

Introduction

Katie J. Hogan and Michelle A. Massé

Service as Calling

All tenured and tenure-track faculty know the trinity of promotion and tenure criteria: research, teaching, and service.¹ But service, like the Paraclete or Holy Spirit, hovering over everything but never seen, often remains a point of blind faith. Feudal, quasi-monastic understandings of dutiful service animate contemporary higher education workplaces, fueling our unstinting dedication to our orders and our vocations.² Almost all faculty do this mysterious “service” work, even though the actual labor of service is rarely tabulated or analyzed as a key aspect of higher education’s political economy. The potentially endless list of tasks on campus, ranging from writing recommendations, advising students, and mentoring junior colleagues, through serving on committees and organizing events, to serving on institutional committees and task forces and writing reports, fills our days, weeks, weekends, and years. A good deal of this labor falls through the cracks, rarely finding its way onto a CV or into a promotion or tenure file, rendering this “off-the-books” work invisible. Such invisibility is the focus of this book.

The invisibility of the labor of service is repeatedly reproduced, even in studies of the profession and of higher education. Learning about, research on, and assessment of teaching have undergone a metamorphosis in the last twenty years; evaluation of research has always been crucial. But we lack both qualitative and quantitative understandings of service and know very little formally about its function as part of schools’ silent economies. This book explores what service is and investigates why this form of labor is often not acknowledged as “labor” by administrators or even by faculty themselves.

Some academic workers see performing service as an honorable endeavor that creates goodwill and community; for others, service labor is a form of rebellion and workplace transformation; for still others, service work is

exploitative and rooted in entrenched structural hierarchies. But for most of us, service is all of these, each response flickering into being at some time during every major service project. This book touches upon many points on this spectrum. Its insights illuminate all professorial faculty experiences with service, but it has a specific focus upon the gendering of service, and a particular emphasis upon service done by women. Exposing the actual labor of service, particularly for women and racial, ethnic, and sexual minorities, helps us understand how this labor then becomes a gendered activity considered appropriate for *all* workers in the group. By examining service as gendered labor and by making the economy of service audible and visible, we can improve the work lives of both female and male academic laborers. Our focus is upon the service labor of the tenured and tenure-track, a decision that at first seems counterintuitive because of that group's privilege relative to non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty. But as that group decreases to less than one-third of the U.S. teaching force in higher education, demand for service that can *only* be fulfilled by professors is expanding, and tenured and tenure-track professors "serve" as the well-fed canaries whose risk marks everyone's danger.

For most U.S. faculty, service is not perceived as intellectual work, and it is often framed as a labor of love instead, akin to the caregiving tasks women perform for their mates, children, places of worship, or community groups rather than as work for which they should be paid and acknowledged. Refusal to perform service can be translated to mean that one doesn't "really care," as Michelle has argued elsewhere, criteria rarely applied to other, non-feminized forms of labor.³ Belying its graceful disappearing act is the profound reality that service, in all its subtle manifestations—as "administration," "professional development," "faculty governance," "collegiality," "commitment to students," "institutional citizenship," "university-community partnerships," or "social justice"—keeps institutions afloat. Without the labor of service, most institutions of higher education in this country would fold. Service functions as an enormously powerful unregulated economy that coexists with—and maintains—the formal, "official" economy of many institutions, just as women's unrecognized domestic labor props up the formal, official economies of countries the world over. Even when service takes on more tangible, practical forms—for instance, when it is viewed as part of our rapidly increasing "how-to" literature of professional development and touted as a way for junior colleagues to learn about the inner sanctums of the workplace, or when it is promoted as a political strategy to stave off the erosion of faculty governance—the *labor* of service remains largely invisible. Regardless of the guise or manifestation service assumes, it is missing from many faculty contracts, often noteworthy in promotion cases only when disgraceful, and frequently a sop in annual reports where it's unrelated to "merit" raises. In short, service is a workplace puzzler.

When viewed from a gender and class perspective, service emerges as the well-trained handmaid of the academy, quietly going about schools' work while other forms of labor call more loudly for our attention. Schools that ignore or downplay the value of such work while simultaneously insisting upon its performance benefit from the silent economy thus created. Schools that extol the virtues of service, enshrining it in institutional mission statements and in hiring, administrative, and promotion structures, often exploit the idea of service as an ethical virtue rather than as time-consuming labor for which employees should be compensated. This notion of service as moral obligation is particularly difficult for faculty to negotiate at religious institutions, but such lofty ideas about service permeate many institutions of higher education, complicating our critical efforts to demystify its powerful ideology. For instance, how can a faculty member, particularly a female faculty member, ask for compensation for activities that are routinely categorized as an index to one's unselfishness, moral goodness, and dedication to students?

While we believe that service is uniquely vulnerable to these kinds of ideological deformations and manipulations, we are not positing sites of higher education as dark satanic mills. But we are saying that they *are* mills: "knowledge factories," to use Michelle Tokarczyk's and Elizabeth Fay's (1993) phrase, in which we produce some very good things, mills in which many other things—including, sometimes, people—are ground exceedingly fine, but also workplaces in which we *work*. Dismayingly like the clerks at Wal-Mart who "volunteer" to spend off-clock hours restocking, cleaning, or taking inventory, academic workers all too often accept the right of their employers to demand their time. More dismaying still, in most instances the "associates" at Wal-Mart know they're being had: faculty, well-trained to see themselves as disembodied rolling cerebrums or as earnest agents of change, often don't. When it comes to service, faculty are the workers who are potentially so disembodied and alienated that they no longer recognize their own labor as labor.

It may seem that faculty make plenty of noise about service. But complaining about service is not the same as critically analyzing it as a significant dimension of academic labor. Just as a plethora of "women's" magazines, manuals, and advice columns in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries loudly called attention to the domestic sphere while eschewing in-depth study of its relationship to the public economy, so too academic service remains largely unanalyzed. In discussing service as "silent," we are referring specifically to its function as a significant part of academia's public economy: an unpaid form of labor that sustains wage labor while nonetheless not "counting" in an economy that recognizes only paid work. It bears repeating that we also recognize that many of us are women and men who gladly choose service as a way to embody what is most important to us as faculty members. Even a service chosen, however, can become, over time, an involuntary tax to the

institution, and service that is imposed from without is more onerous still. And the fact that faculty members may *want* to do service work is irrelevant as the central truth of academic employment, as Sharon Bird, Jacquelyn Litt, and Yong Wang (2004) emphasize: “[That faculty] enjoy the work [they do] is not why they are being paid for doing it” (203).

Doing the University’s Housework

Three decades ago, all too many of us assumed that effective teaching was simply the spontaneous overflow of powerful cerebration. Thanks in part to thinkers such as Paulo Freire, Henry Giroux, Ernest Boyer, and bell hooks, that presumption is no longer with us. Service, however, has not undergone the same reconsideration and critical analysis. Ernest Boyer’s *Scholarship Revisited* (1990) hit a cultural nerve in its insistence upon teaching as a form of scholarship: service is long overdue for a similar reassessment. Quickly heralded as the bold articulation of a long-known truth—that scholarship is integral to every arena of academic work—the ideals set forth in *Scholarship Revisited* were acclaimed, declaimed, and studied, although all too seldom implemented. Almost immediately upon publication, however, Boyer’s insistence upon service as one of these arenas disappeared into the maw of higher education’s teaching/research dichotomies, in which research is valued over teaching, and teaching and research together are framed in opposition to service.

Adrienne Rich, in her classic 1975 essay “Toward a Woman-Centered University,” demystified service by exposing it as labor. Highlighting the academy’s silent dependence upon the unpaid altruism of women as a central dynamic of its political economy, she boldly offered a prescient model for integrating economics, culture, patriarchy, and gender in analyses of higher education. Rich’s clarion call for effective and progressive responses to the changing working conditions of higher education remained generally unanswered or unheard though.

That service takes up the bulk of faculty members’ time and attention at many teaching schools and particularly at community colleges—where a higher percentage of women and people of color are employed than at research universities—emphatically underscores how little has changed in institutional disciplines since Rich’s call to action. In addition, such work, even if it earns one tenure and promotion at one’s home institution, rarely garners recognition beyond that institution—it has no exchange value in the academic job market and often eats into time for the research and scholarship that would allow such work to function as the “portable property” that Wemmick, in Dickens’s *Great Expectations*, so prudently advocates.

Ironically, silence about service reverberates in texts whose focus is specifically academic “work,” repeatedly omitting service as a crucial field of effort while emphasizing teaching. With rare exceptions, such as the “Report of the ADE Ad Hoc Committee on Governance” (Brezna et al. 2001), projects that have made significant contributions to our understanding of “the profession” nonetheless give only the most cursory of nods to service or cut it dead, even while they themselves perform “service to the profession.” In otherwise admirable analyses, such as Terry Caesar’s (2000) *Traveling through the Boondocks: In and Out of Academic Hierarchy*, Cary Nelson’s (2002) “What Hath English Wrought? The Corporate University’s Fast Food Discipline,” the Modern Language Association’s (MLA) “Professionalization in Perspective” (Hutcheon et al. 2002), and several studies that specify “work” in the title, remarkably little notice is taken of who’s working in the night kitchen. The conspicuous absence of the labor of service in projects whose titles emphasize the “work” of academia—such as *Academe’s* special issue “Rethinking Faculty Work” (July–August 2005)—indicates the need for critical, theoretical, and activist reflection on service. *Over Ten Million Served* sheds light on the labor of service and elucidates its cultural and economic influence in academic workplaces. It challenges the uncritical tradition of seeing service as “natural” and points toward a structural redefinition of this fundamental category of academic labor by bringing together a resonant collection of voices in which professorial workers struggle to articulate what “service” has meant in their lives.

We say “struggle” because, despite the extraordinary collective acumen, experience, and achievements represented by these women and men, the majority display what we have come to call the “service unconscious,” manifested in a defensive split between simultaneously held but contradictory beliefs. We know that our behavior sometimes damages us and supports organizational structures that we don’t want to reinforce. And yet we nonetheless persevere in these behaviors and articulate their value for the best of all possible reasons: the ways in which “helping” and “serving” please us and fulfill our deepest-held beliefs about the importance of existence in community and the need to achieve change and support for our colleagues and students. We know that service and sacrifice are often necessary in order to bring about more just workplaces, but much of the service we are pressed into is *not* about creating just and fair workplaces, an insight that several contributors to this volume make clear.

We also know that there is something wrong with our collegial definition of “work” as research, implicit in the question we routinely ask one another, “How is your work going?” According to the logic of this formula, teaching and service, which take up the brunt of our weeks, are time-absorbing distractions and not our “real” work at all. We nod ruefully at the troubling

inconsistency but continue to ask the question. At teaching institutions, where it is widely assumed that teaching and service eclipse research, it may be more unusual to be asked about one's research. The expectation that faculty members will engage in research and publication at non-research institutions is increasing, though, as a report of the MLA's Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion points out. The construction of service as altruistic expression exempt from critical interrogation operates at research institutions as well as at teaching schools. In other words, even though in some schools service is touted as superior to research, and at other schools research is constructed as the superior endeavor, the fact is that both service and research are increasingly being conflated as "serving" the institution.⁴ The need to recognize service as labor for which one is compensated links the diverse institutions across this country.

Wherever we work, service for most of us is surplus labor that we generate ceaselessly and unquestioningly. Thus the essays in this book explore why this form of labor is often not acknowledged as "labor" by administrators or even by faculty themselves. And although service has its own hierarchy—an exquisite *pilpul* that is often left unaddressed—in general, it is a feminized mode of effort. As Katie rightfully notes in "Superserviceable Feminism," female professors are not the only ones who serve: academic labor is becoming feminized through an intensification of service. We know the following:

- Particular fields are service-intensive, such as composition, language instruction, women's studies, and service learning.
- Other ranks also serve: there are assistants, lecturers, instructors, and graduate students dedicated to institutional service. And they also serve who wait, and wait, and wait for tenure-track jobs.
- There are individual men who are paragons of good citizenship and individual women who are shamelessly self-serving.

Although all ranks of academic workers serve, we focus on professors as a faculty group upon which particular pressures are placed. Regarded less as "stewards of the profession," that resounding Carnegie phrase, than as caregivers, many faculty, particularly post-tenure associate professors, are doing organizational work and administrative maintenance that support both the "younger" generations of scholars and students and the "older" one of full professors. The demand for publication by junior colleagues, as well as their inappropriateness as committee members for many major committees, for instance, often leads to a lessened service load for them. And, as the number of associate professors listed as chairs, directors, and even deans suggests, it is

increasingly difficult to recruit senior colleagues for positions of responsibility that were once assumed to be part of that rank's responsibility. Indeed, it was the unique functions of this particular "sandwich generation" academic life stage that particularly interested Michelle when, as co-chair of the MLA's Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession (CSWP), she first proposed the Associate Professor Project, which she oversaw during the first years of its development, and in which Katie participated extensively as a member of the CSWP.

The Association of Departments of English (ADE) Ad Hoc Committee on Governance (Breznau et al. 2001) reports with a note of surprise that in a discussion group made up of recently tenured faculty "the self-descriptions of recently tenured participants revealed an extraordinary degree of administrative responsibility among faculty members who had held tenure only for a year or two. The group included a department chair, a director of undergraduate studies, and an associate dean, as well as many with heavy participation in important committees" (5). The same schools that draw upon their newly tenured faculty often will not promote them for performing the very tasks they're called upon to perform in order to maintain the institution, however: job description and actual tasks are bizarrely awry.

In addition, as the report notes, faculty members who are effective committee members and administrators are turned to repeatedly, which results in an "often uneven distribution of the load of departmental responsibility" (6). Female—or feminized—professors' acceptance of above-average service loads can be forced by external pressure as well as gender socialization and expectations. Such loads can also be embraced, or even sought after, though, because of the faculty member's own definition of professional commitments, justification for not doing other work, internalization of institutional expectations, or naiveté about evaluation criteria.

Service with a Smile

Institutional caregiving, like domestic work, is heavily gendered. Women often find themselves primarily responsible for doing the university's housework as well as the family's, and this "housework," as Dale Bauer and others have called it, constitutes a silent economy that oils the gears of institutional functioning.⁵ Like other kinds of work associated with caregiving, such as nursing and teaching, service work, particularly in its most necessary and standard forms, is "feminized" and denied official recognition. We hypothesize that just as women fill the less-prestigious ranks of language and literature units, so too women and minorities are proportionately overrepresented when we start to tally who's doing the institution's housework. In a recent

article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Piper Fogg (2003) notes that “women have a harder time than men in turning away colleagues who ask them to contribute time and energy to a cause. Barbara Keating, a sociology professor . . . thinks that is because women have been socialized to be caretakers” (A16). Linda Kerber (2005) also wrote about this in a *Chronicle of Higher Education* essay on academic working conditions, pointing out how women are now starting to speak out about “overloaded service expectations (particularly for women of color).” We see this theme manifested strongly in the essays in this collection.

The statistics of a profession’s “feminization,” forcefully set forth in a report by the MLA’s CSWP, entitled “Women in the Profession, 2000” (McCaskill et al. 2000), underscore the fact that the increasing percentage of women in language and literature workplaces is in many instances related to lessened prestige and salary for women *and* men. Indeed, one can argue convincingly that sectors traditionally referred to as “service” components of departments, such as Freshman English or language instruction, are dour harbingers of the fate that is now threatening many humanities units.⁶ Furthermore, early responses from CSWP’s Associate Professor Project, open discussion on service at MLA’s 2005 Delegate Assembly, and anecdotal evidence suggest that, *pace* Steven Porter’s much-discussed 2006 presentation claiming few differences in service loads, the increased demand for service, allied with distributions relative to rank, falls disproportionately upon women and minorities.

Furthermore, women and minorities may be called upon precisely for their embodied representations of “diversity.” Schools, sometimes for the best of all possible reasons, are often specifically committed to having female and minority representation on committees, and it would seem that there are women aplenty for such representation. As Marc Bousquet (2008) repeatedly points out in *How the University Works: Higher Education and the Low Wage Nation*, the proportion of female PhDs in major literature and language fields such as English and French passed the 50 percent marker years ago, but the profile of contingent labor is now overwhelmingly female. As Katie (Hogan 2005) argues in “Superserviceable Feminism,” little has changed since the deplorably uneven stratification that Florence Howe noted in 1971: “Women and racial/ethnic minorities continue to be overrepresented among tenured faculty in two-year, women’s, and non-research/teaching colleges, while these same groups are underrepresented among tenured faculty in elite research institutions and resource-rich public universities” (95).

The hopes once tied to the pipeline theory, which presumed an increase in workplace status and rank once enough female candidates were in place, have ebbed before the realities of slower-than-expected change in the number of women holding professorial jobs and in the skyrocketing numbers of

women in NTT positions. Despite women's overrepresentation in poorly paid NTT jobs held by highly educated workers, they remain underrepresented and overtasked in the tenured ranks of the professoriate upon which so many key task forces, commissions, and committees draw.

Gender and Superserviceability

As the traditional research, teaching, and service triad that has structured the work and personal lives of the professoriate for decades is transformed by the service economy of the global marketplace, we are seeing that many more faculty of all races, genders, and backgrounds are increasingly engaged in various kinds of service work. Jobs and institutions are becoming service intensive, the transformation of higher education into a managed, feminized service economy impacts almost every aspect of our working lives, and few faculty members are exempt from its reach and influence. Such seismic changes in academic life converge to demand that we recognize the status of faculty service as an urgent issue for the future of higher education.

In saying this, we are well aware that service expectations remain unevenly distributed in the prestige economy of higher education according to factors such as institutional type, sex, race, ethnicity, and class, as well as category of service, but this intensified demand for service, or superserviceability, transcends institutional type and traditional experiences of service, as Katie explains. Seeing service as labor, and superservice as a manifestation of the speeded-up academic workplace, reveals its link to the new global economy in which we all work.

Once again, however, we find that the speedup in service that is affecting many professorial faculty is largely ignored. Much of higher education has indeed become a franchise for what Cary Nelson (2002) ringingly castigated as "fast food" disciplines: *who* is serving those demanding customers remains an indigestible truth. There are fewer of us even though there is more work to be done. Recently released data from the federal government indicates that tenure-track and tenured faculty comprise a mere 32 percent of U.S. professors, a sobering fact that infuses a new urgency to the question posed in Mary Burgan's (2006) cogent analysis *Whatever Happened to the Faculty? Drift and Decision in Higher Education*. Like many contemporary professional workers in a downsized economy, professors are experiencing intensification in workload, a phenomenon that has been typically discussed in terms of greater publication requirements for tenure and promotion. But service obligations have also mushroomed because of changing accreditation criteria, outcome assessment, post-tenure review, and an increasing reliance upon corporate management models, even though the number of tenured

and tenure-track faculty who can do these jobs has shrunk by one quarter to one half at many schools.

Schools that once emphasized teaching and service now want scholarly publication; schools that prided themselves upon their faculty's dedication to research now also trumpet their teaching and warm availability to the community as they market education to undergraduates. Yet the shockingly low numbers of faculty who are tenure-track or tenured make these administratively imposed agendas almost impossible to carry out. And the stark 32 percent figure is still lower in humanities units, whose proportion of NTT teachers is grossly inflated by their bearing the brunt of language, writing, and general education requirements.

In addition, the exhilarating expansion of interdisciplinary programs and centers on many campuses is often followed by the draining reality of no staff support. The challenging work of re-theorizing the boundaries of knowledge and curriculum all too often also means finding not only one's inner secretary but one's inner accountant, one's inner fund-raiser, one's inner IT specialist, and one's inner travel agent. And work that once would have been unhesitatingly identified as an administrator's—labor performed for a wage as part of one's job description—or as a task for highly qualified (if poorly paid) staff has devolved to faculty as the numbers of interdisciplinary programs, initiatives, and mission goals proliferate without a proportionate increase in institutional support. The faces that embody these demographic shifts are increasingly female.

As all of this unfolds on campus, faculty are also encouraged to embrace the service legacy of American higher education through “public engagement” programs and community civic partnerships off campus. Formally initiated with the publication of Ernest Boyer's (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered*, and more fully explicated in his 1997 article “The Scholarship of Engagement,” this movement seeks to broaden definitions of scholarship, community, and service and has spawned an industry of books, articles, and Web sites devoted to the creation of engaged campuses committed to reviving the university's image as good citizen. To our knowledge, none of this work seriously concerns itself with the dwindling numbers of tenure-track and tenured faculty lines or the unethical exploitation of contingent faculty, and none of it takes seriously the central idea of this book: that service, while important, meaningful, and often generative, is labor for which one should be paid. Instead, the emphasis rests on transcending traditional ideas of research and service, a worthy goal that many feminists have applauded, but one that should be met with skepticism when framed using the language of “engaged campus” initiatives. Cloaked in social justice language and beguiled by visions of new relationships between communities and colleges and universities based upon mutual respect, the engaged campus literature is earnest and optimistic, but

it glosses over difficult, uncomfortable economic and social realities. It also contributes to a subtle belittling of independent, autonomous intellectual work, a pernicious effect for women and minorities who have struggled for the right to perform that work. In much of this literature, the single-minded scholar who focuses on producing a new book or article emerges as selfish, insular, and elitist. Equally disturbing is the lack of consideration for how the engaged campus movement might play into the university's feminized "service" economy, since service-learning courses and university-community "partnerships" are labor-intensive projects largely carried out by women, graduate students, and NTT faculty.

Increasingly, the very language ascribed to the university is a language of service: faculty members respond to increased demands for endless reports of various kinds; administrators ask faculty and staff to assist them in marketing the public image and mission of the institution; and students are treated as discriminating "customers" to whom faculty and staff must provide academic guidance and personal attention. At the same time, students and contingent faculty serve as cheap sources of campus labor so that colleges and universities can direct funds toward improving campus facilities and sports complexes, all in the name of recruitment, retention, and marketing. And while there are fewer full-time tenured and tenure-track professors to join committees and work closely with administrators and students, the legwork related to these service activities has not decreased. This "servicification" of higher education shifts attention from the production of basic knowledge and bold intellectual inquiry toward a model of selfless serving, helping, and assisting with institutional goals chosen by others for both on-campus—and, increasingly, off-campus—agendas.

Some of our authors, and some respondents to questions about service, rightfully praise the pleasure of service done well and rewarded appropriately. The ADE Ad Hoc Committee on Governance (Breznau et al. 2001) claims: "Service is governance, governance is service" (12), and, in a good workplace that would be all we know and all we need to know. That dictum can be a handmaid's tale, however, at a school in which feminized faculty members serve those who govern.

Over Ten Million Served: Gendered Service in Language and Literature Workplaces theorizes service as a major, yet frequently overlooked, dimension of faculty labor and insists that we turn our critical attention to this essential dimension of labor in the academic workplace. By moving the discourse of service from the familiar framework of complaint and fatigue to a more nuanced feminist analysis of service as work, we open a new window onto the labor dynamics of the contemporary academy. With the ultimate goal of creating immediate and long-term positive change, our contributors consciously demystify service while at the same time offer practical and creative

solutions to the problem—and value—of service in language and literature workplaces.

Part 1, “Service Stations,” examines what “service” is and where it takes place, at the same time as it explores that fungible term. Although we talk readily about “service,” the “service” rubric in U.S. academic workplaces is mostly unexamined, even while service as a category plays a central role in the ongoing restructuring of faculty labor in higher education. Putting service at the center of analysis brings into bold relief questions about an institution’s commitment to learning, intellectual culture, and equitable workplaces.

We begin this section with Mary Burgan’s essay, “Careers in Academe: Women in the ‘Pre-Feminist’ Generation in the Academy,” which delineates a history of women in the profession in relation to service and the changing profession and urges contemporary faculty members to reclaim service as campus activism in order to respond with dignity and effectiveness to the violent corporatization threatening the profession. In “Superserviceable Subordinates, Universal Access, and Prestige-Driven Research,” Sharon O’Dair presents an analysis of the profession in terms of elitism and the voracious investment in prestige and hierarchy permeating the discourse of graduate education and the profession, with significant ramifications for service. Katie J. Hogan’s essay, “Superserviceable Feminism,” initiates a much-needed discussion of the “servicification” of feminism and women’s studies as a powerful manifestation of the gendered working conditions of academe. Hogan diagnoses “superserviceable feminism” as the harbinger of the “servicification” of humanities and of higher education more generally.

Donna Strickland also sees feminized work as foundational in “The Invisible Work of the Not-Quite-Administrator, or, Superserviceable Rhetoric and Composition” and specifically addresses the pervasive ideology that defines composition as administrative service. Drawing on her professional experiences as an assistant professor of composition, Strickland explains that the common misreading of composition studies as administrative service means that service and administrative labor are expected of her, and yet, because she is not officially an administrator, this service work remains largely invisible. In “Foreign Language Program Direction: Reflections on Workload, Service, and Feminization of the Profession,” Colleen Ryan-Scheutz offers a similar analysis of the gendered assumptions of service in the context of foreign language administration and argues for necessary changes that will bring to visibility the labor being done in these programs, mostly by women.

This section concludes with Marc Bousquet’s essay, “Ten Million Serving: Undergraduate Labor, the Final Frontier,” which focuses on the predicament of undergraduate students as poorly paid service workers. It underscores the impact of the contemporary global service economy on higher education in the lives of undergraduates and also illuminates connections between faculty

and students by showing how both groups experience a speedup in the context of increasingly limited opportunities for learning, teaching, and research. Bousquet's essay argues persuasively that we are using the ideology of higher education to train "student workers": what they are in fact learning is how to become docile workers in an exploitative, feminized service economy.

Part 2, "*Non Serviam*: Out of Service," features essays about workers saying—or trying to say—"no" to what is in effect mandatory overtime, as well as deciding how, why, and when to say "yes." Given the current economic conditions under which many academics labor, how can "no" be articulated? How can the increasingly powerless minority of tenured and tenure-track faculty assist less secure workers in their efforts to limit service expectations? How can faculty who choose their service as an integral part of their scholarly and pedagogical commitments to their communities ensure that that service will be recognized? These theoretical/empirical/personal questions are thoughtfully addressed throughout the essays in this section. Presenting strategies to delimit service demands that go too far, discussing what to do when "no" is impossible or perceived as impossible, and analyzing the conditions that make "yes" possible emerge here as central concerns.

In "The Value of Desire: On Claiming Professional Service," Kirsten M. Christensen argues that an integral feature of theorizing and practicing service is the conflict between the desire to serve and service overload. Focusing on the concept of overload as one of the most corrosive elements undermining faculty desire, Christensen analyzes how faculty's own desire for service is repeatedly abused and lessened because of the crushing volume of service requested, not because one is dismissive of service. Christensen offers some ideas about what institutions and faculty can do to transform this unhealthy and ultimately self-defeating pattern.

Using a critical perspective on service and challenging the typical framework of simplistic views of service as moral uplift or good work, Myriam J. A. Chancy explores her own professional behavior in relation to service in "Outreach: Considering Community Service and the Role of Women of Color Faculty in Diversifying University Membership." Chancy also questions the nature of the relationship between the university and the community covered under the mantle of service and asks whose unpaid labor is extracted in order for such outreach to be performed. Raising the specter of colonialism and the history of missionary work couched as selfless service, Chancy wonders "Can the University, with all its trappings of elitism, effectively become communal, a community *participant* rather than a removed player interacting with the community as its other?"

Shirley Geok-lin Lim believes in the potential of service to create community, but she ruefully notes that, throughout her career in academe, service's dark side has eclipsed its positive side, as she lucidly explains in

“To Serve or Not to Serve: Nobler Question.” Lim’s essay uncovers the overloaded burden of service that Christensen’s essay delineates and analyzes the colonialism and racism that Chancy’s piece invokes. Whether the worker labors at a two-year urban community college in an international city or a top research university on the West Coast of the United States, Lim argues that service is too often overwhelming, particularly for women of color.

In “Not in Service,” Paula M. Krebs too describes how although national and/or local institutional service can be energizing and exciting for faculty members, it can devolve into enacting corporate methods of image management and institutional marketing. As one strategy for identifying kinds of service, she proposes a crucial distinction between service organized around creating political change and service that is simply about keeping an institution running more smoothly. What Krebs calls “public service” maps a major route to major change.

Andrea Adolph also insists that not all service is, as she puts it, “created equal.” Service learning/social justice projects informed by disciplinary knowledge therefore should be distinguished from “regular service.” In “Experience Required: Service, Relevance, and the Scholarship of Application,” Adolph looks closely at Ernest Boyer’s *Scholarship Reconsidered* and its companion volume, *Scholarship Assessed*, and she identifies one of the key differences between engaged service and traditional ideas of what is rewarded in the academy: one’s scholarly expertise. By expanding what “counts as scholarship” and by distinguishing among types of service, Adolph offers helpful strategies for identifying and rewarding service.

Margaret Kent Bass’s essay, “Humble Service,” further explores the deployment of service, specifically in terms of diversity initiatives, by delineating the linkages and conflicts among Christianity, service, race, racism, and the racist manner in which colleges and universities formulate and carry out such initiatives. As an African American female faculty member, Bass explains how her identity and body function as an instrument of unpaid service used to meet the white institution’s diversity needs. Bass, like Krebs and Adolph, insists upon drawing major distinctions between kinds of service. Choosing to mentor African American students and other students of color is Bass’s chosen service and emerges from a long legacy of African American women academics, scholars, and activists who see service as transformative activism, as service that “fights the power.” In contrast to this kind of service, Bass identifies service that’s housework and declares, “I define my service, and I ain’t cleaning no institutional houses.”

Phyllis van Slyck’s essay, “Welcome to the Land of Super-Service: A Survivor’s Guide . . . and Some Questions,” offers an analysis of service at LaGuardia Community College of the City University of New York. While van Slyck’s essay focuses on gendered service at a two-year institution that is unionized and part of a powerful university system, her overall goal is to

change the working conditions for all faculty at all community colleges and, like other contributors in this section, to offer insights, observations, and theories that apply to *all* institutions of higher education.

The essays in “*Non Serviam: Out of Service*” make clear that the speedup in academic labor is occurring in some way at all institutions in the United States, and that this speedup is steeped in deeply sexist and racist ideologies. Learning to say “no”—and deciding when “yes” is the best answer—sends a message of immediate practical use and long-lasting theoretical significance.

Part 3, “Service Changes,” is the last section of the book, in which authors theorize about the future of service practices by reclaiming, revising, or restructuring them to reflect egalitarian, intelligent, and ethical social justice principles. As our contributors so vividly demonstrate, visions of service as central to intellectual innovation and progressive community collaborations are not impossible dreams but instead dreams that can only become realities by resisting exploitative labor practices. Through developing egalitarian and community-building forms of service, the authors not only reconstruct service in the campus workplace but also the relationship of those workplaces to the rest of the world.

Patricia Meyer Spacks also presents service as a way to foster robust intellectual sociability in “Service and Empowerment.” While she is aware that service can involve pointless meetings and/or unpaid tasks unequally distributed along lines of gender and institutional type/classification, Spacks’s experience of service is one of significant opportunities for personal development and institutional change. Although she recognizes that service requirements and expectations can be mishandled by administrators and faculty alike, Spacks sees service as an empowering activity and points out that faculty who assist their institutions in achieving their goals are powerful.

Donald E. Hall’s argument in “The Hermeneutics of Service” resonates with the collaborative and thoughtful service that Clausen and her colleagues (see text that follows) enact and honor. Although Hans-Georg Gadamer does not address issues of gender or women’s marginalized position in universities in particular and intellectual life and culture more generally, Hall nevertheless argues that Gadamer’s emphasis on reciprocity, conversation, and dialogue make him a potentially appealing theorist for feminist theorists and practitioners who want to critically examine and transform academic service. Hall calls “dialogue-based communal interactions across and within academic departments” the cornerstone of Gadamer’s theory and of his own hermeneutics of service, and one that would help us achieve the change Hall calls for in *The Academic Community: A Manual for Change*.

In “Rewarding Work: Integrating Service into an Institutional Framework on Faculty Roles and Rewards,” Jeannette Clausen describes an intriguing project that would accurately reflect what the professional faculty at her

institution actually do. Working with the vice chancellor and members of her staff, Clausen contributed to the creation of a document that would offer a framework for integrating service into their university's evaluation of faculty roles and rewards. Consulting current scholarship on the topic, the committee found that the most important source for their research and document was the actual culture of their institution. While the document did not specifically address the gendered aspect of service, by making service visible as labor, their new framework initiated the process of acknowledging all the work that faculty do.

Teresa Mangum sees service as powerful, but she too expresses skepticism about how it is often deployed. Her essay, "Curb Service or Public Scholarship To Go," delineates how service can range from a mundane stint on the parking committee to working with artists, professors, and activists about creating a public art project about the social construction of animals. Mangum, like Adolph, is most enthusiastic about modes of service that are rooted in various kinds of expertise. She too argues that not all service is created equal: public engagement scholarship is not the same as routine "regular" service that one performs on campus. Mangum identifies the "service abyss," that commodious catchall where everything that is not teaching or research is stowed, but she also looks forward to a new generation that will "curb service" and, in so doing, "create educational institutions different from and better than the ones in which they studied."

We close this collection with Valerie Lee's contribution "Pearl was shitin' worms and I was supposed to play rang-around-the-rosie?: An African American Woman's Response to the Politics of Labor." Lee offers a narrative of one department's thoughtful challenge of institutional politics and restructuring of service policies as well as one model for a more egalitarian future in language and literature workplaces. Weaving in African American folklore and literature, traditions of black women's service both in and out of the academy, and the vexed issue of service done by faculty members of color in U.S. English departments, Lee's essay offers a rich example of service activism and theory. In recounting how her department replaced an all-too-familiar model of inequitable research, teaching, and service with a workload in which everyone has equitable teaching, research, and service expectations, Lee poignantly explains how, on one fateful Friday morning, members of her department "voted ourselves a life." That utopian outcome is one we hope other servants of the servants of the academy will also pursue.

The other authors in this volume also want a more nuanced and fair way to evaluate service. Exposing the blurriness of service and identifying how this nebulous catchall category fails to identify distinctions are only partial, if necessary, aspects of what could help combat exploitation of service labor. If service is the category that accounts for everything we do that is not research and teaching, then we need to show how this work is labor and emphasize

that that labor is increasing. Implementing engaged campus projects that are rooted in disciplinary and interdisciplinary methods and perspectives, as well as the personal gifts and talents of faculty, is crucial. Such projects, however, do not necessarily address the stark reality of there being more and more work to be done and fewer and fewer professorial faculty to do it. If the majority of faculty are contingent, then the bulk of service initiatives will fall on the already overextended tenure-track and tenured faculty, or it will be imposed on contingent faculty and part-time instructors who have little choice but to comply.

Over Ten Million Served poses several questions to professorial faculty and faculty in administrative roles who are reading this book:

- What is your own “work”? Have you ever answered the question “How’s your work coming?” in terms of a committee? a course?
- Can you say “no” to service at your school without feeling pressured or marked? Can your colleagues, particularly junior and minority members?
- Service is traditionally not “counted” at many schools, not only in terms of merit, tenure, and promotion but in terms of our time. What is your work week? What does your contract say about “service”? Does it divide work between teaching and research? Can you imagine “working to contract”? Working a forty-hour week? Why not?
- Have you advertised for, or encouraged, untenured assistant professors to direct your Women’s Studies program? Head your Writing Center? Develop your Cultural Studies concentration? If so, have you supported those colleagues for promotion or tenure on the basis of outstanding service?
- Have you, or your department, developed a rationale for the distribution of service?
- How do you evaluate service in your department? Is there any way to distinguish on annual reports—and in annual raises—between the sometimes-present member of the cookie committee and the chair of your curriculum revision, for example?
- Teaching is increasingly an intensive part of graduate student and junior faculty preparation. Is talking about service also a part of your mentoring and training for graduate students and junior faculty?

- Have you suggested that faculty on your campus address service as part of exploring collective bargaining, Faculty Senate or school task forces, or American Association of University Professors (AAUP) initiatives?

Egregiously unjust policies corrode the profession, higher education more generally, and the spirit of individual faculty most specifically. Many of us have risen to the challenge of resisting them by using our time and scholarship to address pressing issues of labor. By foregrounding service as integral to schools' operations, and by focusing on the gendering of service, this book contributes to a growing body of work and offers fresh perspectives on higher education in the United States as a workplace and not an Ivory Tower. In these theoretical and empirical essays addressing the varied kinds of service work we do in academic workplaces, the contributors to this volume teach us that "service" is a significant object of analysis that helps us understand both what the actual work of academia is and who's doing it.

Notes

1. The body of this essay is largely based upon Michelle's presentation, "Finding Good Help: The Silent Economy of Service in Higher Education," and Katie's presentation, "Superservice as a Threat to Academic Freedom," parts of the 2007 Modern Language Association Presidential Forum, "The Humanities at Work in the World" (Chicago, December 28, 2007).

2. The *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) defines service as "work done in obedience to and for the benefit of a master" and as "serving (God) by obedience, piety, and good works." We would like to thank Sigrid King for bringing this definition to our attention.

3. See Michelle's interviews "Higher Ed: A Pyramid Scheme" and "Ten Million Served!" in relation to *Over Ten Million Served* at the excellent site Marc Bousquet constructed in relation to *How the University Works* (New York: New York University Press, 2007). See <http://www.howtheuniversityworks.com> at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TXHzzvWyKLQ> and <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ig18SWw-h6g&feature=related>.

4. For an interesting reinforcement of this point, see John Lombardi's response to the "Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion," in his "Reality Check" series, "Research Competition and the MLA" (January 11, 2007; <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2007/01/11/lombardi>).

5. See Dale Bauer's insightful analyses in "Academic Housework: Women's Studies and Second Shifting," in *Women's Studies on Its Own: A Next Wave Reader in Institutional Change*, ed. Robyn Wiegman (Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press: 2002), 245–57. See also her "The Politics of Housework," in *Women's Review of Books* (February 1998), 19–20.

6. In a Conference of College Composition and Communication presentation, Stuart C. Brown reported upon the data from the third survey he has conducted since 1973 upon the most prestigious site of writing instruction: doctoral rhetoric and composition programs. "Male faculty members were the healthy majority in the 1993 survey and the numbers were relatively equal seven years later. Now, female faculty outnumber male faculty 264 to 224." We would suggest that that trend may mark the field's relative subordination to traditional literature studies and may indeed go hand in glove with the possible decrease in program stability and prestige he mentions. (Scott Jaschik, "What Is a Composition and Rhetoric Doctorate?" See <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/04/04/cccc>).

Works Cited

- Bird, Sharon, Jacquelyn Litt, and Yong Wang. 2004. "Creating Status of Women Reports: Institutional Housekeeping as 'Women's Work.'" *NWSA Journal* 16, no. 1: 194–206.
- Bousquet, Marc. 2008. *How the University Works: Higher Education and the Low-Wage Nation*. New York: New York University Press.
- , Tony Scott, and Leo Parascondola, eds. 2003. *Tenured Bosses and Disposable Teachers: Writing Instruction in the Managed University*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Boyer, Ernest L. 1996. "The Scholarship of Engagement." *Journal of Public Outreach* 1:1:11–20.
- Boyer, Ernest L. 1990 (2d ed. 1997). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Carnegie Foundation/Jossey-Bass.
- Breznau, Anne, Charles Harris, David Laurence, James Papp, and Patricia Meyer Spacks. 2001. "Report of the ADE Ad Hoc Committee on Governance." *ADE Bulletin* 129 (Fall): 1–13. Rpt. in *Profession 2002* (New York: MLA, 2002, 211–28).
- Burgan, Mary. 2006. *What Ever Happened to the Faculty?: Drift and Decision in Higher Education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Caesar, Terry. 2000. *Traveling through the Boondocks: In and Out of Academic Hierarchy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Fogg, Piper. 2003. "So Many Committees, So Little Time." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 50, no. 17 (November 19); (December 19): A14. See also <http://www.chronicle.com/colloquy/2003/collegiality> for discussion of the article.
- Hogan, Katie J. 2007. "Superservice as a Threat to Academic Freedom." 2007 Modern Language Association Presidential Forum, "The Humanities at Work in the World," MLA. Chicago, IL, December 28.
- . 2005. "Superserviceable Feminism." *The Minnesota Review* 63/64: 95–111. See also http://www.theminnesotareview.org/journal/ns6364/iae_ns6364_superserviceablefeminism.shtml.
- Hutcheon, Linda, et al. 2002. "Professionalization in Perspective." MLA Ad Hoc Committee on the Professionalization of PhDs. In *Profession 2002*. New York: MLA, 187–210.

- Jaschik, Scott. 2008. "What Is a Composition and Rhetoric Doctorate?" *Inside Higher Ed* (April 4). <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/04/04/cccc>.
- Kerber, Linda K. 2005. "We Must Make the Academic Workplace More Humane and Equitable." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (March 18): B6–9.
- Massé, Michelle A. 2007. "Finding Good Help: The Silent Economy of Service in Higher Education." 2007 Modern Language Association Presidential Forum, "The Humanities at Work in the World," MLA. Chicago, IL, December 28.
- McCaskill, Barbara, et al. 2000. "Women in the Profession, 2000." Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession. In *Profession 2000*. New York: MLA, 191–215.
- MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion. 2007. "Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion." In *Profession 2007*. New York: MLA, 1–84. Members can also access the report online at http://www.mla.org/tenure_promotion.
- Nelson, Cary. 2002. "What Hath English Wrought? The Corporate University's Fast Food Discipline." In *Disciplining English: Alternative Histories, Critical Perspectives*, ed. David R. Shumway and Craig Dionne, 195–211. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Porter, Stephen R. 2006. "A Closer Look at Faculty Service: What Affects Participation on Committees?" Copy of uncirculated paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, April 8.
- "Rethinking Faculty Work." 2005. Special issue of *Academe: Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 91, no. 4 (July–August).
- Rich, Adrienne. 1979. "Toward a Woman-Centered University." In *On Lies, Secrets, and Silence: Selected Prose 1966–1978*, 125–55. New York: Norton. (First published in 1975.)
- Tokarczyk, Michelle M., and Elizabeth A. Fay, eds. 1993. *Working-Class Women in the Academy: Laborers in the Knowledge Factory*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.