

To Give and to Receive: Recently Tenured Professors' Experiences of Service in Major Research Universities

Professors create their careers through three forms of work: research, teaching, and service. Teaching and research are well defined in most professors' careers and in higher education at large. However, faculty service is nebulous. In this article, we define service as faculty members' contributions to (a) the governance, management, and operation of their employing institution, in whole or in part, internally and externally; (b) the work of their professional/disciplinary associations; and (c) the maintenance of their disciplines and fields at large. Drawing on a three-year study of recently tenured university professors' learning and development across the spectrum of faculty work, we examined the widely held view that faculty service increases after tenure. We also asked what forms increases took and what university professors claimed to gain, developmentally, from engagement in faculty service in the early post-tenure career (up to 5 years after the award of tenure).

Research on Faculty Service and Midcareer: Implications for Understanding University Professors in the Early Post-Tenure Career

Research in higher education contributed the following summary view of faculty service as:

The research reported in this paper was made possible by a grant from the Spencer Foundation. The data presented, the statements made, and the views expressed are solely the responsibility of the authors. Our thanks to Kerry Ann O'Meara, Lisa Lattuca, the editor, and reviewers for helpful comments.

Anna Neumann is Professor of Higher Education at Teachers College, Columbia University. Aimee LaPointe Terosky is adjunct Assistant Professor in Higher Education at Teachers College, Columbia University.

The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 78, No. 3 (May/June 2007)
Copyright © 2007 by The Ohio State University

1. broad-ranging, eclectic, variable, and thereby underdefined;
2. increasingly prominent in faculty careers but under-appreciated and underresearched;
3. in tension between content and context perspectives;
4. comprising "new work" for professors at (or approaching) midcareer, a stage that is itself expansive and underdefined.

We discuss these views of faculty service below.

View 1: Faculty Service as Broad-ranging, Eclectic, Variable, and Thereby Underdefined

Faculty service is inconsistently defined in higher education research (Ward, 2003). Common schemes for organizing faculty service focus on (a) location (internal/external to the institution) (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995) and (b) scholarly content (scholarly/nonscholarly) (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Centra, 1979; Checkoway, 1997; Fear & Sandmann, 1995; Glassick, Huber, & Maeroff, 1997; McCallum, 1994; Taylor, 1997; Ward, 2003). Internal service supports the institution's mission, operations, and cultural life (e.g., service on a curriculum committee, graduation committee), whereas external service involves outreach/public service (e.g., advising a local elderly care program) (Fear & Sandmann, 1995, Lynton & Elman, 1987) or support to disciplines or fields and professional associations (e.g., reviewing for journals) (Becher, 1989; Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Centra, 1979). Scholarly service draws on subject matters in which professors claim substantive expertise (e.g., a professor of mathematics education advising a school district on math curricula); nonscholarly service is disconnected from professors' subject-matter expertise (e.g., a professor of art serving on a budget committee) (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Centra, 1979; Checkoway, 1997; Fear & Sandmann, 1995; Glassick et al., 1997; McCallum, 1994; Taylor, 1997; Ward, 2003). The contingent quality of institutional (internal) service further complicates this diversity given differences in mission attributable to institutional type. In this article, we focus only on faculty service in American major research universities (Research University I, Carnegie Doctoral/Research University-Extensive).

To summarize, faculty service is broad-ranging, eclectic, and contingent on institutional "type." Given this internal diversity, it is no surprise that service is underdefined.

View 2: Service as Increasingly Prominent but as Underappreciated and Underresearched

Although service has long been part of faculty work, its presence in faculty careers has become increasingly obvious over the years, drawing

the attention of policymakers and researchers alike (Boyer, 1990; Braskamp & Ory, 1994; Centra, 1979; O'Meara, 2002). This increased prominence of service in discourses on faculty work and careers may relate to growing demands on faculty to "pitch in" to efforts to improve institutions' financial status, public responsiveness, and accountability (Berube & Nelson, 1995; Boyer, 1990; Fairweather, 1996; Finkelstein, Seal, & Schuster, 1998; Lynton, 1995; Rice, 1996; Sherman & Torbert, 2000; Ward, 2003). Despite such calls for heightened faculty contribution to the institutional good, service is underacknowledged and underappreciated: Professors get less recognition for service than for research and teaching (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Braskamp & Ory, 1994; Centra, 1979; O'Meara, 2002; Ward, 2003). Administrators and professors "view [service] as less meaningful and important than the more easily defined (and rewarded) roles of teaching and research" (Ward, 2003, p. 2).

Probably because it is less valued than research and teaching, service, *as an aspect of the faculty career*, is underresearched. Recent studies have portrayed teaching and research as competing for the faculty's time, with virtually no attention to the additional time demands that service, as a different activity, may make of them (Fairweather & Beach, 2002; Milem, Berger, & Dey 2000). As Blackburn and Lawrence noted, "In contrast to the vast literature on faculty research activity and related issues, there is almost no research on faculty in service roles" (1995, p. 225). The current literature on faculty service explores selected parts of the service role such as committee work (e.g., Smelser, 1993) or participation in governance (e.g., Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Dill & Helm, 1988; Floyd, 1985). It also presents some definitional taxonomies (Fear & Sandmann, 1995), along with approaches to representing and evaluating service as scholarly activity (Boyer, 1990; Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Fear & Sandmann, 1995; Glassick et al., 1997; Huber, 2000; Lynton & Elman, 1987; O'Meara, 1997, 2002; Paulsen & Feldman, 1995; Rice, 1986; Ward, 2003). The paucity of efforts to identify themes that cross-cut service no doubt contributes to its vagueness.

Service then has emerged, paradoxically, as necessary for the institutional welfare *and* as unacknowledged in faculty work lives. Unrecognized as a form of "real" faculty work, it is also underresearched as a "real" strand of the faculty career.

View 3: Service as in Tension between Content and Context Perspectives

Service may be viewed as at the crossroads of two perspectives: content and context.

A *content perspective* addresses the types of activities that professors carry out in their service roles—for example, acting as program coordi-

nator, faculty senate representative, journal editor, and so on. A content perspective also makes clear who professors are serving through such activities—for example, students (teaching and academic mentoring aside), institutional colleagues, disciplinary and professional communities, and so on. The content perspective emphasizes, then, who gains what from the service that professors provide. Though this matters greatly to understandings of service, we must acknowledge that this view leaves out what goes on for the professors themselves as they carry out service. The content perspective does not address professors' experiences of providing service to others.

Alternatively, a *context perspective* highlights service providers' experiences of their giving to others: how professors make sense of their service activities as they carry these out—that is, from within these activities; what engagement in a certain service activity means to them; what service experiences contribute to professors' development. In this view, then, faculty service is positioned as *context*, and we can thereby consider how professors experience being *in* it as they carry it out: what they see, think, and sense *from its insides*, and thus, what they gain.

To round out extant views of service and the faculty career, higher education researchers would do well to analyze faculty service from *both* content and context perspectives. This article is a contribution to the context view that asks: What may professors receive as, through service, they give to others of their expertise and energies? What then may they gain from within their service activity?

To summarize, faculty service is for others; its content is outwardly oriented, away from the professor. We ask, then, what professors gain developmentally while providing service to others.

View 4: Service as “New Work” for University Professors at (or approaching) Midcareer, a Stage that Is Itself Expansive and Underdefined

Confounding the paucity of research on faculty service is the fact that college and university professors' service—for example, administrative work including “departmental or institution-wide meetings or committee work” (U.S. Dept. of Education, 1999, p. 10)—increases through midcareer, a period extending up to 25 years (Baldwin, Lunceford, & Vanderlinden, 2005; see also Baldwin, 1990; Baldwin & Blackburn, 1981; Becher, 1989; and Cox, 1991). We might expect then that after tenure, service would take up time that professors used in other ways through their pretenure years, thereby creating a period of adjustment for professors in the early post-tenure years. It has been noted that professors in full-blown midcareer do, in fact, adjust to service demands, often becoming “integral parts of their institutions . . . [a]ctively

involved in college activities . . . [and] major committees” (Baldwin & Blackburn, 1981, p. 609). We offer, then, the possibility that at any particular point in time, what applies to most midcareer professors (feeling adjusted to increased service) may not apply as clearly to those who are at its gates—that is, the newly tenured. Professors just crossing the tenure line (at or nearing early midcareer) may feel, distinctively, the newness of emergent service demands (possibly alongside other work changes), especially so in major research universities where many were undoubtedly “protected” from service before tenure as they prepared for a research-intensive tenure review. Given this possible variance, generalizing across the full expanse of the post-tenure career risks obscuring brief but potentially significant experiences, especially if these occur at formative times. We may then claim that service increases are likely to come with tenure, yet to date, we know little about how entrants to the post-tenure career experience such change.¹

Regardless, the full length of midcareer is understudied (Baldwin et al., 2005), as is the post-tenure career more broadly. We do not know how newly tenured university professors, in particular, respond to the seemingly inevitable demands of this period as they ready themselves for the mature career. Though acknowledging the widely held belief that engulfment in service may thwart newly tenured university professors’ professional and intellectual development, we probe here the gains they may reap. Knowing such gains are possible, professors can approach faculty service as a career inevitability that, well strategized, may serve their own aims while addressing others’ needs.

Questions to Guide Analysis of Recently Tenured University Professors’ Experiences of Service

Given service as underconceptualized but potentially quite “real” for recently tenured professors, we explore the following questions:

1. What do the work and career narratives of the university professors participating in the study reflect about the widely held perception that faculty service increases after tenure?
2. If these professors’ narratives do reflect service increases, how are these manifest?
3. Bearing in mind the definitional other-directedness of service, to what extent do participating professors gain something, developmentally, from their rendering of service to others? What do their narratives reflect of what they gain?

Framing the Study: University Professors' Experiences within Service as Academic Work

In this analysis we consider what university professors gain from involvement in faculty service. Though professors' gains from service may be analyzed through multiple lenses (e.g., rational, political, social, etc.), we attend only to the cognitive and, more specifically, reflective: the knowledge, understandings, ideas, or insights that professors develop as they carry out faculty service as a certain kind of professorial practice. We refer to these gains as *developmental* because they contribute to professors' understandings of their work and roles. In line with this view, we frame service as:

1. job-related *work* that professors carry out;
2. *professional knowledge* that professors gain (by creating and testing it) as they carry out the work of service; and
3. a *site for improving one's knowledge of service but possibly of other things, too*.

What makes this frame *developmental* may be summarized as follows: In defining service as job-related work and as a professional work practice in which a professor—as a professional worker—may engage (see item 1 above), we view that service also as a site, potentially, for the professor's growing awareness of what she or he is “up to” in the work (i.e., service) and of how, through imagination and reflection and the testing out of insight thereby gained, the worker may come to know some of what she knows for her work and also beyond it (Schon, 1983, 1987; Wenger, 1998) (see items 2 and 3 above). This view assumes, of course, that such learning and development, on the job and even in the moment of its doing, can be formal, informal, or incidental; it may or may not occur intentionally (see Marsick & Watkins, 1990, 2001). Developmentally, then, we conceive of service as professional knowledge that professors gain as they carry out their service obligations as part of their larger professional practice. Their service work is a location for their construction of (further) knowledge about the service being enacted; however, it may also be a site for their learning of other things as well. Professors' learning to provide service is comparable to their learning to teach: They usually learn these practices *on the job* with little help. They may learn highly regarded practices, or they may mislearn them. As they learn to teach or conduct service, they may gain other kinds of professional knowledge as well (e.g., they may learn about collegueship, communicating, and so on). To summarize, as professors

construct their understandings, they learn, and as they learn, they develop as professionals and possibly in other ways as well.

This view resonates with the content-context tension described in the preceding section, though advancing beyond it. Rather than stopping at tension between content and context perspectives, it merges the two, requiring attention to both: A provider's giving of service to others (content) may be an instance of her or his gain (context), in realization or learning. Drawing on this view, we assume that professors learn their professional practices (like service) through reflection *on* and *in* action, much as do other professionals engaged in specialized practice (see Schon, 1987). We define reflection as practitioners' construction of knowledge, about action and its consequences, *as* they take action and *after* it, looking back. Reflection is conscious and intentional; the knowing it yields may be incorporated in the reflective actor's professional action repertoire (Schon, 1983). We offer that professors develop their understandings of service by reflecting on their doing of it while they are *in* it and/or *after* it. With their reflectiveness "turned on," professors may also discern other things beyond service, in effect learning about them on the spot or initiating processes of learning about them over time.

Thus, we view service as a site of professors' learning, reflectively, about service and other things. Our reflections, on theirs, may yield views of service integral to the faculty career.

Study Design and Method

This analysis derives from a three-year study of the learning and development of 40 recently tenured professors (20 women, 20 men) in the sciences (11), social sciences (9), arts and humanities (9), and professional and applied fields (11), working at four major American research universities (Research University I, Carnegie Doctoral/Research University-Extensive, two public/two private).² Professors had been tenured and promoted to the rank of associate professor within 3 years of year-1 interviews. By year 3, they were 3 to 5 years post-tenure; some had been promoted to full professor and several were planning to "come up" within a year or two. Participation by institution was relatively equal (9 or 10 participants per site, 4 or 5 of whom were women, with at least 2 per disciplinary sector).

Interviewees participated in two-hour, on-site interviews carried out in project years 1 ($n = 40$) and 3 ($n = 39$).³ Project data include verbatim transcripts of year-1 and year-3 interviews (average 40 pages per interview), observational notes of settings and participants, scholarly docu-

ments (curriculum vitae, tenure narratives, sample writings, and course syllabi), and additional information collected through electronic searches. Campus documents, interviews with administrators and senior faculty leaders, and various public sources (e.g., Internet-based library collections) offer background data on institutional priorities and work conditions.

This analysis drew on the year-3 interview data due to the year-3 protocol's thematic attention to service. Data analysis proceeded as follows: After several readings, the 39 year-3 transcripts were coded (i.e., text segments bracketed) for all references to respondents' involvement in and experiences of faculty service. Definitions of service by Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) guided the initial coding/bracketing. To assure that other forms of service would not be overlooked (i.e., unclassified in the extant literature), references to faculty work exceeding research and teaching were closely reviewed for fit with extant service definitions.

With the aid of QSR NUD*IST, we initially classified coded segments (approximately 320, fraction of a page to several pages in length) into six descriptive areas:

1. change in quantity of service after tenure (increase/decrease/no change);
2. type of service (external/internal);
3. manifestation of service enlargement;
4. degree of tension associated with service;
5. learning in service; and
6. service strategies (personal rules to guide service engagement).

Due to overlapping content, we combined Areas 5 (learning in service) and 6 (service strategies, as learned) and retained the label "learning" for the full category. Our review of Area 4 indicated that service-related tension often involved tension between service and one or more other features of faculty life (for example, research, teaching, mentoring, and one's personal life outside work). Because we analyze such tensions, in much greater detail, elsewhere (Neumann, 2006b), we removed this data area from the current analysis, thereby leaving four descriptive areas more clearly focused on the research questions at issue in this article.

We analyzed the four descriptive areas (i.e., change in quantity, type of service, manifestation, and learning) separately, noting linkages among them. To do this, we subdivided the data in each area into numerous thematic categories. We read and reread their contents, sorting and re-sorting until we discerned a rationale for combining and sequencing elemental categories. For reporting purposes, we collapsed Area 1

(quantity) with Area 2 (types), thereby creating the three analytic sections of this article: *service change/type of service*, *manifestations of change*, and *learning in service*. The narratives presented below, for each area, reflect this emergent structure. This strategy borrows heavily from grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), a research tradition that purports to induce theory from a “ground” of untheorized data but as conditioned by existing perspectives on phenomena related to the subject of study (see Schatzman & Strauss, 1973, for discussions of theoretical mediation in qualitative research).

Analysis of Recently Tenured University Professors’ Experiences of Service

In this section, we analyze participating professors’ year-3 interviews to identify (a) whether professors experienced an increase in their faculty service and (b) how the increase was manifest.

Study Participants’ Experiences of Changes in their Service Obligations

The perception that service increases after tenure is reflected in a strong majority of study participants’ work narratives. Thirty-four of 39 participants (87%) indicated that their service increased after tenure; two others said that their service, already high before tenure, continued with no change; one said his/her service level stayed at the same moderate level as pretenure. No data pertaining to service change is available for two participants.

Analysis relative to internal/external dimensions of service indicates that 37 of 39 participating professors (95%) engaged in internal university service, primarily service to an academic program or department (32/39, 82%)—for example, as program coordinator (15/39, 38%). Half the sample (20/39) indicated service on institutional committees, primarily search, curriculum, and promotion and tenure. Fewer participants indicated involvement in faculty senates or other university governance bodies, junior faculty mentoring, and student organization advising. Only one participant reported assuming a key administrative post in a major university unit. Nine, however, said that they had directed or were directing centers or institutes.

Two thirds of the sample (26/39, 67%) indicated involvement in external service through work for the discipline or profession (e.g., recruiting and mentoring into the field, editorial and peer-review, leadership of professional and disciplinary associations, tenure/promotion reviews for other universities), or outreach and public service (e.g., community service, advisory services to national or community agencies). Professors’

external service often included a research component (e.g., conducting environmental research for a community), and some included teaching (e.g., providing workshops on health issues for K-12 teachers).

Manifestations of the Service Increase in Study Participants' Career Experiences

What changes did participants experience in the texture of their work lives, given the service increases they reported? Participants reported four kinds of change: accretion (expansion of the service component of faculty work), intensification (changes in stakes associated with service), transformation (conversion of nonservice work into service), and service self-replication (service as perpetuating service).

Accretion. With growing service loads, participants noted that time devoted to service increased; thus the service component of their careers grew. Echoing many, one professor said, "the pattern is for people to get tenure and then to get completely overloaded with administrative and departmental duties." Many explained that junior faculty usually focused on preparing for the tenure review rather than service; thus tenured faculty usually addressed the service needs of programs, departments, the university, and community. Participants varied in reported rate of post-tenure service increase; some noted gradual rise, and others, quick and dramatic expansion.

Intensification. Besides accretion, participants experienced intensification of responsibility in higher-stakes or higher-status service roles than they had previously assumed. Thirty-eight percent (15/39) of study participants became academic program coordinators, 23% (9/39) served as directors of institutes or centers, 15% (6/39) declared membership on high-level college curriculum committees, and 21% (8/39) served as editors or reviewers for professional journals and other publications. A humanist captures the experience: "It's . . . not in quantity [of service tasks], but in quality has gone up. Those are much more powerful committees, I think."

Transformation. Participants also experienced service increases occurring through a process of conversion that may be inevitable as work expands over time: Work that some professors defined as nonservice earlier in their careers (for example, because their projects were smaller then or because mentors or the university provided greater support) gained administrative and organizational dimensions over time, thereby assuming the position of service work, albeit managerial in nature. This process of conversion is captured by a study participant who told us that he finds himself moving away from hands-on work in research, toward

management of staff and graduate students who now do the more substantive work that, in the past, he was able to carry out himself. He explained:

Well, I spend, especially with this big [project], I spend most of my time organizing other people instead of having any time to do . . . the thing myself. And it's sometimes frustrating because it's often things that I actually personally could do a lot better myself.

Another professor described his research as turning, similarly, into organizational work: "I think in reality, I will have less and less time to do research because of the administrative side of it." Professors in the sciences and science-based applied fields frequently reported such change along with the concern that the time and effort they devote, now, to organizing people, activities, and resources often displaces time that they would otherwise dedicate to substantive work on their research. (For comparable findings, see Becher, 1989.)

Self-replication. Participants said that doing service often led to demands for more service, especially if they demonstrated competence and responsibility. "They say no good deed goes unpunished," observed an economist. "If you're good at doing one of these [service tasks], well, great, let's do another one." A literary scholar echoed that sentiment, "And it's partly just, you know, you serve on one committee, word gets out that you'll do it, and so you do more."

Summary. Since participants saw their service as expanding after tenure, we wondered how it entered their jobs and careers. In interviews, professors described their service as growing through processes of accretion, intensification, transformation, and self-replication. Acknowledging the professors' increased giving to others through service, we asked them what they received in return, a topic to which we now turn.

Analysis of Recently Tenured University Professors' Experiences in Service

As explained earlier, in asking what professors received as they gave, in the name of faculty service, we attended only to their reported gains in knowing and understanding. Yet we do not want to paint an overly rosy picture about what their learning yielded. For example, as participants spoke about knowledge they gained through service, many lamented the increased work that service demanded. They worried that service displaced time, energy, and thought they would otherwise devote to research and teaching. Some, in fact, portrayed service as antithetical to learning. "I have never considered any of this administrative business to be a learning experience," a humanist claimed. "It's really a chore that

I try to get done as quickly as possible.” Increased service then posed a challenge to many, and those who managed to turn it toward their learning had to devote effort to make that happen. Moreover, professors who claimed to learn through service were not always happy or hopeful about their learning; as we will soon see, professors’ learning led at times to disappointing or frustrating realizations.⁴

Recognizing the downsides of service, we discuss below three gains—in knowledge or understanding—that professors claimed grew from their service involvement: (a) learning substance (constructing subject-matter knowledge about an area of study); (b) gaining knowledge for and of one’s self; and (c) developing interpersonal, management, and organizational knowledge within the university. Though certain service activities are often viewed as preferable to others (e.g., due to their proximity to scholarship), participants claimed gain from diverse forms of service: scholarly and nonscholarly, institutional and noninstitutional, internal and external.

Learning Substance

Participants spoke most favorably about service they construed as connected to the kinds of knowledge gain—substantive—commonly associated with research and teaching. Over half the study participants (22/39, 56%) said that their service activities complemented and/or fostered their understanding of subjects they studied and taught. In the common view, substantive service-based learning is associated, usually, with work for a disciplinary or professional community (e.g., reviewing for a journal, serving as program chair for a disciplinary or professional conference). The following section extends this view: Study data show that service-based substantive learning can occur also in work for the university, in the form of internal institutional service and public outreach.

Study data also show that service-based substantive learning may take two forms. First, professors may learn about their subjects of study and teaching as they carry out their service responsibilities. In this view, service yields *substance* for learning in the moments of service enactment. Second, professors may learn about their subjects some time after the service activity is complete through relationships with colleagues they met originally while working on service. In this second view, service yields *resources for future substantive learning*. We describe these two ways of learning substantively in service below.

Service that yields substance for in-the-moment learning. Study participants claim that they learn subject matter as they carry out their

service and that they then draw that substantive knowledge into their teaching and research. A professor of social work, for example, drew on substantive learning gained through engagement in community outreach for his teaching:

PROFESSOR: I have a much better idea from teaching, from experience, from the service work, from other things that I do, about aspects of that, you know, teaching how to be a practitioner. And substantive, you know—what does that mean, from beginning, middle, and end [of the professional task at issue]? And what are some of the other issues that, you know, students need to think about and all [to be competent practitioners]? You know, I think those have sort of evolved as well, you know.

INTERVIEWER: So in other words, one of the things you're saying is that even your service activities or outreach sort of activities—

P: Exactly.

I: —service activities have yielded certain kinds of understandings—

P: Exactly.

I: —for you.

P: Exactly. I mean, just knowing, for example, in practice, that when you work with clients, these are clients that are members of communities and that communities have their own experiences. And my work with [city] tells you, you know, you can make a person feel good. But if they don't have a job, and if they're, you know, involved in some, targets of racial profiling, and thing[s] like that . . . in a sense, it emphasizes, sort of, the [unclear] of social work practice. And that it's not just working with somebody in a clinical setting, but it's working with somebody who's a part of a larger community, part of a family, part of a community, part of a system.

While conducting local outreach, this professor gained knowledge, for his teaching and thus also for his larger understanding, of the social work that is core to his scholarly expertise.

Relatedly, a scholar of policy studies chaired the board of a local community agency to which she contributed her scholarly knowledge (thereby conducting outreach as service) while exploring that agency's internal workings (thereby enhancing her substantive understanding of how such agencies work). Her current research focuses on this very topic, and thus she learned substantively, in support of her research, from her outreach activity. "I think, really, [it's] an exemplary organization in terms of its service. . . . So that's a good way for me to see what all these policy issues mean . . . at the organizational level."

Similarly, an engineer described her service to a community whose members sought access to nearby natural resources, as opposed to settling for substitutes of lesser quality:

So anyway, I've been involved in showing that [substitute resources] is not the same as the [natural resources at issue], but [I've done that] from a very scientific point of view. You know, I've show[n] them how the chemistry [of

the two resources] is really different, and this has been by employing a novel technique. And it's fascinating. Now how did I get involved in this? They called me up. You know, and then, and it's just, there's been new science that we've discovered in trying to tackle [this issue] and policy question.

The professor of engineering, like the policy scholar, engaged in research—and learned about her subject of study—while providing service to an external community.

Though community outreach may provide rich substantive learning, so may internal committee service. Another policy scholar described substantive insights he gained through service on a university-level curriculum review committee:

[T]he curriculum committees were very helpful to me, particularly as a teacher. I served on one curriculum committee, the [university] has a diversity requirement where every student has to take a course that's diversity. . . . And I served on the committee that made the decision about whether those courses were gonna be approved. And I learned a lot about how people construct syllabi, . . . how they try and think about intellectual ideas, and I worked—What we would do, every once in a while, there was this one great course where this guy wanted to do a diversity course about [a specialized topic on diversity]. And we, he would've done this thing for literally eight months. He gave us maybe seven versions. And I worked with him. We met on several occasions and it was amazing to watch him. And he basically started out with being a music guy who didn't know the literature on race and ethnicity, and at the end, it's a great course. I mean, it's a really good course. And watching that, I mean, I learned a lot about how can you integrate, you know, what do you do? And it was fascinating to see how he did that. So, in that sense, yes, it was helpful.

As a member of a college-wide curriculum committee, this policy scholar advised a musician developing a course on a topic, diversity, relatively new but important to them both. Though we may assume that the professor of music learned a great deal as he reworked his course, we see that the policy scholar did as well—no doubt, about diversity and music, but as he says, also about how one goes about inquiring and creating teachable ideas across widely divergent fields of study. Although this learning did not contribute directly to the policy scholar's research, it contributed to his understandings of what it takes to bring together knowledge from diverse domains and to represent it meaningfully to others. Though institutional committee service is often viewed as conflicting with scholarly learning, in this example institutional service enhanced a professor's understanding of cross-disciplinary learning, an insight that may matter for his own work.

Not surprisingly, study participants noted, too, that they learned substance of value to research or teaching from peer-review or editorial

service to journals or other publications. A professor of organizational studies, active in editing, claimed to learn “on the cutting edge”:

I’m becoming more central to the editing part of journals and I’m editing a special issue right now on [topic area] for [journal], which is our leading journal. And I’m also on [the] editorial board so . . . I’m now reading manuscripts, which are on the cutting edge. That’s definitely a way to learn about . . . what the research community [is] focusing on.

A professor of business also said that, as a peer reviewer, “I am looking at things from the reviewers’ perspective . . . that can inform . . . the way that I write.” He thereby learned “what I as a reviewer, what I am looking for, so I should try to do the same thing for my own research papers.”

These examples show that professors may gain substantively from service. Though it is common knowledge that service to the discipline or field (e.g., reviewing for journals, organizing professional conferences, conducting professional development workshops) can yield such learning, we see here that outreach and internal institutional service can do so as well.

Service that yields resources for substantive learning later on. At times, engagement in service contributed to study participants’ scholarly learning in less direct but nonetheless powerful ways: It brought new sources of substantive knowledge—in the form of new colleagues—their way. In other words, although it did not provide opportunities for professors’ learning in and of itself, it did open doors to the possibility of such learning in the future. Thus, professors and the new colleagues they met initially through service might engage in research, teaching, or outreach, or they might connect simply for scholarly conversation at a later time. Professors then sometimes used service to identify stimulating scholars outside their own programs and departments, thereby broadening the base of relationships that in the future might support their scholarly work. A professor of finance described how service on a college committee, in fact, led to this kind of research collaboration:

I’ve gotten to meet people in other departments [on committees], I mean, which is, you know, in a sense, learning. . . . So there are some [subject area] people that I wouldn’t otherwise ever—I knew they existed, but I didn’t know them, so I get to meet them this way. . . . You know, with [name of collaborator], I met him that way. But then it was really the research that got it going. The administration [service on committee] was, at most, the link.

The scholar of finance gained a valuable colleague through college committee service, but their intellectual collegueship did not ensue until they took initiative beyond committee work to explore common interests. A social scientist described a similar discovery, committee colleagues whom he anticipated may turn into research colleagues in the future:

I meet people on committees. . . . I've even met people who are interested in some of the same [disciplinary] issues that I am . . . in the [names other departments within the social sciences] that I just didn't know before, and we've talked about our research, and [that] may lead to some productive collaboration at some point. But they're people I just never would have encountered before, and may not have even known that they were interested in the same sets of issues that I was interested in.

In these two cases and others as well, professors' service alerted them to possibilities for engagement in the future with new colleagues about subject-matter issues of common interest.

Summary: Learning substance. Though often distanced from research and teaching, service *can*, at times, support professors' scholarly learning. As the preceding examples suggest, participating professors looked favorably on service that furthered their substantive learning "in the moments" of its happening and that opened opportunities to relationships with stimulating colleagues, and thereby promises of substantive collaboration, in the future.

Gaining Knowledge for and of One's Self

About a third of the study participants (14/39, 36%) indicated that faculty service provided opportunities for learning about themselves or for improved job or career management. Such learning, however, spans much territory—from basic task management to the kind of identity construction sometimes associated with research and teaching (Neumann, 1999). Participants claimed the following gains: (a) learning to manage work on the job, (b) learning to maneuver their careers and develop career options, and (c) learning about one's self as a person.

Learning to manage work on the job. Learning to manage multifarious service tasks in the expanding post-tenure job is not simple. Learning to manage one's time, set priorities, say "no" when warranted, recognize what can be delayed without harm, share tasks and know what not to share—these are but a few examples of what participants said they learned in service.

To enact this learning, participants often constructed—and claimed to live by—personal guidelines for professional action: A social scientist said, "I just had to become more disciplined about setting specific time when I would do research and specific times when I would deal with administrative issues." A landscape architect discussed the need to choose carefully from among multiple outreach invitations, considering "work load . . . how interesting the topic seems to be . . . I'm more apt to, you know, [to] try to do a few bigger things . . . than the little guest lecture

here and . . . there . . . knowing that those will always kinda come along.” A scholar of literary studies explained her “principle of selection” for service as follows: “If there’s a decision to be made for prioritizing my energies, if I’m asked to do something by the [department], if it involves interaction with the graduate students, I say, ‘Yes.’ If it doesn’t, then I tend to say, ‘No.’” A scholar of social work noted that in recent years, he has become “able to say, you know, what’s real, what I can really do and what I can’t.” In deciding whether to undertake a service activity, he asks, given the scope of work at issue, “Is there an end in sight?” And a scholar of engineering said, “What I’m learning is that . . . so what things do I say ‘no’ to?” She explained that in recent years, as she had started a family, her attitude toward service had changed: “I think I used to be more governed with, ‘If you’re part of a community . . . everyone needs to contribute.’ And then after a while, I realized, ‘Bullshit, not everyone contributes. Wait a minute. You know, I need to say no just like everyone else.’”

Such guidelines for professional behavior may be viewed as outgrowths of professors’ learning about their work “on the job.” Like new year’s resolutions, these personal guidelines vary in terms of individual needs, preferences, and challenges. What they reflect, collectively, are desires on professors’ parts to regulate their responsiveness to service increases.

Learning to maneuver career and develop career options. Engagement in new professional activities can spur one to examine one’s interests and rethink career paths. As a result of engaging in service, several participants said they could see moving soon into institutional administration. Although only one had done so at the time of the interviews, several said they were curious and/or expecting to edge closer to administrative careers in higher education. As such, they learned—or instigated processes of learning—about administration and about their possible fit with it. A biologist contemplating an administrative career in light of recent university committee service said, “I just have a feeling that if I wanted to go into administration, I could.” She speculated, “I have a feeling, it’s like, it’s gonna happen.” And an engineer who realized how much he liked “the creative side” of institute management for which he was already responsible—“getting all the programs in place and developing marketing strategy”—cited this realization as reason for accepting the department chairship he was about to assume. Several participating professors paused at this point in their careers to consider trying on administration. Some, like the engineer and biologist, were primed to move into administration. Others, like a psychologist who took on major program coordination after tenure, held back. “There are people who

seem to get more charge out of these positions than I do, and seem to aspire to move on from this to be department chair or dean,” he said. “I’m really not one of those people, and after my three years will be up, I’ll be quite relieved to step aside.”

While the career path from institutional service to university administration is well known, the path from university outreach to large-scale social policy work is less so. A few women participants—notably in the sciences or in science-based fields—said that their outreach involvement had led them to contemplate a career shift—out of academe toward policy work. These participants said that they wanted to continue in science, but in new ways—by considering science in society or science in the world, or as a female professor of engineering quipped, science “within the story” rather than “outside” it:

Right now, I feel a little bit more compelled and intrigued by thinking about the ways in which society has harmed the environment than—, and to think about that in a slightly larger picture than to say, “Okay, class, today we’re going to talk about the partitioning chemistry of PCBs.” I get—, you know, what’s different? One is, we’re taking the chemical and we’re just thinking about it outside a story. The other is to talk about the chemical’s behavior within the story. And I like that, you know. . . .

In taking her science outside the university, viewing it from an “external service” perspective (through outreach/public service), this scholar rethought her interests: “The science is interesting,” she said, “but [just] as interesting are, ‘What are the political or policy implications of that?’” At the time of the interview, she was at a career crossroad: “In the last year, it’s become—more acute. This need to decide—am I going to focus more in maybe a more fundamental hard science area? Or am I going to move more into an area that’s a newer interest which is a little bit more policy related?” Other women in the sample articulated similar questions, each prompted to some degree by their experiences of external service. A portion of their service, then, became a site for rethinking their careers.

Learning about one’s self as a person. Aside from learning about job and career from engagement in service, study participants claimed to learn about themselves simply as people. A psychologist explained what he had gained, as growth, from academic program coordination:

This may sound corny, but it has been good for me to be in this role. . . . I think when I took it on, I said to myself, “I hate roles like this. I don’t think I’m good at them. I don’t wanta do it.” And for all those reasons, that’s precisely why I will do it, because maybe, you know, I should confront my fears and my limitations and learn how to be more comfortable in [the] kinds of roles that I’m not comfortable in, and learn more about myself.

And I think that all [that] has really happened. So—it changes the way, you know, when you come in here to a department as a first-year assistant professor, you feel like one of the kids, and that still kinda lasts for while, and it's easy to just keep seeing yourself in that role—that I'm one of the kids, and it's sort of the adults who really decide what goes on around here. So it's forced me to be one of the adults around here. I guess that's been good for me.

In academic program coordination, this scholar found the opportunity to achieve a form of “adulthood” in the profession that his teaching and research did not provide.

Other scholars, too, spoke of personal gain from service. A literature professor, also assuming program coordination responsibilities, described what the new role contributed to her sense of self in the university:

I think, actually, it has somewhat changed my relationship to the university . . . sort of changed my sense of myself a little bit. . . . I have somewhat less of a sense of myself as somebody who happens to work at this particular place. . . . [I have gained] a little bit more of a sense of myself as a player . . . you know, someone who can help bring things about.

Another scholar in a professional/applied field who also had assumed large-scale program coordination and university service responsibilities described her faculty service as intellectually “detrimental” to her scholarly learning and to her career more broadly. In fact, she claimed it had been “profoundly” so, in good part due to sacrifices in research that service has required of her: “I feel—that the decision to agree to do this, the [program coordination], has had profound, a much more profound effect than I ever thought it would in a number of areas. So that's been disappointing.” Yet she added too, “There's a lot of aspects of, of this that have been positive. I've learned a lot. I think I've done a good job at it. I've learned a lot about myself. . . . About what my temperament is, and what, you know, what . . . brings me energy and happiness in my work.” This scholar represents the uncomfortable, if not hard (even “detrimental”), side of service as, for some, intense engagement in work peripheral to one's scholarly and professional commitments. Yet professors' narratives suggested that such work, no doubt in moderation, can support unanticipated growth: learning about one's self that, untouched and untried, one would not come to know. Engagement in service may present a bounded location for such trying out.

Summary: Gaining knowledge for and of one's self. Involvement in service has the potential to induce learning about one's self, personally and professionally, and this learning, of course, is a noteworthy gain.

Developing Interpersonal, Management, and Organizational Knowledge within the University

Approximately two thirds of the study sample (25/39, 64%) indicated that, in service, they learned how to (a) work with people, especially faculty colleagues (gain interpersonal knowledge); (b) get things done in complex systems (gain management knowledge); and (c) think about the larger institution that employs them (gain organizational knowledge). As their service increased after tenure, many faculty encountered parts of the university they had never before accessed. To carry out their new service responsibilities, they had to gain understanding of their employing organization, how it works, and how then to “work its parts” toward their ends. Below we describe the interpersonal, management, and organizational knowledge that participants claimed to gain through service.

Learning how to work with people (gaining interpersonal knowledge). Because academic service assumes joint endeavor, it is not surprising that faculty might have to learn how to work with others to achieve their service goals. An anthropologist said, “You always learn about people [when you are involved in] doing things like this [service], or—how to get things done, or not get things done.” A scholar of comparative literature said that service allowed him “to see how people present scholarly problems to . . . people who have to turn them into some form of committee or . . . funding initiative. . . . How to articulate concerns without putting people off and make yourself understood.” A professor in the humanities who had reflected deeply on her post-tenure work described what service has taught her about “how to deal with people” as she sought to improve the educational environment:

What is valuable is that it's [service] taught me how to deal with people. If you consider that to be valuable, then yes, it has been valuable. It's enabled me to be in a position to create maybe a better environment to come up with certain initiatives. And I think are better for our students. You know, that are exciting. I'm hoping, for instance [like the speaker series I just set up that] I will learn—you know . . . I will learn from it.

Asked to elaborate on the value to her of learning this way of dealing with people, the professor said:

I try to figure out whether or not I can believe what my [administrator] said, and getting some administrator—again, this is terribly costly—to follow through, and yet not getting in their bad books. Is that valuable? I don't know. It's taught me some lessons in craftiness. Sometimes I learn something about human nature that I'd really rather not know. Is that valuable? Well, yes, but—maybe it's making me more cynical.

Comments such as these reveal that as professors engage in service, much of it new to them, they struggle to discern and to learn ways to work with others. They gain interpersonal understanding.

Learning how to get things done within complex systems (gaining management knowledge). Besides learning about interpersonal features of service, study participants had to learn how to get things done in complex systems, amid interrelated processes, structures, and meanings, well beyond their own subjects of study. As a chemist said, “That’s not, you know, professional in terms of the material, the science. It’s more of cultural and sociological aspects that I’ve learned.” A social scientist explained that through committee service, he had “learned about negotiating the university” and developed skills in “go[ing] between the department and the dean.” A literature professor said she had “learned the workings of the place . . . when you wanta do something, how it needs to be done . . . what are the limits on that, what’s peculiar about how we do things here.” A scientist pointed out that it is important “who you know” in order to identify “where to find resource X . . . where everything is and who to ask . . . [in case] my assistant professor needs something here, you find out who there can . . . fix them up with that.”

Thus, through service these professors learned to manage or otherwise negotiate the social, bureaucratic, and cultural features of their university workplaces.

Learning how to think about larger university organization (gaining organizational knowledge). That professors learned how to manage service amid the complexities of academic organization suggests, of course, that they also learned what organization means and how it works. In service, many faculty came to appreciate the university’s expansiveness—bureaucratically, socially, politically, and culturally—and their own and others’ places within it. They also learned about their departments as organizational parts and, to some extent, as organizations in and of themselves. For many professors, this view was very new. A professor of business noted that his departmental advisory committee service had given him “a holistic perspective [on] what the department . . . the university does.” A geologist similarly commented on the “importance” of using service to understand “the breadth of things that are going on in the university.” The geologist explained:

You learn how different the humanities are from the sciences. You learn how different the business [area] is from the law school. . . . And you learn, I have learned the importance of breadth by being involved. . . . I think faculty members are notoriously bad at this. They think that their sub-sub-sub-discipline is of profound significance to everyone in [central] administration. Well, it’s not. There are, you know, 500 sub-sub-sub-disciplines that operate within the university, no one of which is of critical importance to the [central

administration], so, you know, [*mimicked*] “Stop pounding your hands on the desk for more money.” You know, I mean, I think university service is important . . . in recognizing the, you know, the breadth of a university . . . developing appreciation for the range of activities.

Asked why the breadth of view is important, the geologist said that “it gives you a framework in which to realistically consider, you know, where you are . . . in this larger enterprise.” A social scientist echoed that the breadth of view that service afforded helped him understand “how fortunate we are as a department, and how fortunate I am to be a person in that department, by seeing how difficult things are in some other departments . . . in terms of . . . national standing . . . recruiting graduate students, getting resources from the university.”

A small number of participating professors commented too on how their growing sense of the vastness of the university had led them to think deeply about what it means to be a “player” in it. A philosopher described his eye-opening experiences:

I’ve learned a lot by being on that [college curriculum] committee—I mean it isn’t all stuff that I ever wanted to know. But you know, I had . . . no idea how this college worked. . . . I mean it’s [the college is] huge. And I’ve never . . . been involved in any aspect of the operation of that large, sort of body. And I think this committee . . . the first time that I’ve really ever been engaged in an endeavor where, you know . . . there are all these interests you have to balance, and it’s unbelievable . . . how much, you know, Machiavelian stuff ends up going on. But you know, in my ordinary life when I weigh options . . . , I usually know the people, and I know what the situation that it’s going to affect. You know, I know what’s—whereas here, it’s this huge number of departments, all competing for the same resources. They want us to do these various things with them. And I’d never had, I’d never had an experience like that before, with a sort of large, a large group of people trying to manage part of another larger group of people’s lives. And it’s been, I mean, it’s been, as far as learning how the college works, learning how human beings work, it’s been very interesting. . . . I now know much more . . . than I ever did about this university that I work at.

Asked how useful this new understanding is likely to be to him, the philosopher said, “There’s no question that I now . . . know many more people than I did before. . . . I understand how things work around here in a way that I didn’t have any idea. . . . I’m sure it’ll be helpful to me professionally.” A literature professor also described what improved understandings of “the workings of the place” gained through service implied for her: “I think I have . . . something more of an investment in how it [the university] works, a wish to make it work better.”

However, what professors gained in improved understanding of the larger university did not always lead to positive feelings; it can lead, at

times, to frustration or anger. A woman scientist described how her committee efforts to engage a feminist speaker were persistently blocked; in response, she devoted extensive time to lobbying for funds. In retrospect, the scientist realized that while she was hunting for resources to bring in the speaker, her male colleagues were advancing their research, for example, by “finding out how to get [a specific research measurement],” a valuable contribution to their scientific learning. In the meantime, she missed out on the substantive advance, and as she said, “didn’t learn very much” from the lobbying, however well intended it was. The scientist concluded that the time she invested in bringing feminist views of science to her workplace in support of her own and other women’s work may be effectively cancelled by a culture that positions such effort as loss. We may further infer that the scientist learned, through her committee service, about features of the university that block women’s intellectual advancement. Similarly, a social scientist, also a woman, glimpsed in her service barriers of racism that she has observed in the social settings she studies: Though qualifying that she felt “a little too close to it,” she pointed out to her interviewer that the “whole notion of institutional racism, I think, I am, you know, seeing played out around me [in the university]. . . . I’m kind of seeing things that I either read about or observe from a distance [in other social settings] replicated here.” For both these women, service yielded a view of the university that was enlightening and disappointing.

Summary: Developing interpersonal, management, and organizational knowledge within the university. In doing a particular form of work, we learn it in the moment or later in reflection. It is no surprise that as professors carried out service, they gained knowledge closely associated with it: interpersonal, managerial, and organizational.

Conclusions and Implications: Toward Deepened Views of Service in University Professors’ Work

This analysis reveals the following: First, in line with prevailing views, study participants (all recently tenured university professors) reported noticeable service increases. The service expansion we see among midlife faculty across American academe (Baldwin et al., 2005) may then become palpable, in the major research university, through the early post-tenure career. Second, participants reported that the increases materialized in diverse ways, including through accretion, intensification, transformation, and self-replication; service growth may, then, appear in multiple ways. And third, though viewing service as *giving to others*, participants also claimed *to receive*, as in service they (a) ex-

tended their knowledge of the subject matters they taught or studied, or constructed relationships for doing so later; (b) gained self-knowledge, professionally and personally; and (c) developed interpersonal, management, and organizational knowledge. Service, then, emerged as a potential site for professors' learning and growth even as, in several cases, it posed the expected challenges.

These conclusions return us to a basic concern noted early in this article: that despite its clear presence in university professors' careers, certainly after tenure, service is not well defined as a form of faculty work. Without such definition—and without acknowledging the real presence of service increase in their work lives—university professors can do little to take charge of their service, turning it to good use, for themselves and others. Though we cannot offer a conclusive redefinition of faculty service—one that is fully responsive to university professors' experiences of work and learning—we do offer these thoughts toward a deepened view.

First, given that a dynamic of giving *and* receiving infuses professors' talk about service, we suggest that future policy discourses acknowledge this fact, in effect recasting service as reciprocal. Ideally, service would reflect potential for gain, for those at whom it is directed *and* for those who offer it. Leadership and teaching, two core professional higher education practices, have already been cast this way to useful effect—for example, through views of leadership as shared (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993) and of teaching as multidirectional (Hansen, 2001; Shulman 2004a, 2004b). Given professors' expressed awareness of a dynamic of giving and receiving in service, we suggest that service is likewise multidirectional, and that to gain fully from it, we need to recognize, name, and address this dynamic more openly and more instrumentally than we have in the past.

We suggest then that professors, administrators, and policymakers think about faculty service in terms of what it provides to others and returns to professors for their learning and development. Given the limited scope of our study, we are not in a position to make data-based claims as to what happens developmentally to university professors who engage exclusively in other-oriented service with little attention to their own needs or interests. Nor do we know what happens developmentally to professors who engage in service that is more balanced between giving and receiving. These questions merit attention—in all types of higher education institutions—given growing concerns about the faculty's intellectual and professional vitality through the full length of the post-tenure career. Though we know little about the effects of faculty service on professors' work and lives, we do, sadly, know what happens to some caregivers who lose themselves in giving, in fully selfless ways, to others: At the extreme, they put themselves—their health, potential for

growth, well-being—at risk. What is an appropriate balance? This question merits pursuit in our professional as in our personal lives; it bears special meaning for populations historically burdened with excesses of service, in higher education and otherwise.

Second, we suggest that faculty service be reframed as well to emphasize its potential to connect to professors' substantive learning (Neumann, 2006a; Neumann, 2006b). Given increasing pressures on higher education, it is unlikely that all service can be scholarly. Yet our analysis suggests that with a bit of creative thought, professors may do better than they are now at bringing service and substance closer together in their daily work and careers. In doing so, professors may gain intellectually from service, thereby strengthening their scholarly effort, including their teaching, and they may be less resistant than some are now to engaging in service that simply must be carried out for the good of the enterprise.

We close with the following implication for practice: that university professors would do well to plan for and orchestrate, thoughtfully, the service dimension of the academic career. Professors plan their research careers strategically—what they will study, with whom, why, toward what ends. And increasingly, they think systematically about their teaching careers—as concerned simultaneously with their students' and their own learning. Yet service gets little strategic thought; we might go so far as to say that in some university professors' careers, only service avoidance is strategized. It may be time for professors to attend more closely than they have done previously to the service dimensions of their careers—not to avoid service, but rather to craft it purposefully and meaningfully and to align it, as much as possible, with their substantive interests. University professors may gain as well from “lessons in academic organization and career orchestration,” rather than striving to learn these with little guidance, by happenstance, “on the job.” We suggest that university professors' thoughtful crafting of service within their careers may make it more palatable—perhaps more meaningful—than it typically has been for many. The enterprise, too, stands to gain from faculty service addressed in serious and substantive ways.

Notes

¹Studies of university professors' time expenditure on faculty service in the years immediately following tenure (as opposed to the full length of the post-tenure career, from the award of tenure through retirement) are nonexistent at this time. Given desires for recency and breadth, we turned for guidance to extant analyses of the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF 1987–8, 1992–3, 1998–9, and 2003–4), in particular to Baldwin, Lunceford, & Vanderlinden's (2005) NSOPF 1998–9 analysis of faculty at midlife and in middle career. However, linkages between our own study and that of Baldwin et al. are, at best, uneven, and any apparent parallels must be treated with care:

The large-scale survey data (U.S. Dept. of Education, 1999) on which Baldwin et al. (2005) draw pertain to faculty in (a) midcareer and midlife, each variously defined, and without reference to tenure as a career phase marker; (b) all academic fields; and (c) diverse types of four-year institutions of higher education. Given our study objective, we collected data only on professors in (a) the earliest phases of the post-tenure career (from year 1 up to year 5 post-tenure); (b) selected fields of study as described under study design/method; (c) major research universities (Research University I, Doctoral/Research Universities-Extensive). Further, NSOPF 99 splits off service from administration and outreach, whereas we define such activities, collectively, as service. Per the definition of service we present in the opening of this article, we also include as service any kind of organizing or coordinating work that supports faculty members' core substantive efforts in research, teaching, public service, and so on. Alternatively, the NSOPF classifies faculty consulting as service whereas we do not. Thus, any comparison of NSOPF data to our own is, at best, rough. We examined analyses of earlier cycles of the NSOPF study (for example, Finkelstein et al., 1998), yet those represented definitional quandaries (for example, breadth of the U.S. faculty population studied) similar to those we encountered in analyses of the NSOPF 1998-9 data. We focused on the 1998-9 NSOPF data collection cycle since it overlaps more closely with our own data collection timeline than do earlier iterations.

This discussion, of course, raises two issues: (a) whether university professors' experiences of service change through the full course of midcareer given the potential length of this career phase (a career development issue), and (b) whether service, as a feature of the professorial career, has expanded over time alongside changes in the meaning of service (a historical issue). Though well beyond the scope of our study, these questions merit the attention of researchers interested in tracing changes in what it means to be a professor.

²As noted earlier, we limited the study, including claims derived, to the major research university as the site of professors' learning and development. Given that faculty work varies by institutional type—implying differential emphases on teaching, research, and service, including service to teaching programs in heavily teaching-oriented institutions—extrapolation to other institutional forms should be made with care. That said, we do believe that a cross-type analysis of faculty service, with attention to faculty developmental implications, is warranted.

To comply with pledges of confidentiality, we name no institution or person, and we omit or mask potentially identifying data. Some professors requested that instead of indicating their specific disciplines or fields of study, that we use broader descriptors (e.g., a biologist wishing to be called a scientist, or a political scientist wishing to be described as a social scientist).

³One participating professor was not available for year-3 interviews. Thus we refer to a sample size of 40 for year-1 data and 39 for year-3.

⁴We offer here a partial (i.e., self-reported) though plausible (given sample diversity, strength of response) view of the knowledge that professors may gain within their service activity. Improved evidence of such learning would entail longer-term longitudinal study designs including in-depth subject-matter-anchored interviews and comparative ethnographies, a combined research strategy untried to date in the study of higher education. We must note, too, that in addition to the learning herein reported, other learning unnoticed by respondents might have occurred. The topic merits further inquiry.

References

- Baldwin, R. G. (1990). Faculty career stages and implications for professional development. In J. H. Schuster, D. W. Wheeler, and associates (Eds.), *Enhancing faculty careers: Strategies for development and renewal* (pp. 20–40). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Baldwin, R. G., & Blackburn, R. T. (1981). The academic career as a developmental process: Implications for higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 52(6), 598–614.
- Baldwin, R. G., Lunceford, C. J., & Vanderlinden, K. E. (2005). Faculty in the middle years: Illuminating an overlooked phase of academic life. *The Review of Higher Education*, 29(1), 97–118.
- Becher, T. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines*. Bristol, PA: Open University Press.
- Bensimon, E. M., & Neumann, A. (1993). *Redesigning collegiate leadership: Teams and teamwork in higher education*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Berube, M., & Nelson, C. (1995). *Higher education under fire: Politics, economics, and the crisis of the humanities*. New York: Routledge.
- Blackburn, R. T., & Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bowen, H. R., & Schuster, J. H. (1986). *American professors: A national resource imperiled*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Braskamp, L. A., & Ory, J. C. (1994). *Assessing faculty work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Centra, J. (1979). *Determining faculty effectiveness: Assessing teaching, research, and service for personnel decisions and improvement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Checkoway, B. (1997). Reinventing the research university for public service. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 11(3), 307–319.
- Cox, C. T. (1991). The relationship among rank, experience, and accounting faculty effort allocations. *Journal of Education for Business*, 67(2), 120–125.
- Dill, D. D., & Helm, K. P. (1988). Faculty participation in strategic policy making. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. IV, pp. 319–355). New York: Agathon.
- Driscoll, A., & Lynton, E. (1999) *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Fairweather, J. S. (1996). *Faculty work and public trust*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Fairweather, J. S., & Beach, A. L. (2002, Fall). Variations in faculty work at research universities: Implications for state and institutional policy. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(1), 97–115.
- Fear, F., & Sandmann, L. (1995). Unpacking the service category: Reconceptualizing university outreach for the 21st century. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, 59(3), 110–122.
- Finkelstein, M. J., Seal, R. K., & Schuster, J. (1998). *The new academic generation: A profession in transformation*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Floyd, C. E. (1985). *Faculty participation in decision-making* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 8). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., & Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Hansen, D. T. (2001). *Exploring the moral heart of teaching: Toward a teacher's creed*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Huber, M. T. (2000). *Evaluating outreach: Scholarship assessed's approach*. Paper presented at the Pennsylvania State University. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Retrieved from <http://www.outreach.psu.edu/News/Pubs/Monograph/eval.html>
- Lynton, E. A. (1995). *Making the case for professional service*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Lynton, E. A., & Elman, S. E. (1987). *New priorities for the university: Meeting society's needs for applied knowledge and competent individuals*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Marsick, V. J., & Watkins, K. E. (1990). *Informal and incidental learning in the workplace*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Marsick, V. J., & Watkins, K. E. (2001). Informal and incidental learning. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *The new update on adult learning theory: New directions for adult and continuing education* (pp. 25–34). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McCallum, C. A. (1994). The bottom line: Broadening the faculty reward system. *Teachers College Record*, 95(3), 332–36.
- Milem, J. F., Berger, J. B., & Dey, E. L. (2000). Faculty time allocation: A study of change over twenty years. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(4), 454–475.
- Neumann, A. (1999). Inventing a labor of love: Scholarship as a woman's work. In M. Romero & A. J. Stewart (Eds.), *Women's untold stories: Breaking silence, talking back, voicing complexity* (pp. 243–255). New York: Routledge.
- Neumann, A. (2006a). Professing passion: Emotion in the scholarship of professors in research universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(3), 381–424.
- Neumann, A. (2006b). *Professing to learn: Creating the tenured life and career in the American research university*. Manuscript in preparation.
- O'Meara, K. A. (1997). *Rewarding faculty professional service* (Working Paper No. 19). Boston: New England Resource Center for Higher Education, University of Massachusetts-Boston, Graduate College of Education.
- O'Meara, K. A. (2002). *Scholarship unbound: Assessing service as a scholarship for promotion and tenure*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Paulsen, M. B., & Feldman, K. A. (1995). *Taking teaching seriously: Meeting the challenge of instructional improvement* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2). Washington, DC: George Washington University Press.
- Rice, R. E. (1986). The academic profession in transition: Toward a new social fiction. *Teaching Sociology*, 14, 12–23.
- Rice, R. E. (1996). *Making a place for the new American scholar*. Washington DC: American Association of Higher Education.
- Schatzman, L., & Strauss, A. L. (1973). *Field research: Strategies for a natural sociology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Educating the reflective practitioner for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Sherman, F. T., & Torbert, W. R. (2000). Engaging new forms of social inquiry and social action. In F. T. Sherman & W. R. Torbert (Eds.), *Transforming social inquiry, transforming social action: New paradigms for crossing the theory/practice divide in universities and communities* (pp. 1–9). Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic.
- Shulman, L. S. (2004a). *Teaching as community property: Essays on higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shulman, L. S. (2004b). *The wisdom of practice: Essays on teaching, learning, and learning to teach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smelser, N. J. (1993). *Effective committee service*. Newbury Park, NJ: Sage.
- Taylor, H. L. (1997). No more ivory towers: Connecting the research university to the community. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 11(3), 327–332.
- United States Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (1999). National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, Faculty Questionnaire. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/nsopf/>
- Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement*. Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass & the Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Copyright of Journal of Higher Education is the property of Ohio State University Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.