

# Gender & Society

<http://gas.sagepub.com/>

---

## Gender Inequality and Time Allocations Among Academic Faculty

Sarah Winslow

*Gender & Society* 2010 24: 769

DOI: 10.1177/0891243210386728

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://gas.sagepub.com/content/24/6/769>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[Sociologists for Women in Society](#)

**Additional services and information for *Gender & Society* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://gas.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://gas.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

**Citations:** <http://gas.sagepub.com/content/24/6/769.refs.html>

# GENDER INEQUALITY AND TIME ALLOCATIONS AMONG ACADEMIC FACULTY

SARAH WINSLOW  
Clemson University

*This article focuses on faculty members' allocation of time to teaching and research, conceptualizing these—and the mismatch between preferred and actual time allocations—as examples of gender inequality in academic employment. Utilizing data from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, I find that (1) women faculty members prefer to spend a greater percentage of their time on teaching, while men prefer to spend more time on research, although these preferences are themselves constrained; (2) women faculty members spend a greater percentage of their workweek on teaching and a smaller percentage on research than men, gaps that cannot be explained by preferences or educational and institutional attributes; and (3) women faculty members have larger time allocation mismatches than men—that is, their actual time allocations to both teaching and research diverge more from their preferred time allocations than those of men. These findings shed light on how gender inequality is both produced and maintained in this aspect of academic employment and have implications for job satisfaction, productivity, and the recruitment and retention of current and future faculty members, especially women.*

**Keywords:** *education; organizations; work/occupations*

Although much has changed since the 1991 publication of Massachusetts Institute of Technology's report on the status of women in the sciences (Massachusetts Institute of Technology 1991), more recent data indicate that gender inequality persists in the academy. While women have nearly reached parity with men in the receipt of doctoral degrees (Survey of Earned Doctorates 2007) and initial academic appointments, women faculty members achieve tenure and promotion to full professor at a slower rate than men, are

---

AUTHOR'S NOTE: *An earlier version of this article was presented at the 2009 annual meeting of the Southern Sociological Society in New Orleans. I am grateful to Jerry Jacobs, Dana Britton, and the anonymous Gender & Society reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions.*

GENDER & SOCIETY, Vol. 24 No. 6, December 2010 769-793

DOI: 10.1177/0891243210386728

© 2010 by The Author(s)

underrepresented at top ranks and in administrative positions, and earn less than comparable men (Jacobs and Winslow 2004; Krefting 2003). I explore another component of the gendered nature of academic employment—faculty members' allocation of time to research and teaching and their time allocation mismatches, or the differences between actual and preferred time allocations.

While there are minimal gaps in total weekly work hours (Jacobs and Winslow 2004), women faculty members spend more time teaching than men, while men spend a larger percentage on research than women (Link, Swann, and Bozeman 2008). While some have argued that the allocation of faculty members' time is largely left up to their own discretion (Massy and Zemsky 1994), faculty members are constrained by a variety of forces—institutional structures, disciplinary norms, and cultural expectations—in allocating their time as they desire. A number of studies indicate that the correspondence between actual and preferred weekly work hours is weak for workers in general (Clarkberg and Moen 2001; Jacobs and Gerson 2004; Reynolds 2003; Reynolds and Aletraris 2006). Moreover, insofar as the ability to get one's preferences met is fundamentally an indication of power, those with more status and in more powerful positions in the academy—historically, men—ought to have smaller time allocation mismatches.

In this article, I apply insights from research on gender inequality in paid labor to an examination of faculty members' actual and preferred time allocations to teaching and research, conducting analyses of faculty time use that focus on how gender operates as a social structure “shaping actors' perceptions of their interests and . . . constraining choice” (Risman 2004, 432). Specifically, I add to the research literature on this topic by (1) investigating multiple explanations for differences in time allocations, (2) examining how preferences are themselves constrained, and (3) conducting the first set of analyses on time allocation mismatches among faculty and potential explanations for those mismatches.

## **GENDERED TIME ALLOCATIONS AND TIME ALLOCATION MISMATCHES: POSSIBLE EXPLANATIONS**

Employment-related behavior and outcomes—and any gender-related differences in these—have a multitude of interrelated causes, ranging from workers' preferences and traits to workplace constraints and employers' demands. A preference-based explanation would assert that gender differences in time allocation derive largely from gender-differentiated preferences.

Hakim's preference theory (Hakim 2002) posits that recent advances have given women "genuine choices" for the first time; any residual gender gaps in labor market experiences and outcomes are the result of gender-differentiated preferences, with institutional constraints relevant "only at the margins" (p. 430). Among university faculty, although there is evidence that women have higher motivations for teaching (Bailey 1999) and men are more heavily oriented toward research (Schuster and Finkelstein 2006), strictly preference-based approaches, such as Hakim's theory, fail to acknowledge the extent to which men's and women's preferences, far from being solely a reflection of individual desires, are constrained by structural factors.

A number of studies indicate that cumulative employment experience and job characteristics shape an individual's employment attitudes and work time preferences (Clarkberg and Moen 2001; Kan 2007; Reynolds 2003; Reynolds and Aletraris 2007; Risman, Atkinson, and Blackwelder 1999). Several scholars argue that workplace culture and, specifically, the reward structure of a given occupation or employment context, shape preferences for work time (Clarkberg and Moen 2001; Kan 2007; Reynolds 2003; Reynolds and Aletraris 2007). This suggests that faculty members at institutions that differentially reward research over teaching may report a preference for allocating a greater percentage of their time to research than faculty members at other institutions. To the extent that women are disproportionately likely to be located at less research-intensive institutions, women's higher preferences for teaching and lower preferences for research may be the result of gender-differentiated reactions to workplace climates and reward structures. Similarly, women may prefer to spend more time on teaching because they are more likely to be instructors and lecturers, positions for which commitment to teaching is central to occupational success.

Significant attention has been paid to the ways work-family constraints shape employment attitudes and preferences, particularly, preferences for hours worked. While it is reasonable to assume that those who experience the greatest amount of tension in negotiating work and family ought to prefer to reduce the amount of time they spend in paid labor, the evidence that marital and parental status affect work hour preferences is mixed (Reynolds and Aletraris 2006). While McRae (2003) argues that women's employment preferences are shaped by child care demands, others (Reynolds 2003; Reynolds and Aletraris 2007) find that neither family structures associated with work-family conflict (e.g., single- versus dual-earner parents) nor reported levels of work-family conflict are associated with preferences for fewer hours at work. Nonetheless, family status may affect faculty members' time allocations—and in gender-specific ways. Specifically, women faculty may

prefer to spend a greater percentage of time on teaching because, unlike research commitments, teaching obligations have fixed start and end times that may more easily accommodate children's schedules.

The contours of academic careers, including the use of one's time, are further shaped by educational credentials and occupational positions—namely, degree level, degree field, and academic rank. Women, on average, have credentials and positions associated with greater teaching obligations—they are less likely to have doctorate degrees (Schuster and Finkelstein 2006); are overrepresented in education, health fields, and the humanities (National Center for Education Statistics 2009); and are overrepresented in the teaching-oriented ranks of instructor and lecturer and underrepresented among full professors (Schuster and Finkelstein 2006). Moreover, one's educational credentials and position in the academic hierarchy are also sources of status and power. This suggests that men faculty members, who are more likely to have PhDs and be full professors, ought to have smaller time allocation mismatches than women, who, with less status and power, are less able to get their preferences met.

Perhaps the most immediate constraint on time allocations, particularly teaching, are the demands placed on any given faculty member in the form of course and student loads. Those who teach more classes and/or students likely spend more time on teaching and, given evidence indicating that time spent on teaching takes away from time spent on research (Fox 1992), less time on research. This likely contributes to differences in faculty members' time allocations. Women often have heavier student loads (Hart and Cress 2008) and mentoring and advising responsibilities (Bird, Litt, and Yong 2004). Moreover, there is evidence that students expect a more intensive, time-consuming teaching approach from women faculty members (Sprague and Massoni 2005).

Institutions of higher education may also be compelled to encourage time allocation patterns that reflect their institutional missions (Link, Swann, and Bozeman 2008), thus creating another structural constraint on faculty time allocations. Teaching time is greatest—and increasing most rapidly—at liberal arts institutions, while the emphasis on research is greatest at research universities (Milem, Berger, and Dey 2000). To the extent that women are disproportionately located at teaching-intensive institutions and men at research institutions, institutional location may explain at least a portion of the gap in time allocation. Similarly, faculty members may be compelled to allocate their time in accordance with their perception of the relative importance of teaching and research at their institution over and above the effects of institution type. Previous research indicates that individuals'

allocation of time to work is substantially shaped by the reward structure of employment (Reynolds 2003). If women are less likely to be at institutions that value research over teaching, they would be expected to spend a smaller percentage of time on research and a larger percentage of time on teaching. In this way, gender gaps in time allocation may be partly explained by gender gaps in institutional reward structures. Moreover, if research is valued over teaching, institutions may privilege those who spend a larger percentage of their time on that activity. To the extent that allocating one's time as one desires is a manifestation of that privilege, the reward structure of an institution may contribute to any gender gaps in time allocation mismatches.

An additional aspect of workplace culture important for understanding gender differences in time allocation and time allocation mismatches is the treatment of women faculty members. Number of studies demonstrate that women faculty feel less included, respected, valued as researchers, and likely to be taken seriously than men (Cress and Hart 2009; Fox 2001, 2010). Cress and Hart (2009) found that just more than half (57 percent) of women feel that gender equity exists on their campus; this contrasts sharply with the 90 percent of men who feel similarly. Hart and Cress (2008) further demonstrate how a seemingly unfair allocation of teaching responsibilities affects time expenditures, arguing that men are more likely to teach "vanity courses with small enrollments" (p. 182), leaving women disproportionately responsible for large, core courses. Thus, women and men faculty members may spend different amounts of time on teaching and research because resources, opportunities, and expectations are unfairly distributed. Moreover, women may experience greater time mismatches because of discriminatory actions—whether they be subtle or direct—that leave them less able to align their actual and preferred time allocations.

Finally, just as child care and scheduling concerns may shape women's time allocation preferences, so too might they affect women's actual time allocations. A large body of research indicates that parenthood differentially affects men's and women's employment experiences, including time spent in paid labor (Kaufman and Uhlenberg 2000). At the same time, scholars have argued that faculty members allocate their discretionary time to research (Massy and Zemsky 1994). To the extent that women with children have less discretionary time than men and childless women, they likely allocate a smaller percentage of their workweek to research. Marital and parental status may affect men's time allocations less insofar as men are less likely to be responsible for family care needs.

Assumptions about gender and family obligations are also embedded in the structure of organizations (Acker 1990). A number of scholars have

argued that the scheduling of work and structure of workplaces are built around a model of an “ideal worker” who is relatively unencumbered by responsibilities outside of paid labor, best represented by a man with a wife at home to manage family responsibilities (Williams 2000). There is substantial evidence to suggest that academia is built on a male worker norm. The likelihood of successfully marching through the lockstep life course of a traditional academic career is much greater for those not encumbered by family demands (Mason and Goulden 2002), and women faculty members report being looked down upon as less qualified or committed academics because they have families (Cress and Hart 2009). Applied to time allocation, the institutionalization of the male worker norm suggests that those who fit such an ideal ought to be more likely to get their time allocation preferences met. Women’s lower likelihood of fitting this mold could be a factor in any greater time allocation mismatches they experience.

## METHOD

### The Data

The data were drawn from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF), a nationally representative survey of college and university faculty administered by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) of the U.S. Department of Education. The NSOPF is a multiwave, cross-sectional survey that has been administered four times to date: during the 1987–88, 1992–93, 1998–99, and 2003–4 academic years. The analyses presented here utilize the 1999 wave because it is the most recent wave with complete data on actual and preferred time allocations. For the present analysis, I restricted the sample to full-time faculty members not on sabbatical during the fall 2008 semester; all employment-related information refers to this semester. This resulted in a sample size of 12,510.<sup>1</sup>

### Measures<sup>2</sup>

*Actual time allocations.* The analyses focus on teaching and research because (1) they are the two largest components of the faculty workweek and (2) additional analyses indicate no systematic differences between men and women in time allocations to the other NSOPF-measured components of the faculty workweek (professional growth, administration, service, and consulting).<sup>3</sup>

- *Percentage of time spent on teaching:* The NSOPF instructs respondents to report the percentage of their workweek they spend in the classroom, preparing for class, and advising and mentoring undergraduate and graduate students.
- *Percentage of time spent on research:* The NSOPF defines research as preparing articles or books, attending or preparing for conferences or speeches, performing or exhibiting fine or applied arts, seeking funding, and reviewing proposals.

*Time allocation preferences.* To measure time allocation preferences, I use faculty members' direct reports of the percentage of their workweeks they would prefer to allocate to instructional activities and research (defined above).

*Time allocation mismatches.* These measures—one each for teaching and research—reflect the mismatch between respondents' actual and preferred time allocations, created by subtracting actual from preferred time allocations. A positive mismatch indicates that a faculty member would prefer to spend more time on that activity than he or she currently does; a negative mismatch indicates that a faculty member would prefer to spend less time on that activity.<sup>4</sup>

*Sex.* Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were male or female. This is a dummy variable with female coded 1 and male coded 0. In my discussion of the results, I use the terms *sex*, *male*, and *female* since they reflect responses to this survey measure. In the conclusion, I use the term *gender* when arguing that distinctions between male and female respondents reflect the operation of gender at the individual, interactional, and institutional levels.

#### *Controls.*

- *Highest degree:* This is a dummy variable coded 1 if the respondents' highest degree is the highest terminal degree in his or her field (PhD, MD, JD, etc.) and 0 otherwise.
- *Rank:* Respondents are classified as being a (1) full professor, (2) associate professor, (3) assistant professor, (4) instructor or lecturer, or (5) another rank or at an institution with no ranking system.
- *Discipline:* Respondents are classified as having one of the following primary disciplines: humanities (reference), biological sciences, physical sciences, medicine, nursing, other health fields, architecture/engineering, business, computer science/math, social science, education, vocational fields, and other fields (see Jacobs and Winslow 2004).

- *Institution type*: Respondents are classified as being at one of the following types of institutions (Carnegie classification; categories with two tiers combined): research, doctoral, comprehensive, liberal arts, two year, or other (theological seminaries, medical and other health profession schools, business schools, schools of engineering and technology, and law schools).
- *Value of research over teaching at institution*: This is a dummy variable coded 1 for agreement (agree or strongly agree) and 0 for disagreement (disagree or strongly disagree) with the statement, "At this institution, research is rewarded more than teaching" (NCES 1999, 25).
- *Number of classes*: This measure reflects the total number of classes the respondent taught in fall 1998 (individualized instruction and labs excluded).
- *Average class size*: This is a NSOPF-created variable measuring the average number of students in each of a respondent's classes.
- *Number of students receiving individual instruction*: This is the number of students in independent studies or other one-on-one instruction situations.
- *Number of student committees*: This is a measure of the number of undergraduate and graduate thesis, dissertation, or exam committees on which the respondent served during fall 1998.
- *Discrimination*: While the NSOPF does not contain a direct measure of personally experienced discrimination, it does contain a measure of perceptions of the treatment of women at one's institution. This is included as a dichotomous measure coded 1 for disagreement (disagree or strongly disagree) and 0 for agreement (agree or strongly agree) with the statement, "Female faculty members are treated fairly at this institution" (NCES 1999, 25).
- *Family status*: The NSOPF asks directly about marital status but not parental status. However, the survey does ask respondents to indicate how many dependents they have (a dependent is defined as someone who gets at least half of his or her financial support from the respondent). I utilize a created variable in which respondents are categorized as being (1) married with dependents, (2) married without dependents, (3) single without dependents, or (4) single with dependents. Given literature suggesting that the ideal worker is exemplified by a married person with someone at home managing family responsibilities, those who are married with dependents are utilized as the reference group in the analyses.

## Analysis Plan

The analyses are presented as a series of regression models predicting (1) preferred time allocations, (2) actual time allocations, and (3) time allocation mismatches (see Reynolds and Aletraris 2007). The first set of models allows for an examination of how preferences are constrained, possibly in gender-specific ways. The second set considers a series of possible

explanations for faculty members' actual time allocations and differences in time allocations. The third set of models, examining mismatches, is presented alongside parallel analyses of actual and preferred time allocations, allowing one to determine whether a given factor affects the gap between preferred and actual time allocations because it affects preferred time allocations, actual time allocations, or both (see Reynolds and Aletraris 2007 for an extended discussion of this methodological approach). In discussing the results, I focus on differences between men and women and the ability of other measures in the models to explain these gaps, highlighting the relationship between other measures and the dependent variable as warranted. In addition, I present pooled analyses using sex of the respondent as a covariate. Where relevant, I discuss the results of analyses (not presented) separated by sex. All regression analyses are adjusted for potential clustering, given that the 12,510 respondents are located at 813 institutions.

## RESULTS

Table 1 focuses on faculty members' preferred percentage time allocations. As will be the case in all tables, panel A presents the results for teaching while panel B presents the results for research. The first model indicates that females faculty members prefer to spend approximately two-and-one-half percent of their workweek more on teaching than males. Descriptive analyses indicate that female faculty members would prefer to spend 52 percent of their workweek on teaching, while male faculty members would prefer to spend just more than 48.6 percent of their workweek on teaching.<sup>5</sup> The gap in teaching time preferences is rendered nonsignificant in the second model with the inclusion of controls. Stepwise inclusion of the other covariates (not shown) indicates that this is driven by female faculty members' lower likelihood of having a doctorate degree. Those with a doctorate, a category in which female faculty are underrepresented, have lower teaching time preferences than do those without a doctorate degree.

The effects of other covariates on the sex gap in teaching preferences essentially offset one another. Women are more likely to be instructors and lecturers and to be at institutions other than research institutions, both of which, as predicted, are associated with greater teaching preferences. Contrary to the expectation that child care demands may raise preferences for teaching among those (particularly, female faculty) with children those without dependents, whether single or married, prefer to spend a greater percentage of their time on teaching than those who are married with

**TABLE 1: Ordinary Least Squares Regression of Preferred Percentage Time Allocations to Teaching and Research**

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Panel A: Teaching</i>		<i>Panel B: Research</i>	
	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>
Female	2.6164**	0.1682	-5.3231**	-0.9144*
Highest degree		-2.9366**		10.2840**
Rank				
Full		—		—
Associate		0.9789		0.2151
Assistant		0.6855		3.4239**
Instructor/lecturer		4.4619**		-2.3308**
Other rank/No ranking system		-8.9771**		0.6958
Field				
Humanities		—		—
Biological sciences		-2.3279*		9.2278**
Physical sciences		2.5225*		1.1850
Medicine		-11.1122**		-8.6163**
Nursing		2.5280*		-4.5395**
Other health fields		-4.5759**		-2.9415**
Architecture/Engineering		2.8364**		1.6857
Business		2.2931*		-2.4865**
Computer science/Math		5.1208**		-1.8334**
Social science		-1.2188		-0.5823
Education		0.9002		-5.2087**
Vocational fields		3.1189		-2.3207*
Other		-2.7238**		-2.9108**
Institution type				
Research		—		—
Doctoral		6.7111**		-7.1583**
Comprehensive		12.3944**		-13.8566**
Liberal arts		16.7755**		-15.9977**
Two year		21.4674**		-9.4673**
Other		3.3804*		-8.2736**
Research valued over teaching		-0.2682		1.0080
Teaching commitments				
No. of classes		1.2583**		
Average class size		0.1502**		
No. independent students		0.0456**		
No. of student committees		0.2237**		
Women treated unfairly		-1.1512*		0.1236
Family status				
Married with dependents		—		—
Married without dependents		2.3890**		-0.8433*
Single without dependents		1.1583*		-0.1098
Single with dependents		0.5356		-0.1992

SOURCE: 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (National Center for Education Statistics 1999).

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

dependents. Female faculty members are more likely than male faculty members not to have dependents. At the same time, female faculty are more likely to perceive that their institutions value research over teaching and/or treat women unfairly, both of which are associated with lower teaching preferences. Additional analyses indicate that the treatment of women at one's institution interacts with sex such that female—but not male—respondents have lower preferences for teaching when they are at institutions they perceive as treating women unfairly.

The first model of panel B indicates that women prefer to spend just more than five percent less of their workweek on research than do men; specifically, male faculty members prefer to allocate just less than one-quarter of their workweek to research, while female faculty members prefer to spend just less than one-fifth of their workweek engaged in research. Controlling for all other measures in the second model, the sex gap is reduced to less than one percent. Stepwise models not presented indicate that a substantial portion of the sex gap in research time preferences can be explained by female faculty members' lower likelihood of having a doctorate degree (insofar as those with doctorate degrees prefer to spend a greater percentage of their workweek on research than do those without doctorates). Rank explains little of the sex gap in research time preferences because female faculty members are more likely than male faculty members to be both assistant professors and instructors or lecturers; the former is associated with greater research preferences, while the latter is associated with a smaller preferred percentage time allocation to research. Institutional context also plays a role—female faculty are less likely to be located at research institutions or at institutions that value research over teaching, both of which are associated greater preferences for research.

Table 2 shifts the focus to actual time allocations to teaching (panel A) and research (panel B). The first model of panel A indicates that female faculty members spend about four percent more of their workweek on teaching than male faculty; while female faculty members spend approximately 56 percent of their workweek (or approximately 29 hours per week) on teaching, male faculty members spend less than 52 percent of their workweek on instructional activities (or just less than 28 hours per week). The second model of panel A includes a control for respondents' preferred percentage of teaching time, which is positively associated with actual teaching time. Differences in preferences—which, recall from Table 1, are themselves constrained—account for approximately 50 percent of the sex gap in time allocated to teaching. Yet given equal preferences, female faculty allocate approximately two percent more of their workweek to teaching than male faculty.

**TABLE 2: Ordinary Least Squares Regression of Actual Percentage of Time Spent on Teaching and Research**

Variable	Panel A: Teaching			Panel B: Research		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Female	4.4215**	2.0850**	1.7642**	-5.4248**	-1.3166**	-0.9439**
Preferred teaching %		0.8930**	0.8002**			
Preferred research %					0.7718**	0.7312**
Highest degree Rank			1.6832**			-0.2773
Rank						
Full			—			—
Associate			1.6467**			-0.3916
Assistant			3.6284**			0.2368
Instructor/lecturer			3.8001**			0.1786
Other rank/No ranking system			-3.8409**			3.7739**
Field						
Humanities			—			—
Biological sciences			-1.1062			4.0112**
Physical sciences			0.8824			1.2456*
Medicine			-5.5509**			-0.5731
Nursing			0.3990			0.0794
Other health fields			-2.4869**			1.3123*
Architecture/Engineering			-0.2538			1.3228*
Business			-1.2085			1.1969**
Computer science/Math			0.1015			0.9695*
Social science			-1.1101*			-0.5088
Education			-3.2126**			0.6157
Vocational fields			-1.7460			1.2336*
Other			-4.0035**			1.5256**

(continued)

**TABLE 2: (continued)**

Variable	Panel A: Teaching			Panel B: Research		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Institution type						
Research			—			—
Doctoral			1.7303**			-3.0986**
Comprehensive			3.9832**			-4.6844**
Liberal arts			4.8287**			-5.4743**
Two year			3.5982**			-4.1624**
Other			0.6105			-2.0755**
Research valued over teaching			-1.2962**			0.4378
Teaching commitments						
No. of classes			0.8832**			
Average class size			0.0813**			
No. independent students			0.0147*			
No. of student committees			0.1553**			
Women treated unfairly			0.1901			-0.5936*
Family status						
Married with dependents			—			—
Married without dependents			0.706*			-0.3390
Single without dependents			0.5815			0.1548
Single with dependents			0.1974			-0.7604

SOURCE: 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (National Center for Education Statistics 1999).

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

The inclusion of controls in the third model of panel A reduces the sex gap in teaching time allocation further. This is driven by female faculty members' lower likelihood of having a doctorate degree as well as their concentration in more teaching-intensive ranks and at more teaching-intensive institutions. Perceiving that one's institution values research over teaching is, as predicted, negatively associated with actual teaching time allocations, although additional analyses indicate that this effect is concentrated among male faculty. Those who are married without dependents spend a greater percentage of their workweek on teaching than do those who are married with dependents, offering partial support for the effect of fitting the ideal-worker norm. Additional analyses indicate that this relationship is concentrated among male faculty. Controlling for preferences, educational attributes, rank, and institutionalized constraints, a sex gap of nearly two percent remains. In the context of weekly work hours, controlling for all measures in the model, female faculty spend approximately an additional hour more per week on teaching than do male faculty.

The three models of panel B present similar analyses of the percentage of time faculty members report actually devoting to research. The first model indicates that female faculty spend more than five percent less of their workweek on research than do male faculty. Descriptive analyses indicate that female faculty members spend approximately 13 percent of their workweek (approximately seven hours) on research, while male faculty members spend approximately 18 percent of their workweek (approximately 10 hours) engaged in research. This weekly three-hour gap accumulates to approximately 45 hours in a 15-week academic semester. The second model indicates that preferences explain approximately three-quarters of the sex gap in the percentage of time allocated to research. Yet controlling for their smaller preferred percentage of research time, which, recall from Table 1, is itself shaped by a multitude of factors, female faculty members spend about one percent less of their workweek on research than do male faculty members (roughly one half hour).

The sex gap in time allocated to research is further reduced by the inclusion of controls in the third model. This is largely due to female faculty members' disproportionate concentration in less research-intensive disciplines and institution types. Unlike the percentage of time allocated to teaching, research time allocations are not significantly associated with the perception that one's institution values research over teaching, suggesting that institutional climate discourages teaching time rather than increasing research time allocations. While teaching time allocations were not affected by the perceived treatment of women, faculty members who perceive that

their institutions treat women unfairly spend a smaller percentage of time on research than do those who perceive that their institution treats women fairly. Although not testable here, it is possible that a reduced ability to spend time on research is a manifestation of an unfair climate.

Family status is not significantly associated with research time allocations in the pooled sample. Additional analyses indicate that for male faculty, those who are married without dependents spend a smaller percentage of time on research than those who are married with dependents. For female faculty, those who are single with dependents spend a smaller percentage of time on research than those who are married with dependents. Controlling for all measures in the model, female faculty members spend a smaller percentage of their time on research than do their male colleagues. More specifically, there is a sex gap in research time allocations of just less than one percent, or the equivalent of just less than one half hour per week less on research for a female faculty member compared to an otherwise identical male.

Table 3 examines time allocation mismatches. For each set of analyses, I present four models—one for preferences (identical to the model presented in Table 1), one for actual time allocations (similar to the final model in Table 2, but without a measure of preferences), and two for the mismatch between preferred and actual time allocations (one including just sex and the other including all covariates). I focus on the mismatch model, referring to the other two models for comparative purposes. Given how the mismatch measure is calculated, a negative value indicates wishing to spend less time on teaching or research than one currently does, while a positive value indicates wishing to spend more time than one currently does.

The first allocation mismatch model in panel A indicates that, compared to male faculty, female faculty would prefer to spend nearly two percent less of their workweek on teaching than they currently do. The inclusion of all other covariates in the second mismatch model has little effect on the sex gap in teaching time allocation mismatches. Stepwise inclusion of all measures in the model indicate that while some of female faculty member's attributes (namely, their lower likelihood of having a doctorate degree) exacerbate the relationship between sex and teaching time mismatches, they have some attributes (e.g., they are more likely to be assistant professors and instructors) and face some constraints on their time (e.g., they teach more classes and provide more students with individualized instruction) that attenuate the relationship between sex and teaching time mismatches. A sex gap in teaching time mismatches remains—compared to male faculty members, female faculty members wish to spend 1.7 percent less of their workweek (or approximately one hour less per week) on teaching than they

TABLE 3: Ordinary Least Squares Regression of Time Allocation Mismatches

Variable	Panel A: Teaching				Panel B: Research			
	Allocation Mismatch				Allocation Mismatch			
	Preferred	Actual	Model 1	Model 2	Preferred	Actual	Model 1	Model 2
Female	0.1682	1.8988**	-1.8052**	-1.7306**	-0.9144*	-1.6125**	0.1017	0.6981**
Highest degree Rank	-2.9366**	-0.6674		-2.2692**	10.2840**	7.2427**		3.0413**
Full	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Associate	0.9789	2.4300**		-1.4511**	0.2151	-0.2343		0.4494
Assistant	0.6855	4.1769**		-3.4914**	3.4239**	2.7405**		0.6834
Instructor/lecturer	4.4619**	7.3703**		-2.9084**	-2.3308**	-1.5258**		-0.8050*
Other rank/No ranking system	-8.9771**	-11.0239**		2.0469**	0.6958	4.2826**		-3.5869**
Field								
Humanities	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Biological sciences	-2.3279*	-2.9689**		0.6410	9.2278**	10.7589**		-1.5311**
Physical sciences	2.5225*	2.9007*		-0.3783	1.1850	2.1121*		-0.9271
Medicine	-11.1122**	-14.4421**		3.3302**	-8.6163**	-6.8737**		-1.7427**
Nursing	2.5280*	2.4218*		0.1062	-4.5395**	-3.2401**		-1.2994*
Other health fields	-4.5759**	-6.1484**		1.5724	-2.9415**	-0.8387		-2.1029**
Architecture/Engineering	2.8364**	2.0158		0.8206	1.6857	0.0901		-1.7758**
Business	2.2931*	0.6263		1.6668*	-2.4865**	-0.6213		-1.8652**
Computer science/Math	5.1208**	4.1989**		0.9219	-1.8334**	-0.3711		-1.4623**
Social science	-1.2188	-2.0853**		0.8665	-0.5823	-0.9346		0.3523
Education	0.9002	-2.4923*		3.3929**	-5.2087**	-3.1931**		-2.0156**
Vocational fields	3.1189	0.7496		2.3693*	-2.3207*	-0.4634		-1.8573*
Other	-2.7238**	-6.1829**		3.4591**	-2.9108**	-0.6028		-2.3079**

(continued)

**TABLE 3: (continued)**

Variable	Panel A: Teaching				Panel B: Research			
	Allocation Mismatch		Allocation Mismatch		Allocation Mismatch		Allocation Mismatch	
	Preferred	Actual	Model 1	Model 2	Preferred	Actual	Model 1	Model 2
Institution type								
Research	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Doctoral	6.7111**	7.1002**	-0.3891	-7.1583	-8.3330**	1.1747*	—	—
Comprehensive	12.3944**	13.9006**	-1.5062**	-13.8566**	-14.8169**	0.9603**	—	—
Liberal arts	16.7755**	18.2517**	-1.4762*	-15.9977**	-17.1723**	1.1746*	—	—
Two year	21.4674**	20.7754**	0.6920	-9.4673**	-17.1352**	-0.6057	—	—
Other	3.3804*	3.3153	0.0651	-8.2736**	-8.1255**	-0.1481	—	—
Research valued over teaching	-0.2682	-1.5108**	1.2426**	1.0080	1.1750**	-0.1669	—	—
Teaching commitments								
No. of classes	1.2583**	1.8901**	-0.6318**	—	—	—	—	—
Average class size	0.1502**	0.2015**	-0.0513**	—	—	—	—	—
No. independent students	0.0456**	0.0512**	-0.0056	—	—	—	—	—
No. of student committees	0.2237**	0.3343**	-0.1106*	—	—	—	—	—
Women treated unfairly	-1.1512*	-0.7310	-0.4202	0.1236	-0.4666	0.6402*	—	—
Family status								
Married with dependents	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Married without dependents	2.3890**	2.6177**	-0.2287	-0.8433*	-0.9556*	0.1123	—	—
Single without dependents	1.1583*	1.5083*	-0.3500	-0.1098	0.0745	-0.1843	—	—
Single with dependents	0.5356	1.1905	-0.6549	-0.1992	-0.9061	0.7069	—	—

SOURCE: 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (National Center for Education Statistics 1999).

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

currently do. This stems largely from the sex gap in actual time allocations. In other words, while female and male faculty members have similar teaching time allocation preferences (net of controls), female faculty spend more time on research than do their male counterparts, thus producing a greater negative mismatch for female faculty than for male faculty.

The first mismatch model in panel B indicates no significant sex difference in research time allocation mismatches. The second model of panel B indicates that, net of controls, female faculty members, more so than males, would prefer to be allocating more of their time to research than they actually are. Stepwise inclusion of all measures in the model (analyses not shown), indicate that the sex gap in research time allocation mismatches stems largely from differences in education level and rank. Looking across all three models of the panel, we see that female faculty members have a greater mismatch because although they prefer to allocate just less than one percent less of their weekly work time to research, they actually allocate approximately 1.5 percent less of their weekly work time to research than male faculty. In other words, the magnitude of the sex gap in actual time allocations is larger than the magnitude of the sex gap in preferences, thus producing a sex-differentiated mismatch disadvantaging female faculty.

Also of note, those who perceive that their institutions treat women unfairly have a larger positive time allocation mismatch than those who perceive their institutions to be fair (a relationship that does not differ by sex), suggesting that a climate of unfairness translates into a greater difficulty in getting one's preferences met. Additional analyses also indicate that female faculty members who are single with dependents have a significantly greater positive research time allocation mismatch than do female faculty members who are married with dependents, indicating that those who do not fit the ideal-worker norm—and, arguably, those who deviate the most from it—are less able to get their preferences for research time met.

## CONCLUSION

The results offer support for the contention that gender is embedded in the structure of academic careers. They also add to our understanding of gender inequality in academia by identifying and attempting to explain differential time allocation preferences, behaviors, and mismatches. Several findings stand out. First, women faculty report preferring to spend a larger percentage of their workweek on teaching and a smaller percentage on research, although these preferences are themselves shaped by gendered

opportunities. Women's greater preferences for teaching time allocation can be explained by their lower likelihood of having a doctoral degree—there is no evidence for gender-differentiated teaching preferences beyond their dependence on educational credentials. Moreover, a sizeable portion of the gender gap in research time allocation preferences can be explained by educational credentials and institutional features. While human capital theorists would argue that gender-differentiated teaching and research preferences largely or completely reflect the choice to differentially invest in one's credentials, one must consider how the "choice" to invest in one's education is itself constrained. Given that the data utilized here represent a cross-section of American faculty in the late 1990s, the legacy of men's historic advantage in doctorate degree receipt is evident. Recent data indicating that women have now surpassed men in the receipt of doctoral degrees (Jaschik 2010) suggest that gender gaps in time allocation preferences ought to be narrower among current and future academic faculty.

The results also indicate that research and teaching time allocation preferences are shaped by the features of the institutions in which men and women are located. This suggests that gender-differentiated preferences may in part reflect the constraints women face in obtaining positions comparable to those of men. While exploring the sources of gender gaps in education and institutional location is beyond the scope of this article, research on preferences for work time demonstrates that individuals accommodate their preferences to their situations rather than vice versa (Reynolds and Aletraris 2006, 2007). Women faculty members may prefer to spend a larger percentage of time on teaching and a smaller percentage of time on research not because this is what they prefer under ideal circumstances but because, as a result of a legacy of gender inequality in educational and occupational opportunities, these are the options they perceive as realistic.

Second, women faculty devote a larger percentage of their weekly working time to teaching and a smaller percentage to research than men. A sizeable portion of the gap in teaching and research time allocations can be explained by gender-differentiated (and constrained) preferences, women's lower likelihood of having a doctorate degree, their overrepresentation in teaching-intensive ranks and institution types, and their underrepresentation in research-intensive ranks and institution types. The perception that one's institution values research over teaching is associated with lower teaching time allocations for men but is not significantly related to research time allocations, suggesting that such an institutional climate discourages teaching time rather than increases research time allocations. Family status affects teaching and research time allocations and in gender-specific ways. For men,

those who are married without dependents spend a smaller percentage of time on research than do those who are married with dependents, offering some support for the claim that those who fit the male ideal-worker norm are advantaged in academia (insofar as research is a more highly regarded activity). For women, those who are single with dependents spend a smaller percentage of time on research than do those who are married with dependents, offering support for the advantages accruing to those who fit the ideal-worker norm and suggesting that women in arguably the most demanding family context—single mothers with children—reduce the time they allocate to what is likely the most discretionary area of faculty time allocation, research.

Finally, women are more likely than men to be teaching more than they prefer and researching less, gaps that cannot be fully explained by educational, institutional, and family status attributes. This result offers support for the contention that higher-status groups, in this case, men, are seen by administrators as more deserving of rewards (Krefting 2003), indexed here by the ability to get one's preferences met. Moreover, insofar as power can be defined as the ability to get one's preferences met, the gender gap in time allocation mismatches represents a previously undocumented example of men's continued greater power in the academy. It is important to underscore that men have a time allocation advantage over and above the effect of their having other, measureable attributes associated with status (e.g., rank, institutional affiliation, etc.).

Taken together, the analyses presented here indicate substantial gaps in the use of faculty members' time, gaps that cannot be explained by measureable attributes included in the models. What might explain these gaps? The results are consistent with research and theory on the impact of gender status beliefs in shaping behaviors, expectations, and perceptions of the rewards that we and others deserve (Ridgeway 1997). This perspective would argue that despite growing equality in men's and women's representation in academia, the interactional processes by which gender status beliefs produce inequality result in gender differences in faculty members' actual and preferred time allocations and time allocation mismatches.

Research indicates that preferences (including career aspirations) are shaped by individuals' assessments of their likely success in a given activity; these attributions for success are themselves shaped by cultural ideologies about gender (Correll 2004). It may be that men prefer to spend a larger percentage of their time on research because gender status beliefs dictating their greater competence (particularly at "masculine" tasks) shape their individual time allocation preferences. The results are also consistent with the argument that gender status beliefs influence behavior over and above their effect on preferences because individuals adjust their activities in light of the gendered expectations others have of them (Correll 2001). Women's

larger actual time allocations to teaching, for example, suggest that they may be influenced by students' expectations of a more time-intensive teaching approach from their women professors (Sprague and Massoni 2005). At the same time, the results are consistent with research indicating that competence-related gender status expectations raise one's definition of the work required to be successful at tasks deemed appropriate for one's gender (Eccles 1994). Specifically, gender-differentiated time allocations may be attributed to a higher internalized teaching bar for women and a higher internalized research bar for men.

Although these results offer compelling evidence for persistent gender inequality in academia, they are limited in at least two ways. First, the data are cross-sectional, so we cannot know whether individuals accommodate their preferences to their behavior over time, as some research has suggested (Reynolds and Aletraris 2007). In addition, the data were gathered more than a decade ago, before institutions of higher education were profoundly affected by the recent economic downturn. At many institutions, this has meant increased student and/or course loads, which may have increased faculty members' actual time allocations to teaching and, given evidence that the two obligations are competing (Fox 1992), decreased time on research. If this has happened with little change in preferences, time allocation mismatches have likely grown as well.

What this means for gender inequality is an empirical question. On one hand, if increased teaching demands have been relatively equally distributed, overall time allocations may have shifted, but any gender gaps ought to have remained consistent. On the other hand, gender gaps may have grown even if increased teaching obligations are distributed equally insofar as men's general reluctance in moving into female-dominated activities (England 2010) suggests they may be slow to increase their teaching time significantly (even when faced with growing teaching obligations). Furthermore, if increased teaching demands are disproportionately imposed on those already concentrating more on teaching, the current economic downturn may further disadvantage women faculty members. Although recent data (National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics 2009) indicate few differences in men's and women's teaching and research time, suggesting that time allocation gaps have narrowed, the analyses focused on only handful of fields at research institutions. Examining the contours of faculty time use—and how they may be gendered—during periods of institutional transformation is a ripe area for future research.

How and why do these time allocation differences matter? Previous research indicates that those with heavier teaching obligations, particularly women, report more stress (Hart and Cress 2008), while those who spend

a greater percentage of their time on research report higher workload satisfaction (Jacobs and Winslow 2004). Taken together, these findings suggest that women faculty may be more stressed and less satisfied than men. The time allocation differences presented here also have implications for research productivity and career success. The percentage of time one spends on research is positively associated with research productivity, while the percentage of time spent on teaching is negatively related to research productivity (Jacobs and Winslow 2004). Since research time is linked to research productivity (Jacobs and Winslow 2004) and research productivity remains a key component in employment reviews (Lewis 2004), gender differences in research time allocations may contribute to gender-differentiated patterns of tenure and promotion.

At the same time, women may be more likely than men to exit academia. Reynolds and Aletraris (2006) find that individuals are more likely to resolve work hour mismatches by changing employers than by making adjustments while maintaining employment continuity. Moreover, Boheim and Taylor (2004) find that women are more likely than men to exit an employment situation when their preferences and actual behavior do not match—a position in which women are disproportionately likely to find themselves. If they choose to leave any given position, the data presented here, in combination with previous research, suggest that women faculty may be less marketable than their male colleagues. Since women bear a disproportionate responsibility for labor that is institution specific (e.g., institutional housekeeping, mentoring individual students), their investments are less likely to be portable across institutions. This stands in stark contrast to men, whose investments in research make them more highly desirable candidates should they choose to leave their own institutions. Finally, the results have implications for the ability of American educational institutions to attract young, newly minted women PhDs to academic employment. Faced with institutionalized expectations for their behavior and the prospect of disproportionately constrained time allocations, these women may pursue employment outside academia (Mason, Goulden, and Frasch 2009).

## NOTES

1. Because of restricted-access data limitations, the sample size reported here is rounded to the nearest 10.
2. National Center for Education Statistics (1999).
3. A limitation of the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty for faculty time-use studies is the manner in which it categorizes service and administration. For

example, administrative activities are described as including “departmental or institution-wide meetings or committee work,” which many might well consider to be service. This may account for the lack of difference between men’s and women’s time spent in service activities.

4. Analyses not shown indicate that 43.9 percent of faculty members (41.2 percent of males and 48.5 percent of females) spend a greater percentage of their time on teaching than they would prefer, 32.5 percent (34.7 percent of males and 28.8 percent of females) allocate exactly the percentage of time to teaching that they prefer, while 23.6 percent (24.1 percent of males and 22.7 percent of females) teach less than they would prefer. More than half (54.5 percent; 54.2 percent of males and 54.9 percent of females) spend a smaller percentage of their time than they would prefer on research, 35.8 percent (36.2 percent of males and 35.0 percent of females) allocate their research time as they prefer, and 9.8 percent (9.6 percent of males and 10.1 percent of females) spend a greater percentage of time on research than they would prefer.

5. The slight difference between descriptive and multivariate analyses is attributable to the different estimation techniques employed.

## REFERENCES

- Acker, Joan. 1990. Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society* 4 (2): 139-58.
- Bailey, Jeffrey G. 1999. Academics’ motivation and self-efficacy for teaching and research. *Higher Education Research and Development* 18 (3): 343-59.
- Bird, Sharon, Jacquelyn Litt, and Wang Yong. 2004. Creating status of women reports: Institutional housekeeping as “women’s work.” *NWSA Journal* 16 (1): 194-206.
- Boheim, Rene, and Mark P. Taylor. 2004. Actual and preferred working hours. *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 42 (1): 149-66.
- Clarkberg, Marin, and Phyllis Moen. 2001. Understanding the time-squeeze: Married couples’ preferred and actual work-hour strategies. *American Behavioral Scientist* 44 (7): 1115-36.
- Correll, Shelley J. 2001. Gender and the career choice process: The role of biased self-assessments. *American Journal of Sociology* 106 (6): 1691-1730.
- Correll, Shelley J. 2004. Constraints into preferences: Gender, status, and emerging career aspirations. *American Sociological Review* 69 (1): 93-113.
- Cress, Christine M., and Jeni Hart. 2009. Playing soccer on the football field: The persistence of gender inequities for women faculty. *Equity and Excellence in Education* 42 (4): 473-88.
- Eccles, Jacquelynne S. 1994. Understanding women’s educational and occupational choices. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 18 (4): 585-609.
- England, Paula. 2010. The gender revolution: Uneven and stalled. *Gender & Society* 24 (2): 149-66.
- Fox, Mary Frank. 1992. Research, teaching, and publication productivity: Mutuality versus competition in academia. *Sociology of Education* 65 (4): 293-305.

- Fox, Mary Frank. 2001. Women, science, and academia: Graduate education and careers. *Gender & Society* 15 (5): 654-66.
- Fox, Mary Frank. 2010. Women and men faculty in academic science and engineering: Social-organizational indicators and implications. *American Behavioral Scientist* 53 (7): 997-1012.
- Hakim, Catherine. 2002. Lifestyle preferences as determinants of women's differential labor market careers. *Work and Occupations* 29 (4): 428-59.
- Hart, Jennifer L., and Christine M. Cress. 2008. Are women faculty just "worrywarts?" Accounting for gender differences in self-reported stress. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* 17 (1/2): 175-93.
- Jacobs, Jerry A., and Kathleen Gerson. 2004. *The time divide*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jacobs, Jerry A., and Sarah Winslow. 2004. Overworked faculty: Job stresses and family demands. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 596 (November): 104-29.
- Jaschik, Scott. 2010. Women lead in doctorates. *Inside Higher Ed*. <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/09/14/doctorates> (accessed September 15, 2010).
- Kan, Man Yee. 2007. Work orientation and wives' employment careers: An evaluation of Hakim's preference theory. *Work and Occupations* 34 (4): 430-62.
- Kaufman, Gayle, and Peter Uhlenberg. 2000. The influence of parenthood on the work effort of married men and women. *Social Forces* 78 (3): 931-49.
- Krefting, Linda A. 2003. Intertwined discourses of merit and gender: Evidence from academic employment in the USA. *Gender, Work and Organization* 10(2): 260-78.
- Link, Albert N., Christopher A. Swann, and Barry Bozeman. 2008. A time allocation study of university faculty. *Economics of Education Review* 27 (4): 363-74.
- Lewis, Philip. 2004. The publishing crisis and tenure criteria: An issue for research universities? *Profession* 2004: 14-24.
- Mason, Mary Ann, and Marc Goulden. 2002. Do babies matter? *Academe* 88 (6): 21-27.
- Mason, Mary Ann, Marc Goulden, and Karie Frasch. 2009. Why graduate students reject the fast track. *Academe* 95(1): 11-16.
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology. 1991. A study on the status of women faculty in science at MIT. <http://web.mit.edu/fnl/women/women.pdf> (accessed May 5, 2010).
- Massy, William F., and Robert Zemsky. 1994. Faculty discretionary time: Departments and the "academic ratchet." *Journal of Higher Education* 65 (1): 1-22.
- McRae, Susan. 2003. Constraints and choices in mothers' employment careers: A consideration of Hakim's preference theory. *British Journal of Sociology* 54 (3): 317-38.
- Milem, Jeffrey F., Joseph B. Berger, and Eric L. Dey. 2000. Faculty time allocation: A study of change over twenty years. *Journal of Higher Education* 71 (4): 454-75.

- National Center for Education Statistics. 1999. 1999 National Study of Post-secondary Faculty: Faculty questionnaire. U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Washington, DC.
- National Center for Education Statistics. 2009. Digest of education statistics: 2009. <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d09/> (accessed May 5, 2010).
- National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics. 2009. Doctorate recipients from U.S. universities: Summary Report 2007-08. Special Report NSF 10-309. <http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/nsf10309/> (accessed August 27, 2010).
- Reynolds, Jeremy. 2003. You can't always get the hours you want: Mismatches between actual and preferred work hours in the U.S. *Social Forces* 81 (4): 1171-99.
- Reynolds, Jeremy, and Lydia Aletraris. 2006. Pursuing preferences: The creation and resolution of work hour mismatches. *American Sociological Review* 71:618-38.
- Reynolds, Jeremy, and Lydia Aletraris. 2007. For love or money? Extrinsic rewards, intrinsic rewards, work-life issues, and hour mismatches. *Research in the Sociology of Work* 17:285-311.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 1997. Interaction and the conservation of gender inequality: Considering employment. *American Sociological Review* 62 (2): 218-35.
- Risman, Barbara J. 2004. Gender as a social structure: Theory wrestling with activism. *Gender & Society* 18 (4): 429-50.
- Risman, Barbara J., Maxine P. Atkinson, and Stephen P. Blackwelder. 1999. Understanding the juggling act: Gendered preferences and social structural constraints. *Sociological Forum* 14 (2): 319-44.
- Schuster, Jack H., and Martin J. Finkelstein. 2006. *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sprague, Joey, and Kelley Massoni. 2005. Student evaluations and gendered expectations: What we can't count can hurt us. *Sex Roles* 53 (11/12): 779-93.
- Survey of Earned Doctorates. 2007. Doctorate recipients from United States universities: Selected tables 2007. [http://www.norc.org/NR/rdonlyres/2D5FD7C8-4AE0-4932-B777-0BC8EA7965EF/0/2007\\_selectedtabs.pdf](http://www.norc.org/NR/rdonlyres/2D5FD7C8-4AE0-4932-B777-0BC8EA7965EF/0/2007_selectedtabs.pdf) (accessed March 6, 2009).
- Williams, Joan. 2000. *Unbending gender: Why family and work conflict and what to do about it*. New York: Oxford University Press.

*Sarah Winslow is an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Clemson University. Her research focuses on gender, paid labor, and family and has been published in Journal of Marriage and Family; Journal of Family Issue; Community, Work, and Family; and Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.*