions were important predictors of contentment with role balance. In terms of identities that were significant in both models, age was a positive, significant identity-based predictor in both the balance and service models. A limitation of our study was that we could not control for rank; based on prior literature (e.g., Baez, 2000; Misra et al., 2012; Mitchell & Hesli, 2013), however, we suspect that age and rank are correlated, but that rank is a more instructive measure. Still, we interpret our findings regarding age to suggest that older (and likely higher ranking) faculty possessed higher service morale and held better opinions of both their balance of faculty responsibilities and of the size of their service loads.

Adjunct Faculty

In terms of organizational position, being an adjunct faculty member was a significant, positive predictor in both models. This finding suggests either that adjuncts' sole responsibility on campus was teaching, for which faculty were compensated, or that the perceived value of participation in service made participation worthwhile to faculty even if it was uncompensated. Some of the positive feelings observed by adjunct faculty are also likely to have been an outgrowth of the attention that the university directed towards understanding their work-life needs and experiences. In the year prior to the campus's survey administration, the Provost commissioned a taskforce on part-time faculty. This work resulted in the university granting health care benefits for part-time faculty after teaching for three consecutive semesters at a load of two or

more three-credit courses. The university's faculty senate also modified its bylaws to create seats for contingent faculty representation in shared governance. These changes were accompanied by a host of other modifications, some of which included identifying a point person in the Provost's office and in each dean's office for contingent faculty, establishing a consistent course cancellation policy that compensates instructors for their course preparation even if the course does not occur, dedicating funds in the teaching center to support contingent faculty members' teaching development, identifying physical space for contingent faculty offices, and making university commitments to merit-based salary increases and minimum compensation levels for part-time faculty.

Quality of Benefits and Services

In addition to being an adjunct faculty member, both regression models further found one of Johnsrud and Rosser's (2002) faculty work-life dimensions, satisfaction with the quality of benefits and services, to be a significant, positive predictor. This finding suggests that the campus may benefit from intentionally allocating greater service responsibilities to faculty with higher salaries (e.g., to full professors) and/or by providing additional compensation to faculty with high service loads. In addition, it demonstrates that appropriate administrative support for faculty's teaching and scholarship/creative work is essential to faculty in balancing multiple responsibilities, managing service loads, and continuing to publish—a critical act for advancement (Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Lawrence et al., 2011; Misra et al., 2011). Our findings suggest that a campus striving to help faculty excel at multiple responsibilities, including service obligations, and avoid burnout, should proactively offer teaching as well as scholarship support. Faculty developers on other campuses might learn from the campus in our study by working with new or pre-tenure faculty to mentor them in teaching and in navigating relationships with their department chairs and deans, by offering pedagogical workshops, and by initiating task forces with campus partners to focus on faculty members' work-life needs. Minimally, campuses should ensure that faculty are aware of existing campus resources to support faculty in their various roles.

Beyond the examples of faculty development pursued by the campus in this study, campuses could further offer course development funds and/or course releases to faculty engaging in particularly innovative and time-consuming curriculum development or other teaching work. This is exactly what occurred on the campus under study following a review of our survey findings and further campus conversations. The campus adopted the practices of compensating part-time faculty for their participation in teaching orientation and pedagogical workshops, providing grants for teaching-oriented professional development, and creating opportunities for faculty to receive formal mentoring and feedback.

Women and Work Balance

Consistent with prior literature suggesting that women engage in more service than men (Guarino & Borden, 2017; Misra et al., 2011; Misra et al., 2012; Mitchell & Hesli, 2013), female faculty were less satisfied with their work balance than male faculty in our study, although being female was only a marginally significant predictor of faculty satisfaction with service amount. Chi-squared tests revealed that two of the specific sources of women's dissatisfaction in this study may have been that female faculty experienced lower levels of the campus meeting their professional priorities and rewards expectations and lower levels of administrative relations and support on campus.

These findings echo findings from a recent study by Denson, Szelényi, and Bresonis (2017), which found that faculty perceptions of institutional support for work-life balance and faculty satisfaction with time spent on research were critical predictors of faculty satisfaction with work-life balance. Our results suggest that faculty perceptions of the adequacy of institutional support for research and teaching, as well as faculty satisfaction with work-life balance, were important predictors of faculty perceptions of satisfactory role balance. In other words, when faculty felt their campus adequately supported them in their non-service roles of research and teaching, and when they felt they could maintain a satisfactory work-life balance, faculty were more satisfied with their overall role balance. Faculty who were overextended in research or teaching, and faculty who did not feel that their careers allotted

them adequate time for their personal lives, were more likely to be dissatisfied with their faculty role balance. Women's lower levels of satisfaction with their work balance may therefore have occurred in part because achieving work-life balance can be particularly challenging for women (O'Laughlin & Bischoff, 2005), who are generally responsible for completing more unpaid work at home than their male colleagues in addition to fulfilling their professional responsibilities (e.g., Holland, 2015; Schiebinger & Gilmartin, 2010).

Faculty developers may be able to help female faculty who are feeling overwhelmed with work and home responsibilities attain promotions and tenure by coaching them on time management skills and strategies, including scheduling family time and time for domestic labor. Time management skills alone should not be considered an adequate solution, however, for addressing systemic inequities in faculty service loads; campuses must also seek ways to provide structural supports for faculty success. Offering faculty access to affordable child care was one campus-level initiative that the campus in our study pursued to improve faculty equity. Campus child care centers may be especially valuable to faculty with young children in balancing caregiving duties with scholarly work. Campuses wanting to support pre-tenure women may also do well to offer initiatives that provide faculty with small grants to assist in funding the outsourcing of domestic work, providing women with more time for their research.

In this study, women might also have been less satisfied with their balance of faculty responsibilities because they felt less connected to shared governance opportunities on campus, or may have felt that their research time was less protected by campus leaders when compared to their male colleagues. As members of this campus have begun to discuss, departments should create systems to track how much service each faculty member is doing and to try to avoid overloading any single untenured person. Faculty developers may need to work specifically with women, faculty of color, or other faculty performing disproportionate shares of service to help them identify the most important service experiences they wish to engage in and to help them decline or end their participation in other opportunities that have become excessively burdensome. Campuses and faculty developers should

work to cultivate a shared sense of community so that all community members feel responsible for engaging in some service to the institution and so that all faculty are aware that when they do not do their share of service, it falls upon their colleagues to pick up the slack.

Administrative Relations and Support

In addition to the differences between men and women's satisfaction with role balance, the balance model also found the dimension of administrative relations and support to be a significant, positive predictor (this dimension was marginally significant in the service model). This finding suggests that when faculty view their campus leaders as effective—from the department or program level to the very top levels of campus administration—they experience greater ease in balancing their three primary roles. Strong leadership may facilitate faculty role balance in part because effective leaders create systems and processes that make expectations transparent and that help faculty prioritize which service opportunities to take on. Faculty members' share of administratively-oriented service may also be smaller when campus leaders are effective because efforts are not duplicated and work time is not wasted on fruitless endeavors or on trying to make sense of chaotic assignments.

Importantly, when faculty perceive themselves as having opportunities to participate in campus decision-making processes, they demonstrate higher scores of faculty service morale. Faculty who participate in shared governance likely experience higher service morale at least in part because they view their participation as a meaningful means by which to accomplish goals that are desirable to them. Faculty developers may be able to help faculty succeed by teaching faculty how to develop good relationships with campus leaders and how to get involved in meaningful service opportunities; the mentorship model at the campus in this study supports this suggestion.

Professional Priorities and Rewards

In addition to the significant findings we have already discussed, both models found professional priorities and rewards to be marginally significant, positive predictors. The more that faculty felt connected to the campus's values, welcomed by the

campus, and able to maintain a satisfactory work-life balance, the more satisfied they were with the amount of service they performed and with the balance of their job responsibilities. From a faculty development perspective, this finding again suggests the importance of helping faculty allocate their time in ways that enable them to achieve optimal work-life balance.

Collectively, our results provide initial evidence that all three of Johnsrud and Rosser's (2002) dimensions of faculty work-life may be important predictors of faculty service morale. Future studies should continue to test the construct of faculty service morale and its relationship to the three dimensions of faculty work-lives.

Conclusion

Our models tested the relationships between faculty service morale and faculty's social identities and other demographic characteristics, faculty work environments, and the three dimensions of faculty work-lives categorized by Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) as professional priorities and rewards, administrative relations and support, and quality of benefits and services. Our findings suggested that identity characteristics, organizational environments, administrative relations and support, and quality of benefits and services all played important roles in predicting faculty service morale in this study. Though findings from this single campus study are not generalizable to all campuses, an important takeaway is that there are many ways that campuses can support faculty in their service roles to help faculty become more productive scholars, to retain faculty, and to create equitable conditions for promotion and tenure contributing to increased faculty diversity. Compensating faculty for fulfilling particularly onerous campus service obligations and/or assigning these tasks to higher ranking faculty; providing faculty with adequate administrative support for research and teaching; tracking service loads to ensure equitable distributions; creating policies, practices, structures and services to help faculty maintain optimal levels of work-life balance; hiring and cultivating effective campus leaders at all levels; and providing for meaningful faculty participation in shared governance – including participation by adjunct faculty – may all contribute to faculty possessing higher levels of service

morale. Faculty developers also can contribute to improving levels of faculty service morale by coaching faculty in time management – assisting faculty in systematically prioritizing their time both within their professional and personal lives – and by mentoring faculty in navigating departmental politics and employing successful teaching strategies. High levels of faculty service morale may in turn benefit campuses by increasing the collegiality of departmental, college-level, and university-wide climates, with the effect of further contributing to faculty retention, productivity, and diversity. These findings are good news for campuses because they offer an actionable path forward in promoting equitable advancement and success among faculty as well as creating more collegial and appealing academic communities.

Considering the evidence, campuses must make concerted efforts to provide all faculty with the leadership, support, compensation, and opportunities needed to thrive. Campuses might begin this work by first investigating how existing institutional structures reward and/or inadvertently punish faculty for their service contributions.

References

Allison, P. D. (2002). *Missing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Antonio, A. L., Astin, H. S., & Cress, C. M. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *Review of Higher Education*, 23(4), 373-397.

Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education*, 39(3), 363-391.

Baldwin, R., & Chronister, J. (2001). *Teaching without tenure: practices and policies for a new era*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Bellas, M. L., & Toutkoushian, R. K. (1999). Faculty time allocations and research productivity: Gender, race, and family effects. *Review of Higher Education*, 22(4), 367-390.

Bergquist, W. H. (1992). *The four cultures of the academy*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Biglan, A. (1973a). The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57(3), 195-203.

Biglan, A. (1973b). Relationships between subject matter characteristics and the structure and output of university departments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57(3), 204-213.

Denson, N., Szelényi, K., & Bresonis, K. (2017). Correlates of work-life balance for faculty across racial/ethnic groups. *Research in Higher Education*. doi: 10.1007/s11162-017-9464-0

Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method*. New York, NY: Wiley.

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*. doi: 10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2

Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 27(1), 5-20.

Holland, K. (2015, April 28). Working moms still take on bulk of household chores. *CNBC*. Retrieved from http://www.cnbc.com/2015/04/28/me-is-like-leave-it-to-beaver.html

Johnsrud, L. K. & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: A multilevel explanation. *Journal of Higher Education, 73*(4), 518-542.

Jones, W. A., Hutchens, N. H., Hulbert, A., Lewis, W. D., & Brown, D. M. (2017). Shared governance among the new majority: Non-tenure track faculty eligibility for election to university faculty senates. Innovative higher education. doi: 10.1007/s10755-017-9402-2

Kezar, A. (2004). What is more important to effective governance: Relationships, trust, and leadership, or structures and formal processes? *New Directions for Higher Education*, 127, 35-46.

Kezar, A. & Sam, C. (2014). Governance as a catalyst for policy change: Creating a contingent faculty friendly academy. *Educational Policy*, *28*(3), 425-462.

Lackritz, J. R. (2004). Exploring burnout among university faculty: Incidence, performance, and demographic issues. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*(7), 713-729.

Laden, B. V., & Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Job satisfaction among faculty of color in academe: Individual survivors or institutional transformers? *New Directions for Institutional Research, 27*(1), 57-66.

Lawrence, J., Ott, M., & Bell, A. (2011). Faculty organizational commitment and citizenship. *Research in Higher Education, 53*(3), 325-352.

Levanon, A., England, P., & Allison, P. (2009). Occupational feminization and pay: Assessing causal dynamics using 1950-2000 U.S. census data. *Social Forces*, *88*(2), 865-892.

Mamiseishvili, K., & Rosser, V. J. (2011). Examining the relationship between faculty productivity and job satisfaction. *Journal of the Professoriate. 5*(2), 100-132.

Milem, J. F., Berger, J. B., & Dey, E. L. (2000). Faculty time allocation: A study of change over twenty years. *Journal of Higher Education*, 454-475.

Misra, J., Lundquist, J. H., & Templer, A. (2012). Gender, work time, and care responsibilities among faculty. *Sociological Forum*, *27*(2), 300-323.

Misra, J., Lundquist, J. H., Holmes, E., & Agiomavritis, S. (2011). The ivory ceiling of service work. *Academe*, *97*(1), 22-28.

Mitchell, S. M., & Hesli, V. L. (2013). Women don't ask? Women don't say no? Bargaining and service in the political science profession. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, *46*(2): 355-369.

Neumann, A., & 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.

O'Laughlin, E. M., & Bischoff, L. G. (2005). Balancing parenthood and academia: Work/family stress as influenced by gender and tenure status. *Journal of Family Issues, 26*(1), 79-106.

O'Meara, K. (2002). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *Review of Higher Education, 26*(1), 57-80.

O'Meara, K., Kuvaeva, A. & Nyunt, G. (2017). Constrained choices: A view of campus service inequality from Annual Faculty Reports. *Journal of Higher Education,* 1-29.

O'Meara, K., Terosky, A. L., & Neumann, A. (2008). Faculty careers and work lives: A professional growth perspective. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 34*(3), 1-221.

Padilla, A. M. (1994). Ethnic minority scholars, research, and mentoring: Current and future issues. *Educational Researcher*, *23*(4), 24-27.

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

Schiebinger, L., & Gilmartin, S. K. (2010). Housework is an academic issue. *AAUP, January-February 2010*. Retrieved from https://www.aaup.org/article/housework-academic-issue#.WV_gVOmQzcs

Shin, J. C., & Jung, J. (2014). Academics job satisfaction and job stress across countries in the changing academic environments. *Higher Education, 67*(5), 603-620.

Singell, L. D., & Lillydahl, J. H. (1996). Will changing times change the allocation of faculty time? *Journal of Human Resources*, *31*(2), 429-449.

Simpson, A. (2015). The surprising persistence of Biglan's classification scheme. *Studies in Higher Education*. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2015.1111323

Stoecker, J. L. (1993). The Biglan classification revisited. *Research in Higher Education*, *34*(4), 451-464.

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Turk, T. T. (1981). Women faculty in higher education: Academic administration and governance in a state university system, 1966–1977. *Pacific Sociological Review, 24*(2), 212–236.

Turner, C. S. V. (2002). Women of color in academe: Living with multiple marginality. *Journal of Higher Education*, *73*(1), 74-93.

Volk, C. S., Slaughter, S., & Thomas, S. L. (2001). Models of institutional resource allocation: Mission, market, and gender. *Journal of Higher Education, 72*(4), 387-413.

Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Xu, Y. J. (2012). The similarities and differences in the work experience of women faculty in traditional and nontraditional disciplines. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 155,* 67-83.

Jessica K. Ezell Sheets is a doctoral candidate in higher education and student affairs at the University of Iowa. Her email address is jessica-sheets@uiowa.edu.

Cassie L. Barnhardt, Ph.D., is assistant professor of higher education and student affairs and a faculty associate with the Center for Research on Undergraduate Education at the University of Iowa. Her email address is cassie-barnhardt@uiowa.edu.

Carson W. Phillips is an institutional researcher at the University of Michigan. He completed his MA in Educational Policy and Leadership Studies at the University of Iowa. His email address is carsonp@umich.edu.

Peggy H. Valdés is a doctoral candidate in higher education and student affairs at the University of Iowa. Her email address is peggy-valdes@uiowa.edu.

Appendix A

Scale Items

    All item response options consist of an agreement scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree) unless otherwise noted.

Dimensions of Faculty Work-Life

Professional Priorities and Rewards (4 items, α = 0.74)
- Campus's strategic priorities resonate with my personal and professional values.
- I am satisfied with my current work-life balance (the ability to separate work and non-work priorities).
- Given my personal religious/spiritual values, I feel my beliefs are accepted and respected here.
- I feel the campus work environment is welcoming towards me.

Administrative Relations and Support (5 items, α = 0.85)
- Campus is an effectively managed, well-run organization.
- The administrative leadership of my department/program chair is effective.
- Overall, I am confident in the leadership abilities of the campus administration.
- Campus demonstrates a commitment to helping me succeed in my job.
- There are opportunities for me to participate in the decision-making process on campus.

Quality of Benefits and Services (3 items, α = 0.71)
- Please rate your current level of satisfaction with your salary. *(1 = Very Dissatisfied, 2 = Dissatisfied, 3 = Satisfied, 4 = Very Satisfied)*
- There is appropriate administrative support for my teaching.
- There is appropriate administrative support for my scholarship/creative work.

Ten Habits of Innovative Leaders
Executing a Game Plan for Academic Leadership

This title is free with the Online Edition of the Journal of Faculty Development

This book pulls back the wizard's curtain to reveal the dispositions, habits, and strategies of highly effective innovative leadership into academia as well as other fields. For their foundational definition of leadership, the authors like the one used by a highly respected name in the field, Peter Northouse: "Leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal." This book will not detail the various styles of leadership, but instead will concentrate on the particulars of developing an innovative approach to leadership from the ground floor up. The contents:

Ten Habits of Innovative Leaders
Executing a Game Plan for Academic Leadership
By Charlie Sweet, Hal Blythe, Bill Phillips, & Russell Carpenter

Now Available — $37.95