

Exploring the Gendered Condition of Faculty Development

Jaclyn Rivard

University of Minnesota

Andrea Beach

Western Michigan University

Ann Austin

Michigan State University

Mary Deane Sorcinelli

University of Massachusetts-Amherst

Abstract

The purpose of this poster presentation is to explore the gender make-up of faculty developers, and the possible meanings and implications of the field's condition. Data were collected from professional faculty developers, using an online survey, and analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlations, and Chi-square statistics, as appropriate. Preliminary results show that the field is indeed gendered, and that there are additional gender-based imbalances within the field.

Exploring the composition of faculty development can lead to broader understanding, and innovation within the field.

Faculty development has grown in leaps and bounds over the last fifty years. From its humble beginnings mostly focused on sabbaticals, the field of faculty development has evolved within and alongside higher education. Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, and Beach (2006) describe five ages in the history of the field; these include the Age of the Scholar (1950s-60s), the Age of the Teacher (1970s), the Age of the Developer (1980s), the Age of the Learner (1990s), and the Age of the Network (2000s). The Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network in Higher Education is the preeminent organization for faculty developers; it has also experienced significant growth and change since its beginnings in 1976. The field has coalesced, and involvement continues to rise as faculty development has become an integral part of higher education.

With the ever-growing focus on assessment, greater numbers of part-time faculty, increase in online courses, and other shifts in higher education, faculty development is of increasing importance to the success of individual faculty, programs, and departments. The present and increasing need for, and demonstrated benefits of faculty development (Sorcinelli, et al., 2006; Cooper & Stevens, 2002), and the need for institutions to become learning organizations that, "engage in reflection, adaptation, and growth" (Senge, 1990; Sorcinelli, et al, 2006), should put this field at the forefront of higher education. Maximizing the productivity potential of faculty development requires an understanding of the field's current condition, and the meaning and implications of that condition.

The condition of faculty development has been anecdotally accepted as gendered; a scan of the field reveals there are indeed far more women than men active in it. The objective of this poster presentation is to explore the gender make-up of faculty developers, and discuss possible meanings and implications for the field. Measuring the gender make-up of faculty developers in

various institutional types and positions, and examining their resources and actions within those circumstances can yield a deeper understanding that can be applied to innovation in the field.

The research questions this poster presentation begins to address are:

- 1) What is the gender make-up of the field of faculty development, and subsets of the field?
- 2) What meaning, if any, can be inferred from this current condition of the field?
- 3) What are the likely implications of this gender make-up?

Perspectives

While there is a general consensus that the field of faculty development is gendered, and anecdotally this seems to be true, no research has been published that measures this phenomenon or inquires into its meaning or possible implications. There has, however, been much discussion about the gendered condition of other academic areas such as nursing, and K-12 education (Kalogrides, Loeb, & Bètielle, 2013; Galman & Mallozzi, 2012), as well as a push for increasing the gender diversity in STEM (science, technology, engineering, math) fields (Xu, 2013). An imbalance in gender anywhere in academe leads to an imbalance in equity. It is beneficial to higher education and individual fields to thoroughly investigate and address any question of gender imbalance.

Whatever the gendered condition of a field, it seems that women get the so-called 'short end of the stick.' In K-12 education, men are promoted more often to administrative roles, while the primarily female teachers are marginalized (Trahan & Growe, 2012). This marginalization of women in education extends into higher education; Ropers-Huilman (2003) reported concerns from respondents about being expected to mother instead of mentor, and a lack of recognition in

the tenure process for publications in feminist journals.

The marginalization of women in higher education also extends to the number in faculty positions. While the percentage of females earning doctoral degrees has surpassed the number of males, males still hold a majority of full-time instructional faculty positions (Snyder, 2008; Tuitt, 2010). The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) produced a report in 2006 that looked closely at these numbers. That report found that at Associate Colleges, women had gained ground and nearly reached parity, holding 46.9 percent of full professor positions. However, they lagged far behind at Baccalaureate institutions where they hold 29.3 percent, at Master's institutions where 28.3 percent of full professor positions are held by women, and Doctoral institutions where it is only 19.3 percent (West & Curtis, 2006).

A particularly pronounced lack of diversity exists in STEM fields, where the 'leaky pipe' sees girls as early as grade school starting to push away from these subjects; reasoning for this varies as women age, from a lack of awareness of significant female role models, and fear of social rejection, to the less than welcoming culture (Markert, 1996). While increasing the number of women in STEM fields has been the focus of several initiatives over the last two decades, there remains a wide gap between the genders (Hill, Corbett, & St Rose, 2010; Austin, Laursen, Hunter, Soto, & Martinez, 2011).

In their report for the American Association of University Women (AAUW), Hill, Corbett, and St. Rose (2010) discuss the question of 'implicit bias' and the research of Mahzarin Banaji and associates, which shows that people associate math and science with 'male.' In addition, females in so-called 'male' jobs are considered less likeable, and unless they are very clearly successful, they will be judged to be incompetent. Implicit bias, and attitudes about those who cross into a field gendered differently than they are have the potential for significant impact

on participation in a field, and could perpetuate existing imbalance.

The disparity demonstrated in these fields is tied to implicit bias, and the gendered condition of each; so too then, is any gendered field in danger of inequity. Faculty development *is* gendered, as we will show below, and the women who are leading the field are in danger of having their scholarship and accomplishment marginalized as a result. In order to assess, and prevent or address any disparity, faculty developers must step back, and see the field as it is. Revealing and analyzing the gendered condition is the first step in understanding the possible meanings and implications of it.

Methods, Data, and Analysis

The data used here were collected as part of a two-stage mixed methods study that examined the organizational structures, collaborative relationships, and priorities that drive the practice of faculty developers across the range of institutions of higher education. The first stage of collection was a web-based survey of members of four faculty and professional development organizations. This first stage is the one from which the data used in this paper were collected.

The survey consists of 48 questions in 10 sections, and a final question allowing for open comments about the survey and the participant's thoughts. Four of these sections were administered only to participants who identified themselves as directors or coordinators of their program to ensure that institutional program information was provided consistently by one participant per institution. These four areas included Institutional Classification and Information, Program Description, Program Goals and Purposes, and Interdepartmental and Collaborative Efforts. The six sections administered to all participants include Faculty Developer Experience and Demographics, Audience, Program Foci, Program Approaches, Assessment of Programs and

the Future of Faculty Development.

The Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network in Higher Education is the preeminent organization for faculty developers; its membership made up the bulk of the potential respondent pool for this study. A total of 385 responses were received, for a response rate of 30 percent. During data collection, three attempts were made to contact possible respondents; no further attempts were made to contact non-respondents. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlations, and ANOVA and linear regression, as appropriate.

Results

The responses from this study affirm that faculty development is gendered. Respondents were 73 percent female, and 26.4 percent male, with 0.5 percent responding 'prefer not to answer' (N = 371; Unreported = 14). As shown in Table 1, in the United States, the prevalence of women in the field holds up across institutional classifications, and overall, is not a phenomenon linked only to particular colleges and universities.

Table 1. U.S. respondents by institutional classification

	Percent of Respondents		Proportion of Genders		
	Female	Male	All	Female	Male
Research/Doctoral	73.4%	26.0%	52.6%	52.0%	54.2%
Comprehensive	75.0%	23.5%	20.8%	20.9%	19.3%
Liberal Arts	73.7%	26.3%	11.5%	11.5%	12.0%
Community Colleges	65.7%	34.3%	10.6%	9.4%	14.5%

N = 329; Unreported =6

A 2010 survey of POD Network membership also showed that faculty development is a gendered field, although to a slightly lower extent than this study showed. That survey had 402 respondents, for a rate of 23.3 percent of the total POD membership at the time. Of those respondents, 67 percent reported female as their gender (Winkelmes, 2011). Other demographic measures from the POD survey also parallel the data collected in this study including age, race, and highest degree earned (see Tables 2, 3, and 4).

Table 2. Comparison of racial demographics in the 2010 POD survey and this study

Race	This Study	POD Survey
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.30%	0.50%
Asian	3.80%	5.50%
Black or African American	4.70%	4.20%
White/ Caucasian	89.30%	85.80%
Prefer Not to Answer	1.90%	0.00%

N = 365; Unreported = 20

Table 3. Comparison of highest degree earned in the 2010 POD survey and this study

Highest Degree Earned	This Study	POD Survey
Bachelor's	1.00%	1.00%
Master's	23.00%	19.00%
Doctorate	76.00%	76.00%
Other	0.50%	4.00%

N = 372; Unreported = 13

Table 4. Comparison of age demographics in the 2010 POD survey and this study

Age	This Study	Age	POD Survey
25-29	1.30%	Under 30	1.00%
30-34	5.10%	31-40	17.00%
35-39	9.40%		
40-44	11.80%	41-50	29.00%
45-49	16.60%		
50-54	14.70%	51-60	30.00%
55-59	20.10%		
60-64	14.70%	61-71	20.00%
65-69	5.60%		

N = 373; Unreported = 12

Table 5. Years in faculty development by gender

Time in Faculty Development	Total	Male	Female
0- 4 years, 11 months	29.4%	25.5%	32.5%
5 years- 9 years, 11 months	30.9%	29.6%	32.8%
10 years- 14 years, 11 months	18.2%	22.4%	17.3%
15 years- 19 years, 11 months	8.3%	9.2%	7.7%
20 years- 24 years, 11 months	5.5%	7.1%	5.2%
25 years- 29 years, 11 months	1.3%	1.0%	1.1%
30- 35 years	2.9%	4.1%	2.6%

N = 371; Unreported = 14

Table 6. Area of highest degree by gender

	Total	Female	Male	Prefer Not to Answer
Education	42.0%	40.9%	44.4%	100.0%
STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Math)	12.0%	11.6%	13.3%	0.0%
Arts and Humanities	18.0%	17.8%	18.9%	0.0%
SBE (Social, Behavioral, Economic)	26.6%	29.0%	20.0%	0.0%
Professional (Medical, Business)	3.7%	3.1%	5.6%	0.0%
Other	0.6%	0.4%	1.1%	0.0%

N = 350; Unreported = 35

When the number of years respondents have been in the field is examined we find higher numbers of men still in the field after more than ten years, and more women who have joined the field in the last ten years (see Table 5). Also, the number of men and women coming from particular disciplines to faculty development is not significantly different. However, these individuals tend to come from gendered fields, such as education, and SBE fields (see Table 6).

At the program level in faculty development, men in the field possess more than their share of the power. Those reporting the title of director were 68.3 percent female and 31.2 percent male, compared to the overall participant percentages of 73 percent and 26.4 percent, respectively. Table 7 shows that 44.9% of men in the field fill director positions, compared with only 40.3 percent of women, and 6.1% of men in the field are program coordinators, compared to 5.3 percent of women. Men hold a disproportionate number of director positions in all institutional classifications except master's granting colleges and universities, in which they hold a smaller share of the directorships (see Table 8).

Table 7. Primary role of respondents

	Total	Female	Male	Prefer not to Answer
Director	41.6%	40.3%	44.9%	50.0%
Program Coordinator	5.5%	5.3%	6.1%	0.0%
Senior-level Administrator	11.3%	12.5%	7.1%	50.0%
Faculty Member	14.6%	14.1%	16.3%	0.0%
Associate/ Assistant Director	13.2%	13.7%	12.2%	0.0%
Technology Consultant/ Designer/ Coordinator	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Instructional Consultant/ Designer/ Coordinator	9.1%	9.1%	9.2%	0.0%
Graduate Student Positions	0.6%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Research Positions	0.8%	0.8%	1.0%	0.0%
Chairperson	1.1%	1.1%	1.0%	0.0%
Educational Developers	0.8%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	1.1%	0.8%	2.0%	0.0%

N = 363; Unreported = 22

Table 8. U.S. directors by institutional classification

	All	Female	Male
Community College	9.9%	7.6%	15.7%
Liberal Arts	10.5%	10.1%	11.8%
Comprehensive	25.1%	27.7%	19.6%
Research/Doctoral	49.7%	47.9%	52.9%

N = 171; Unreported = 0

An interesting phenomenon takes place just above the program level, where the gender break-down of senior-level administrators who have faculty development within their purview (19.6 percent of respondents) were 80 percent women and 20 percent men. Proportionally, this is 16.2 percent of the female respondents and 11.2 percent of male respondents. Taking a closer look, Table 9 shows that men hold a majority of these positions in associate's, community, and technical schools, and bachelor's/baccalaureate colleges and universities, while women hold the majority at the master's and doctorate granting institutions.

Table 9. Senior-level administrators by institutional classification

	Total	Female	Male
Associates/Community College	12.8%	6.3%	42.9%
Bachelor's College/University	12.8%	9.4%	28.6%
Master's College/University	25.6%	28.1%	14.3%
Doctorate Granting	48.7%	56.3%	14.3%

N = 39; Unreported = 1

There is a notable imbalance in budget distribution (see Table 10). While both male and female directors have budget amounts that vary from small to large, when we consider who is operating on a 'small budget' the imbalance emerges. For example, 73.2 percent of female directors have a budget under \$100,000, while only 60.8 percent of male directors reported a budget this low. There is also an imbalance in mid-level budgets, ranging from \$100,000 to \$199,999 annually, with 25.5 percent of male directors and only 12.4 percent of female directors reporting this level. The imbalance does not, however, extend to the highest budgets. In this category, female directors have a slight advantage, with 14.4 percent of them operating with over \$200,000 annually, while 13.7 percent of male directors have a budget this high.

Table 10. Department budget by director's gender

Budget	All	Female	Male
\$0- 24,999	29.70%	32.00%	25.50%
\$25,000- 49,999	17.60%	14.40%	23.50%
\$50,000- 99,999	21.60%	26.80%	11.80%
\$100,000- 149,999	10.10%	7.20%	15.70%
\$150,000- 199,999	6.80%	5.20%	9.80%
\$200,000- 249,999	5.40%	6.20%	3.90%
\$250,000- 299,999	3.40%	3.10%	3.90%
\$300,000- 399,999	1.40%	2.10%	0.00%
\$400,000- 499,999	1.40%	1.00%	2.00%
\$500,000 or more	2.70%	2.10%	3.90%

N = 148; Unreported = 45

Within the institutional classifications, trends vary from the overall picture. At community colleges, female directors hold a proportionally smaller number of low and mid-level budgets, while they hold a clear majority of high budgets. At research/doctoral institutions, men hold a far lower proportion of low budgets than on average at only 36.4%, while holding much larger than average proportions of mid- and high level budgets (see Table 11). The distribution of budgets at Canadian institutions is also notable; here female directors have lower than average proportion of low budgets, a proportion of mid-level budgets equal to male directors, and all of the budgets over \$200,000.

Table 11 Institutional classifications reporting budget levels by director's gender

		\$0 - 99,999	\$100,000 - 199,999	\$200,000 and up	N
Research/Doctoral					
	All	53.3%	20.0%	26.7%	60
	Female	63.2%	13.2%	23.7%	38
	Male	36.4%	31.8%	31.8%	22
Comprehensive					
	All	89.2%	8.1%	2.7%	37
	Female	92.9%	3.6%	3.6%	28
	Male	77.8%	22.2%	0.0%	9
Liberal Arts					
	All	92.3%	7.7%	0.0%	13
	Female	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	8
	Male	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5
Community Colleges					
	All	70.6%	17.6%	11.8%	17
	Female	66.7%	11.1%	22.2%	9
	Male	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	8
Canadian Institutions					
	All	58.3%	33.3%	8.3%	12
	Female	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	6
	Male	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	6

N = 148; Unreported = 45; R/D = Research/ Doctoral; Comp = Comprehensive;
 LA = Liberal Arts; CC = Community College; Can = Canadian Institutions

There are also areas where no apparent difference exists. For example, female and male faculty developers earned roughly the same distribution of highest degrees. The POD report did not break down level of degree attainment by gender, so it cannot be ascertained if this holds true outside of this study.

It is important to note that due to the overwhelming majority of women in the field, in most cases the number of women in each category exceeds the number of men. This examination considers whether women in the field hold an equal proportion of power in terms of leadership positions, money, and other factors. The question at hand is the gendered condition of the field, the imbalance of power, and what these mean for the field of faculty development.

Significance of the Study

Why is faculty development gendered? What does it mean for the field—what are the likely implications? Now that our consciousness of the gendered condition of faculty development has been raised, faculty developers ought to turn their attention to these important questions. The causes and meanings of this differential must be ascertained, so that faculty developers can determine if, and what kind of action should be taken.

Implicit bias could play a strong role in the significance of the gendered condition of faculty development. If education is viewed with a female bias, and faculty development is viewed as a subfield of education, the female bias could be extended to faculty development. This could be a contributing factor to the decreased number of men in the field. One way to balance participation in the field may be to increase association of faculty development with fields carrying a male bias, such as STEM fields, or to highlight ways in which these fields are already interacting with, and integrated into faculty development. The field may already be headed in this direction, as some faculty development programs move to online and blended formats, and as more support is offered for instructors of online and blended classes.

This study showed that in fact 41.9 percent of faculty developers hold their highest degree in education. The next greatest contingent comes from SBE (social, behavioral,

economic fields) where only 26.6 percent of faculty developers get their start, followed by 18.9 percent from the arts and humanities. Examining directors only shows a bit more balance, although 36.7 percent still come from education, with 28.9 percent from SBE and 22.8 percent from arts and humanities. The male-dominated STEM fields weigh in at just 12 percent overall, and 12.8 percent of directors.

Table 12. Field of highest degree by gender

Field of Highest Degree	All	Female	Male
Education	41.8%	40.9%	44.4%
STEM	12.0%	11.6%	13.3%
Arts and Humanities	18.1%	17.8%	18.9%
Social-Behavioral-Economic	26.6%	29.0%	20.0%
Professional (Medical, Business)	3.7%	3.1%	5.6%
Other	0.6%	0.4%	1.1%

N = 349; Unreported = 36

Table 13. Directors' field of highest degree by gender

Field of Highest Degree	All	Female	Male
Education	36.7%	34.9%	40.7%
STEM	12.8%	11.9%	14.8%
Arts and Humanities	22.8%	22.2%	24.1%
Social-Behavioral-Economic	28.9%	32.5%	20.4%
Professional (Medical, Business)	1.1%	0.0%	3.7%
Other	0.6%	0.8%	0.0%

N = 180; Unreported = 13

Table 14. Directors' previous position by gender

Previous Position	All	Female	Male
Director	21.7%	20.8%	23.2%
Program Coordinator	7.8%	9.6%	3.6%
Senior-level Administrator	3.9%	4.8%	1.8%
Faculty Member	37.8%	37.6%	37.5%
Associate/Assistant Director	21.1%	20.0%	23.2%
Technology Consultant/Designer/Coordinator	2.8%	0.8%	7.1%
Instructional Consultant/Designer/Coordinator	6.7%	6.4%	7.1%
Graduate Student Position	1.1%	0.8%	1.8%
Chairperson	2.8%	3.2%	1.8%
Other	2.8%	2.4%	3.6%

N = 181; Unreported = 12

There is a similar breakdown in the previous positions of directors of faculty development, with 37.8 percent coming from faculty positions, and 21.1 percent coming from associate or assistant director positions. This seems to indicate that faculty development positions are being filled from within the home institution. If indeed this is a trend that holds true, it is possible that the gendered condition of faculty development can be at least partially attributed to the gendered condition of the field of education.

These imbalances build a profile of a female faculty member or faculty developer who likely has a degree in an education field, and is already on campus, as the likely candidate for many directorships in the field. Faculty developers and administrators alike ought to discuss this profile and the potential impact of perpetuating it.

This preliminary review of the data raises many questions about the gendered condition of faculty development. Should faculty developers address this imbalance? What can be done about it? Why are fewer men entering the field, and clustering into leadership positions? If faculty development is indeed being marginalized as a gendered field, faculty developers need to find places and ways in which gender can be addressed. The anecdotal acceptance of the gendered condition of faculty development was the first step on a journey; this research begins the second step, which is one of significant value to the field. When faculty developers understand the condition of their field, the work of harnessing the power of that condition, or diversifying the field can begin in earnest. Faculty development is in many ways a microcosm of higher education; understanding the gendered condition of this field could lead to broader applications.

References

- Austin, A.E., Laursen, S., Hunter, A., Soto, M., Martinez, D. (2011) Change strategies to support the success of women scholars in STEM fields: Categories, variations, and issues. Presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Cooper, J.E., & Stevens, D. D., eds. (2002) *Tenure in the sacred grove: Issues and strategies for women and minority faculty*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Galman, S. C., & Mallozzi, C. A. (2012) She's not there: Women and gender as disappearing foci in U.S. research on the elementary school teacher, 1995-present. *Review of Educational Research* 82(243). doi: 10.3102/0034654312453343
- Goodwin, L. D., & Stevens, E. A. (1993) The influence of gender on university faculty members' perceptions of "good" teaching. *The Journal of Higher Education* 64(2), 166-185.
- Hill, C., Corbett, C., & St. Rose, A. (2010). *Why So Few? Women in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics*. American Association of University Women. 1111 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, DC 20036.
- Kalogrides, D., Loeb, S., & Bètielle, T. (2013) Systematic sorting: Teacher characteristics and class assignments. *Sociology of Education* 86(103). doi: 10.1177/0038040712456555
- Markert, L.R. (1996) Gender related to success in science and technology. *Journal of Technology Studies*, 22(2), 21-29.
- Ropers-Huilman, B. & Shakleford, M. (2003). Negotiation identities and making change: Feminist faculty in higher education. *Gendered futures in higher education: Critical perspectives for change*. 135-147.
- Senge, P.M. (1990) *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Snyder, T.D., Dillow, S. A., & Hoffman, C.M. (2008) *Digest of education statistics 2007*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics: Institute of Education Sciences. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2008/2008022_0.pdf

- Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., Eddy, P. L. & Beach, A. L. (2006). *Creating the future of faculty development: Learning from the past, understanding the present*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Trahan, M., & Growe, R. (2012) Inequalities of women: Understanding marginalization of female educators and the quest for change. *Focus on Colleges, Universities and Schools* 6 (1).
- Tuitt, F. (2010) Working with underrepresented faculty. In K.J. Gillespie, D. L. Robertson & Associates (Eds.), *A Guide to Faculty Development* (pp. 225-242) San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- West, M. S. & Curtis, J. W. (2006) *AAUP faculty gender equity indicators 2006*. Retrieved from AAUP Website: <http://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/63396944-44BE-4ABA-9815-5792D93856F1/0/AAUPGenderEquityIndicators2006.pdf>
- Winkelman, M. (Ed.) (2011) *Analysis of several themes emerging from the 2010 membership survey data*. Retrieved from POD Network Website: <http://wikipodia.podnetwork.org/Home/topics-for-discussion/2010-pod-membership-survey>
- Xu, Y.J. (2013) Career outcomes of STEM and non-STEM college graduates: Persistence in majored-field and influential factors in career choices. *Research in Higher Education* 54(3) p. 349-382. doi: 10.1007/s11162-012-9275-2