

# Special Cluster on Gendered Service in Rhetoric and Writing Studies:

## II. Administration, Emotional Labor, And Gendered Discourses Of Power: A Feminist Chair's Mission To Make Service Matter

---

Michelle Payne

**Abstract:** *Michelle Masse' and Katie Hogan's edited collection, Over Ten Million Served (2010), argues that "complaining about service is not the same as critically analyzing service as a significant dimension of academic labor" (15). Nor, as Phillips and Heinert argue, is the admonition to "just say no" an ethical solution to the gendered inequity of academic labor. In this essay, I not only illustrate the consequences of saying yes to service and analyze its significance, but I illustrate the ways that service positioned me to advocate for change at my own institution. More specifically, I focus on the unique administrative role of the Department Chair, particularly in terms of the gendered emotional labor required to sustain an academic department and the "incongruous, gendered bureaucratic structures" (Bird) that have essentially institutionalized and naturalized "emotive dissonance" as an inevitable consequence of being a chair. I argue that interrogating this emotive dissonance—these "outlaw emotions"—is critical not only to exposing how those structures perpetuate inequity, but also to transforming gendered service and redefining the power and authority of academics, more generally. In making this argument, I draw upon sociological theories and research on emotion studies, research on academic administration, and my own administrative experience, including the strategies I developed based on my own "outlaw emotions" to disrupt these gendered discourses by 1) reconfiguring the definitions of and rewards for "service" within my department, and 2) initiating an institutional conversation about Department Chair labor that led to several policy changes.*

**Keywords:** *Department Chair, English department, Emotional labor, Gender, Feminized labor, Higher education, Service*

A progressive model of service is one in which we are willing to force change, even incremental change—to disrupt without destroying. This kind of service is not in service to the institution but in service to the constituencies with whom one's loyalties lie, whether it be women faculty, untenured faculty, or any particular group, configuration, or cause.

Paula Krebs, "Not in Service"

Because emotions express the valuations of a community, descriptions of how we work must address the way emotion structures our professional activities. Emotion is a central component in social relations and is intertwined with issues of power and status in the work world....If we are to posit good work practices..., we need to address the ways in which our profession produces emotional dispositions for its workers.

Laura Micciche, "More Than a Feeling: Disappointment and WPA Work"

## Introduction

Written almost a decade after Laura Micciche's important article on emotional labor and WPA work, Michelle Masse' and Katie Hogan's edited collection, *Over Ten Million Served* (2010), adds to the growing research on the gendered nature of academic service and argues that "complaining about service is not the same as critically analyzing service as a significant dimension of academic labor" (15). Nor, as Phillips and Heinert argue, is the admonition to "just say no" an ethical solution to the gendered inequity of academic labor. In this essay, I not only illustrate the consequences of saying yes to service and analyze its significance, but I illustrate the ways that service positioned me to advocate for change at my own institution, to "use the privilege that tenure conveys to change the problematic values and structural inequities of institutions" (Phillips & Heinert). More specifically, I focus on the unique administrative role of the Department Chair, particularly in terms of the gendered emotional labor required to sustain an academic department and the potential role Department Chairs can play as leaders in transforming gendered service in higher education.

Scholars like Micciche, Masse' and Hogan, and a handful of others have begun to address administrative labor by analyzing "the way emotion structures our professional activities" (Micciche 452). I hope to build upon that work by analyzing the emotional labor of Department Chairs and its significance in the overall labor of a department. This labor occurs within what Micciche calls

the “culture of disappointment in the academy and its ever-widening scope” (433), a culture that my colleagues and I have been examining in this issue: the corporatization of the academy, inequitable and exploitative working conditions for faculty, gender inequities within the structure of academic labor and its reward systems—the “disappointed hope” we and others have experienced in our professional lives (Micciche 446), as women, as faculty, as administrators. Micciche argues that such an analysis “can be one basis for exploring the relationship between work practices and emotional dispositions that contributes both to the larger discourse on administration and to an understanding of those factors that create a culture of disappointment in the academy” (434-435).

One of those factors for Department Chairs is the “rupture” between faculty desires for a supportive, collegial department climate and the institutional disdain for the emotional labor that is critical to creating such an environment, disdain that is reflected in university policies, university reward systems, disciplinary principles, and the day-to-day interactions between a chair and those she leads. Furthermore, these ruptures are sustained by “incongruous, gendered bureaucratic structures” (Bird) that privilege a masculine faculty identity over a feminized administrative identity, despite the institutional power of a Department Chair, and have essentially institutionalized and naturalized “emotive dissonance” as an inevitable consequence of being a chair.

I argue that interrogating this emotive dissonance—these “outlaw emotions”—is critical not only to exposing how those structures perpetuate inequity, but also to transforming gendered service and redefining the power and authority of academics, more generally. In making this argument, I will draw upon sociological theories and research on emotion studies, research on academic administration, and my own administrative experience, including the strategies I developed based on my own “outlaw emotions” to disrupt these gendered discourses by 1) reconfiguring the definitions of and rewards for “service” within my department, and 2) initiating an institutional conversation about Department Chair labor that led to several policy changes.

First, however, I want to acknowledge my own positionality as a white, cis-gendered, heterosexual, able-bodied, upper-middle class full professor. Gender is my only minoritized identity, which means my privilege in this academic and cultural context positioned me differently to advocate for the changes I describe here than if I were not white, for example, or not upper-middle class. That gender is my only minoritized identity has also shaped my experiences with academic service differently from those who have many

minoritized, intersecting identities.<sup>1</sup> My administrative narrative, therefore, does not and cannot represent the experiences of ALL faculty who identify as female, nor is it the only feminist approach to transforming gendered service. I offer it as one example, using many theoretical lenses to understand both my situated, embodied experiences and my ethical responsibilities as a privileged academic administrator.

## On Saying Yes to Administrative Service

My professional narrative is likely familiar to many of us who are or have been administrators: In my second year as an Assistant Professor I became the Assistant Director of the Writing Program at Boise State, collaborating with my colleague and friend, Bruce Ballenger, who was the Director. Together we oversaw a gradual but significant transformation in the program's curriculum and pedagogical orientation, in the morale and working conditions of our writing instructors, in the training of our teaching assistants, and in the administration's respect and support. We developed an assessment program that was lauded as a model across campus. We did administrative work in the summers without pay, earning tenure and promotion for the traditional scholarly publications we wrote in between fragments of time, not for the administrative service that consumed more than 50% of our workload.

But we were largely invisible. The Dean noticed us because first-year writing students had stopped coming to his office to complain. Our chair noticed us because we were hiring too many of our former MA students. Our MFA Director noticed us because our application process was—in his view—frightening potential students away. We became visible, in other words, to the degree that we were or were not serving someone else's needs.

My perspectives on gender and academic service were honed during the nine years I was the Assistant and later the Director of the Writing Program. Although my tenure and promotion were not negatively affected by my administrative service, I was increasingly aware that over half of my workload, half of my professional identity, did not matter in any tangible way—not in terms of release time, additional compensation, or public recognition. It DID matter, however, to the students, TA's, and instructors with whom I worked.

---

1 Research has shown, for example, that faculty of color are often overtaxed with committee assignments, and female faculty of color can be even more so. This over-taxation can have detrimental effects on tenure and promotion as well as emotional and psychological well-being. E.g., see Porter; Lawrence, Ott, & Bell; Museus, Ledesma, and Parker; Ross and Edwards. See also Gutiérrez y Muhs, et al; Schnackenberg and Simard on the experiences of women of color, queer, and transgender administrators.

And it mattered to me—as an academic, a teacher, an administrator, and a person. I learned to live with the dissonance, as so many of us do, with the disappointment (as Micciche argues) that seemed a “natural” consequence of the emotional disposition that was inscribed in the role of a WPA.

## **Laboring Emotions**

What I was experiencing, in retrospect, is what sociologists define as “emotive dissonance.” Although the term is frequently defined from a positivist perspective as the dissonance created between a worker’s “true self” and the “fake self” he/she is expected to display, a post-structuralist perspective defines it as the tension between an individual worker’s “preferred identity” and his/her “required identity” (Tracy 262, 264, 272). My “preferred identity,” in this case, conflicted with my “required identity” as a faculty member who accepted that her labor as a WPA would not be rewarded or recognized within institutional discourses. The emotional labor of being a WPA, as Micciche and others have demonstrated, is all the more challenging because of this dissonance. But, as I’ll illustrate later, that dissonance can become transformative when we choose to take our “outlaw emotions” seriously, when we see that dissonance as “unconventional emotional responses” (Jaggar 160) that are potentially subversive to the status quo.

Department Chairs experience a similar kind of emotive dissonance. When one becomes a chair, that labor is tied to the chair’s unique position within the university’s power structure, a position fraught with sometimes-contradictory responsibilities and contradictory rhetorics about being chair. Those contradictions and consequent emotive dissonance are part of the incongruous, gendered, bureaucratic structures within the academy: first, because a chair’s job requires emotional labor, but within an institutional culture that devalues that work<sup>2</sup>; second, because the role is constructed around gendered binaries that are often regarded as a diminution of the ideal academic worker (a faculty member)—as a loss of one’s preferred identity; and third, because the university’s bureaucratic structure confers power and authority on the chair’s role, but its reward system renders the work invisible. In other words, the feminized emotional labor of chairs (or other academic administrators) is necessary to their own power, authority, and effectiveness, even as it undermines their status in the academic community.

---

2 The emotional labor of administrative service has been addressed by a number of scholars in the field (Micciche; Jacobs and Micciche; Holt, Anderson, and Rouzie; Strickland; Hogan and Masse).

## What is Emotional Labor?

Originally described by Arlie Hochschild in 1983, emotional labor characterizes a wide range of jobs (teachers, administrative assistants, flight attendants, etc.), jobs that are most often performed by women or are feminized because the nature of the work is associated with feminine qualities. As sociologist Amy Wharton notes, “a job requires emotional labor when its performance involves making voice or facial contact with the public; when its performance involves producing an emotional state in the client or customer; and when the employer has an opportunity to control workers’ emotional displays” (Wharton 157). A large portion of a Department Chair’s job requires him/her to interact with people—in meetings, phone calls, emails, complaints, interruptions, performance evaluations, etc.—and to manage his/her own emotions in order to motivate faculty, for example, or present an argument to the Dean for new resources, or respond to a student complaint. Expressing and managing emotions becomes labor when it is necessary to performing one’s job: “a pleasant emotional facade is part of the commodity bought and sold” for service professionals in the travel or entertainment industries, for example; for emergency personnel, emotional labor is central to providing their service (Tracy 263); for managers or others in leadership positions, one’s emotional control is used strategically to “purposefully control emotions in an effort to appear more powerful, masculine, and rational” (Tracy 263).

As managers as well as the “face” of the department, chairs are expected to control their own emotions, discipline the emotions of those they supervise, and display appropriate emotions for delivering “good customer service.” They are, in sociological terms, “privileged emotion managers” (Wharton 153): when I receive hostile emails from faculty, for example, I am expected to control my hurt and anger and respond calmly; when the department has to make severe budget cuts, I am expected to convey calm and measured optimism; when a faculty member or student weeps in my office, I am expected to keep calm and balance my empathy with the goals of the meeting. At the same time, I have to address the emotions of others in ways that are consistent with university policy and federal laws, behaviors from colleagues and staff that range from inappropriate outbursts to misuse of power to disrespectful and irresponsible comments and actions.<sup>3</sup> As a privileged emotion manager, I am “the boss,” “the Man,” a cog in the panopticon charged with overseeing my colleagues and friends—as well as myself.

---

3 And these expectations weren’t simply implied. They were clearly stated in the university’s Statement of Shared Values, for example, and in the position guidelines for Department Chairs.

## Emotional Labor as Leadership

This emotive dissonance seems to be an inevitable consequence of being a chair, particularly when one reads the advice literature. As Hecht, et al note, "Department Chairs are both managers and faculty colleagues, advisors and advisees, soldiers and captains, drudges and bosses." They differ from administrators above them in part because of the particular kinds of emotional labor required.<sup>4</sup>

The dean and the vice president ... do not have to say good morning—every morning—to their colleagues in the department; they do not have to teach several times a week alongside their colleagues; they do not have to maintain a family relationship with their faculty members. The Department Chair, on the other hand, must be acutely aware of the vital statistics of each family member including births, deaths, marriages, divorces, illnesses, and even private financial woes. This intimate relationship is not duplicated anywhere else on the campus because no other academic unit takes on the ambiance of a family, with its personal interaction, its daily sharing of common goals and interests, and its concern for each member. (Hecht, et al)

The emotional labor of Department Chairs, as Schell also illustrates, is unique in part because it is tied to the intimate relationships that characterize families.<sup>5</sup> And the consequences are tangible: How a chair manages these relationships contributes to a department's overall climate, which in turn affects how well faculty are able to work collegially and handle conflict productively (Portath 24; Cipriano).

Given the findings of a number of studies, a chair's emotional labor can have a greater impact on faculty retention than a chair's administrative labor. As Robert Cipriano notes, "climate, collegiality, and culture are more important to early career faculty than workload, money, and tenure clarity" (Cipriano 17), a claim that is reinforced in the latest (2014) report from the Collaborative

---

4 Deans and Provosts perform emotional labor, as well in many of the same ways, depending on the size of their units and their approach to leadership.

5 Feminist scholar Kathy Ferguson notes, "[e]motional laborers are required to take the arts of emotional management and control that characterize the intimate relations of family and friends ... and package them according to the 'feeling rules' laid down by the organization" (qtd. in Mumby and Putnam 472).

on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) (2). In fact, a “study by August and Waltman (2004) found that the factor of collegiality was the most significant predictor of career satisfaction for all faculty women regardless of rank” (Terosky, et al 60). In addition, research in the social sciences has established clear links between department culture and faculty retention, identifying several key influences (all under the purview of the chair): “professional development resources, work-life climate, the clarity and fairness of the tenure process, transparency, person-department fit, and collegiality” (Campbell & O’Meara 53). Faculty satisfaction, in other words, is affected by the way a chair manages emotion.

Developing such a culture requires what management scholar Ronald Humphrey describes as “leading with emotional labor”: that is, when “managers or other leaders . . . use emotional labor and emotional displays to influence the moods, emotions, motivations and performance of their subordinates or followers” (Humphry, et al , 153). To effect change, however, I would argue that leaders must also take seriously the emotive dissonance and outlaw emotions they and their colleagues experience. Leading with emotional labor is essential for a department to be effective, to be functional, to retain faculty and staff, to teach and research effectively, and to fulfill the institutional mission.

### Department Chair: A Less-Than-Ideal Worker

Leading with emotional labor, however, contrasts sharply with academia’s masculine model of the “ideal academic worker.” This ideal worker “is married to his or her work, can move at will, and works endlessly to meet the demands of tenure” which are “built upon men’s normative paths and assumes freedom from competing responsibilities, such as family, that generally affect women more than men” (Wolf-Wendel & Ward 237). Not surprisingly, these ideals are reflected in much of the literature about becoming a Department Chair. Walter Gmelch and Val Miskin, for example summarize the transition from faculty member to Department Chair by contrasting the characteristics of a faculty member’s work with that of chair, a contrast which highlights gendered binaries:

<b>Faculty Member/Ideal Academic Worker Masculine</b>	<b>Department Chair Feminine</b>
Solitary, independent	Social, collaborative



Focused; uninterrupted time	Fragmented; interrupted time
Autonomy	Accountability
Manuscripts	Memoranda
Private (closed door)	Public (open door)
Professing	Persuading
Stability (movement within discipline)	Mobility (mobile, visible within university structure)
Client (requesting, expecting)	Custodian (dispensing resources, managing space and materials)
Austerity	Prosperity (perception of more control over resources and greater pay)

(Gmelch & Miskin)

It's no wonder that new Department Chairs are greeted with condolences rather than cheers: being a chair can mean the death of one's research agenda, a loss of autonomy and academic prestige, the pity of one's colleagues, constant interruptions, and days filled with mundane rhetorical and administrative tasks and the problems of unruly faculty colleagues. It can mean the loss of one's identity as an ideal academic worker. Despite the visibility, recognition, and—in some quarters—prestige of being a Department Chair, research has shown that most faculty who become chairs do so out of a sense of obligation ("It's my turn"), a commitment to helping their department, or a sense of "altruism, fear, or a need for change" (Carroll and Wolverson 8), and rarely do they choose the role as a form of career advancement. In fact, only 20% of chairs go on to other administrative roles (Carroll and Wolverson 6) (although the number is higher for chairs in hard sciences (Carroll and Wolverson 5)). Depending on the institution and its values, in a culture that grants the highest status to the masculine role of faculty scholars and teachers, Department Chairs, despite their limited institutional authority, also occupy a feminine role of service that often garners very little "real" status among faculty peers, regardless of the gender of the chair.

However, the reality is that, as institutional leaders, Department Chairs make "up to 80 percent of all administrative decisions...in colleges and

universities” (Carroll and Wolverton 3), from hiring faculty to scheduling classes to resolving grade appeals and requesting resources. Tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty perceive Department Chairs “to be the most important players in issues involving faculty’s work roles and workload, chances for promotion, salary/compensation, role in governance, professional development, academic freedom, and professional status” (O’Meara, “Scholarship Unbound” 6). As a Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs said, “chairs are essentially running a small company. They are responsible for as many as 30-40 full-time faculty, a dozen staff members, several hundred students, millions of dollars of research funds and several millions of dollars in operating budgets. Why are we preparing them like they are going to be running a lemonade stand?” (quoted in Enyeart).

Given how central emotional labor is to Department Chair work, then, I would extend Carroll and Wolverton’s claim above and say that 80% of the decisions made at an institution depend on the administrative AND emotional labor of Department Chairs. And yet that labor is not valued in the reward structure of most institutions of higher education.<sup>6</sup> As countless studies and institutional policy documents have demonstrated, it is rare that Department Chair service is counted toward promotion or rewarded with stipends, course reassignments, or permanent salary increases. As Phillips and Heinert also note, like other service activities on a CV, “Department Chair” is simply one item in a long list— implicitly equal to being a member of a College committee or consulting with community members or organizing a reading—and collectively relegated to the least important category of faculty work.

## The Consequences of Saying “Yes”

“Institutional barriers to gender equality are embedded in everyday taken-for-granted university practices, making them difficult to recognize, let alone be transformed.”

Karen Pyke, “Service and Gender Inequity among Faculty”

My own experience when I was a first-term chair exemplifies the consequences of saying yes to highly consequential, feminized, administrative labor. I narrate it here to explain what motivated me to initiate changes, how my outlaw emotions became central to my advocacy work and eventually—ironically—led me to continue as chair for several more terms. I’m also well aware of the emotional labor I have to exercise as I narrate and analyze my experience

---

6 Some institutions do seem to be rewarding this labor more frequently, however, based on anecdotal evidence.

here. I just recently stepped down as chair and many of the people involved are still in my department; I am making public an event that those involved could not, given confidentiality rules around Promotion and Tenure; I was/am in a greater position of power than my colleagues; and I want to emphasize my analysis of what happened and why, not place blame or reinscribe a victim narrative. I also do not want to imply that my experience is representative.

Like Eileen Schell, I was asked to run for chair well before I felt ready, and I was able to say no for a while. But I said yes about four years after tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, before my daughter was even in preschool. I found the work demanding, sometimes exhausting, but ultimately fulfilling and transformational. Two years into my first term as chair, I chose to apply for promotion to full professor. I had published two editions of a co-edited textbook, an extensive Instructor's Manual (254 pages), and several textbook chapters in addition to presenting at a large number of national, regional, and local conferences. I'd also been in significant administrative roles since my second year and several of my accomplishments fit the WPA's criteria for intellectual work. After consulting with several colleagues across campus on the merits of my case, I decided to apply. I was one of four applicants for Full in our department that year, and for the other three candidates I continued in my role as chair: I reviewed their materials and, per policy, sat in their interviews, silently observing.

Unlike my colleagues, for my interview with our six-person committee, I did not have someone to sit as the chair's proxy during P & T interviews, so I was without an institutional representative and without the separate evaluation that the chair usually provides. It hadn't occurred to me to request either one. But as the unusually tense and awkward interview progressed, I began to wish I'd thought about asking for both. After my interview, the committee chair stopped by my office and delivered the vote: the members voted 4 to 2 against recommending me. I was stunned and confused. The two male colleagues had received unanimous, glowing support. The other female colleague who applied for Full initially received no support for her case, even though she had a book contract in hand. I was struggling to make sense of what was happening.

Within a week I found myself sitting in our conference room with the Promotion and Tenure Committee, appealing their initial vote, documents spread in front of me. Toward the end of the meeting, a senior faculty member stood up and began to defend the committee's decision.

"You have not lived up to your potential," he said, "nor to the expectations we had of you when you were hired."

My colleague seemed to be winding up for more criticisms about my work and my career choices. I'd been offering numerous pieces of evidence for my case and asking for clarity on the criteria they were using. The department

didn't have specific criteria for promotion, only general guidelines from the College and University policies that indicated service could not substitute for research. One member told me that I'd made a bad career choice when I chose to become chair instead of focusing on research, so I shouldn't expect to be promoted. For half the committee, my work as chair and as the former WPA did not matter to my promotion. It was irrelevant. And now my senior colleague was driving that point home as passionately as he could: I had presented at national conferences but never turned those into juried articles; I focused on textbook materials, which were not juried (according to my colleague), not considered research, and of little scholarly consequence. My assigned workload in service and research didn't matter. "Surely you'd agree that the Dean has a heavier workload than you do," my colleague said, "but he's still publishing academic articles. Why should we hold you to a different standard?"<sup>7</sup>

Before anyone could see my tears, I began packing up my materials and stood up in the middle of his speech. "This meeting is over," I said. "I'm done."

After I left, the committee voted on my appeal, this time splitting evenly, three to three. That same week, after an appeal from the other female candidate, they unanimously reversed their vote and recommended she be promoted to full professor.

It was September of 2008. A month earlier, the day before classes began, one of our long-time linguistics faculty members had died in a sudden wildfire that consumed half of a dozen houses in a matter of minutes. I received the call while I was in the parking lot of my daughter's school, having just dropped her off for her first day of first grade. The news was devastating—indeed, traumatic—for the department and for my colleague's students, even the larger Boise community. It was devastating to me, as well, although I couldn't show it. I had to exude calmness and provide reassurance. I had to keep the department's activities moving forward as I also created space for everyone's grief. I had to talk to the press. I had to find replacements, meet with all her classes, and hold informational meetings for students and faculty where they could express their grief.

Then, in the same week that Mary Ellen died, my mother called from the hospital to tell me my father had had a heart attack. A few days later, my husband at the time was diagnosed with prostate cancer. Regardless, I had memorial service to help plan, where I gave a eulogy to the friends, family, students, and colleagues who packed a ballroom on campus. But even in our collective grief and celebration of Mary Ellen's life, I was primarily alone, separate

---

7 The Dean had not, in fact, been publishing.

from my colleagues, the one who needed to lead the way through this tragedy and manage her own grief privately.

When I walked into my first meeting with the Promotion and Tenure Committee, all of my colleagues knew what I had been dealing with, at home and at work. Our department had the “ambiance of family.” That knowledge, however, did not seem to affect the manner in which they communicated their decision. Their decision and how it was conveyed was business, not personal; it was rational, not emotional; it was about upholding the scholarly standards that were being eroded by the university. It was a given that I was expected to fulfill the duties of chair that the committee saw as an obstacle to the masculinist ideal of full professor. All of us were adhering to the implicit emotion rules that had always governed professional and academic life: emotion (or certain kinds of emotion) had no place in decisions about performance. They were private, untouchable.

The evidence before the committee was simply that, evidence. The fact that they could not agree on what that evidence meant within the institution’s promotion policy bespoke deeper conflicts about what constitutes scholarship, who gets to decide, and what those definitions mean for faculty identity and power. For three members, definitions of scholarship from the MLA, CWPA, and CCC were either not persuasive, not relevant, or could be ignored: “Those committee members who oppose promotion see that Dr. Payne’s decision to devote so much of her limited writing time to conference presentations and on these supplementary textbook materials rather than on juried publications has hurt her ability to produce the high-quality research that marked her career here a decade ago.”

Although all six members likely believed they were using rational, objective standards as the basis for assessing the evidence for promotion, their disagreement was about more than simply having different criteria. It was reflective of the university’s “incongruous, gendered bureaucratic structures” (Bird 205). The “decentralized decision-making structures” we value in academia also “permit disjunctures between formal expectations and reward structures at university level and department level, and between formally stated and informally reinforced university and department expectations and reward structures for faculty” (Bird 205). Regardless of what had been going on for me personally, my colleagues and I were wrestling with university policies; a lack of department policy or criteria; and past promotion decisions that had reflected disciplinary standards not stated in policy.

Not only was the vote about my promotion not personal; it was, in many senses, professional. Service was perceived as largely irrelevant to tenure and promotion compared to excellence in research and teaching. I did not fit the white masculine model of individualized labor, the “ideal worker.” At that time,

I was an Associate Professor who had spent the previous nine out of ten years devoting 40-80% of my workload to administration and service and less than 20% to research (often 5-10%), but I was being assessed based on what my non-administrative colleagues were: the unspoken expectations of a 20% research workload. So it was true, I was not able to produce traditional scholarship at the same rate as my colleagues who did very little service.

Half of the committee believed I should have just said “no” to being an administrator if I wanted to be promoted to full professor. In their letter to the Dean, they wrote,

There is no question that Dr. Payne’s many service contributions have affected her research productivity. The question is whether this factor is a mitigating factor. Those who oppose promotion argue that it does not, that Dr. Payne has charted her own career and that her decisions have resulted in a level of scholarly productivity that does not meet the standard of a Professor at Boise State.

The day that my then-husband had prostate surgery, I was in his hospital room reviewing the promotion dossiers of the three colleagues who had been unanimously recommended for promotion to Full and composing my own assessment of their cases—as Department Chair, absent any emotion—knowing full well that my own might be denied.

## “Man Up”

When I ran for chair in 2006, I heard secondhand that a female colleague didn’t think I could handle the pressure because I was too sensitive, not tough enough. I had a reputation for being empathetic, kind, and nurturing. In fact, those qualities had been publicly acknowledged two years earlier: I had received the Larry Selland Humanitarian Award, which is given to those who “exemplify Dr. Larry Selland’s caring nature, his compassion, his integrity and his encouragement to women and people of color.” I also had a collaborative managerial style, one I’d developed based on feminist principles, and that, too, was well known. Not surprisingly, after I was elected chair, a male colleague sent me an email telling me to “man up.” Be decisive. Be a leader. Stop soliciting feedback. Be a man.

Later, both of these colleagues would oppose my promotion.

I shouldn’t have been surprised, but I was. I had two interrelated responses: I managed my grief and anger privately and mostly alone, upholding the positivist epistemology that demands such emotions be set aside, and I continued with the professional demeanor I’d developed over years of managing my emotions. I was getting on with my professional life, so to speak. At the same time, I began to develop strategies for disrupting that positivist epistemology.

To use philosopher Alison Jaggar's term, I took my "outlaw emotions" seriously. "Outlaw emotions," according to Jaggar, are those that "are distinguished by their incompatibility with the dominant perceptions and values" and are typically experienced by the marginalized and subordinated (160). I questioned my anger and humiliation. Had I made a bad career choice? Was I not, in fact, a scholar anymore? Was I in denial about standards for promotion, not able to see the ways I'd failed? Did I get what I deserved? Did I still have a right to judge my colleagues' work as their chair? Did I have a right to feel angry, humiliated, ashamed? Were my colleagues right?

I WAS angry and humiliated, but couldn't act that way, both because I was the chair and because I was a woman, a woman known to be "emotional." I had to deal with the emotive dissonance. The promotion review process was, ideally, supposed to be impartial, rational, and not personal, so why should I be angry at the outcome? I could simply withdraw my application, wait until I was finished being chair and devote that time to producing the research expected, then apply for promotion again later. I could work within the status quo, return to being an ideal academic worker and accept that my administrative service would remain invisible.

Except that I didn't agree with the status quo—as an academic, a chair, a feminist, a Comp/Rhet scholar, and a woman. I also wasn't the only chair on campus who had encountered resistance from her department promotion committee, so mine was not an isolated incident. I also knew that my Dean believed administrative service should be counted toward promotion, and the university was well on its way to integrating the Boyer model of scholarship into its practices, but not yet its policies.

My experience galvanized my resolve to initiate significant change within my department, change that would be informed by critically reflecting on my emotions, interrogating them with evidence and research, and drawing on that dialogue to transform the way we valued, assessed, and rewarded ALL areas of our work. In taking my own outlaw emotions seriously, recognizing the sources of my emotive dissonance, and working from my authority as chair, I set about disrupting gendered discourses and structures, those that devalued faculty service in general and emotional labor in particular, as well as the "privileged emotion managers" who were expected to uphold them.

## **Disrupting Gendered Discourses: Changing department Culture**

Although these events came together in one particular year, the events themselves are far from unique in the life of a Department Chair, and they illustrate the pattern my colleagues and I have been addressing. The culture

of my department at that time was not unique, of course. Higher education research has identified these types of gendered patterns since 1986: As Terosky, et al note,

women academics find themselves in vulnerable positions in regard to career advancement because they carry disproportionately higher workloads in the areas of teaching, service, and lower level administration. Women are no longer fully blocked from entering the profession, but gendered expectations within the promotion process for publication productivity is misaligned with the workload women face. (Terosky, et al 60)

Like many English departments across the country, we too had a higher percentage of men in the full-professor rank (67%) than women (33%) given the actual gender distribution of the full-time faculty (49%/51%). In addition, all the previous WPA's and Department Chairs had been men with one exception (in the 1980s). They had either been promoted to Full before becoming chair or went up after stepping down; their children were either adults or their spouses/partners assumed primary care of domestic life. I was the second woman to be the WPA and to be chair, one of only two in the eleven departments in the College of Arts and Sciences. Like Eileen, I had postponed child-bearing until after tenure, but I needed rounds of fertility treatments to conceive my only child, learning later that I couldn't have any more children. I was also both the primary provider and caretaker in my family. But I was not the academy's "ideal worker" (Hoschild; Terosky, et al 61). I'd spent my career in a feminized field, a feminized profession, doing feminized work as a researcher and as an administrator.

But AS an administrator, I did have a degree of influence and authority, and I didn't take that for granted. When I became chair (two years prior to my promotion experience), one of the first things I did to recognize and compensate service activities was to adjust administrative workloads in the department, pay faculty for summer duties, compensate part-time faculty for service work<sup>8</sup>, and reduce the number of contingent faculty crammed into offices. I focused on continuing to build a stronger sense of community within the department, using our new collaboratively-defined mission and goals to guide our decisions. Several years after my own promotion experience, I began to see tangible changes in the professional lives of my colleagues and in the ways we assessed our work. Ironically, the poor career choice I evidently made to be a Department Chair is the very one that enabled me to facilitate

---

8 I did so through strategic enrollment management and the revenue sharing funds we began receiving for our summer offerings.



the transformation of gendered service in my department. It also positioned me well to advocate for similar changes on the institutional level.

## **Taking Emotions Seriously**

As we've noted throughout our essays, the gendered discourses of service are complex, and strategies for disrupting those discourses will vary across institutions. In my case, institutional culture and history were critical to the changes I and others have initiated in the past few years. The strategies I outline here developed somewhat organically, as responses to my own experience as a faculty member in an English Studies department, as a WPA and a Department Chair; to my intellectual commitments to feminism, student learning, rhetorical theory and practice, and ethical labor practices; to the leadership styles of our Dean and Provost; and to the institutional change that began in earnest after 2003, when we hired a new President.

When Dr. Robert Kustra arrived, Boise State had only been a university for about 30 years, and the effects of that transition were still palpable. Having begun as Boise Junior College during the Depression, Boise State University began to emerge in the 1970s, adding a German research model to its existing liberal arts/teaching mission<sup>9</sup> and all the complications that came with such a change. Faculty who had been teaching five courses per term prior to the 1970s were reduced to four; tenure and promotion based on research productivity was instituted in the 1980s; and by the time I arrived in 1997, about half the full-time faculty in the English department were teaching three courses per semester. Research was becoming a defining feature of faculty roles across campus, displacing the historical emphasis on teaching and service. "Our long-term goal," Dr. Kustra said in his university-wide address in 2003, "is to become a metropolitan research university of distinction. To achieve this goal, we must be collaborative, entrepreneurial and competitive." A key measure of our success would be to move from the Carnegie Classification of a Masters 1 institution to a doctoral research institution,<sup>10</sup> and our strategic plan would get us there.

By the time I became chair in 2006, Boise State was well into what Adrianna Kezar and others term the "mobilization stage" of our transformation, having begun "to question and challenge the current status quo—practices and policies that are enmeshed within the current institutional culture" (Kezar and

---

9 The University retained its community-college mission until just recently, when the College of Western Idaho began.

10 Boise State was recognized as a doctoral research institution in January, 2016.

Sam 59). Over the next several years, we were immersed in the “implementation stage” (Kezar and Sam 59-60): “focusing on creating infrastructure and support for the reform” (Kezar and Sam 60). We had been challenging the status quo, questioning the values that drove it, working collaboratively across units to develop changes, and implementing specific structural and policy changes. Change wasn’t only in the air; it was in offices and classrooms and the foundations of new academic buildings.

After 2008, by the time I began initiating changes within my own department and advocating for change institutionally, “the values, norms, and underlying assumptions that guide behaviors” (Kezar and Sam 58) at Boise State had been reshaped, creating opportunities for change that had not been apparent before.

## **Changing department Culture: Developing Performance Criteria**

A key component of the strategic plan was increasing our research productivity, and it was clear that department initiatives would need to be aligned with those goals and values. Among the changes our department implemented, we developed an enrollment management plan that allowed us to reduce teaching loads without extra costs or increased caps. Faculty who had demonstrated consistent scholarly/creative activity were reduced from a 60% teaching load to 50%. At the same time, we needed to restructure the way we administered our degree programs, so we had separate Discipline Directors for each curricular area. As the number of faculty directors increased, a number of faculty began to complain privately that it seemed only Associate Professors were carrying the department’s service load. The resentment was beginning to build from this tension between research and service.

Faculty resentment is one of those emotions chairs tend to avoid but need to manage; it can undermine collegiality and community very quickly. Rather than dismiss it as “what faculty do” or as simply the “sour grapes” of one or two people (i.e., see it as an individual, personal problem), I took the emotion seriously. I decided to look at the data and see what we needed to address, either as a community and/or as individuals.

As it turned out, we did indeed have a problem, one that was much bigger than I had thought and one I wouldn’t have noticed if I’d ignored that pesky and all-too-common feeling of resentment. Instead, I realize in retrospect, I engaged the department in what Jaggar would call “critical reflection on emotion” that led to reassessing our practices and stated values—that led, in other words, to political action on a micro level. As Phillips and Heinert argue, we

began to transform gendered service by “redefining and assessing labor and workload in terms of how it supports the institutional mission.”

During our fall semester retreat in 2010, I integrated a discussion of shared governance and performance criteria into our yearly strategic planning conversation.<sup>11</sup> In our retreats, I had made it a practice to emphasize the progress we’d made on our goals each year, tracking our accomplishments visually in a table, and then using retreat time to plan for the coming year. We were getting used to talking about our work in relationship to something larger than ourselves, no matter how tenuous or conflicted it was.

We started with three questions designed to help us connect our strategic plan to performance criteria:<sup>12</sup> 1) Given our vision, mission, and goals, what kinds of activities will help us get there? 2) What are we already doing that is helping us achieve these goals? 3) What kinds of activities do faculty and staff need to engage in to help us reach that vision?

I divided faculty into groups for each category of our strategic plan and asked them to 1) list what we are already doing toward those goals; 2) list what we could be doing; and 3) translate those lists into performance criteria to answer the third question above. We had a positive and lively discussion.

Not surprisingly, during the conversation some faculty raised their concerns about the inequities they perceived in service workloads. By focusing on our mission and goals during the retreat, I had intentionally created a context within which they could voice their concerns publicly, but do so without being perceived as complainers. I then returned to those concerns when we shifted to shared governance and displayed the data I’d found. I illustrated the changes that had occurred in faculty workload capacity over the past twelve years, departmentally and by program. We had increased our contributions in all three areas of teaching, research, and service, and our administrative release time had almost doubled. At the same time, some areas in the department were contributing more to shared governance than others, notably the smaller areas of technical communication, rhetoric and composition, and linguistics. When we looked at the data by faculty rank, it was quite clear that Associate Professors were doing more of the administrative work AND more of the committee work than Full Professors and Assistant Professors. In fact,

---

11 We’d been holding semester retreats for about seven years at that point, so faculty were accustomed to using that time to tackle big issues—from curriculum revisions to strategic planning to university initiatives. They have been one of the key means of changing department culture.

12 See also Ward for a discussion of similar approaches for addressing service.

55% of all the administrative roles in the department were held by Associate Professors, while only 23% were held by Full Professors. The data suggested a pattern that couldn't be dismissed offhand.

## **Aligning Service to Mission and Goals**

Instead of focusing on the “complainers,” we focused on the larger system—our mission, goals, and values—looked at the evidence, and saw a problem that was not about individualized labor or “just saying no.” Associate Professors were carrying an undue service burden, Full Professors were relatively inactive, and Assistant Professors who had heard they should minimize service were missing important opportunities.<sup>13</sup> We asked what we could do within our unit to define service expectations and rewards for all faculty so they aligned with our mission and values. We didn't ignore the resentment and we didn't embrace it; we used it to fuel our ideas for change.

As a result of this work, we drafted performance expectations; our committee memberships became more diverse by rank; and more Full Professors began participating in department and college-level governance. We instituted stipends for part-time adjuncts who served and full-time nontenure-track lecturers were included on all tenure-track faculty hiring committees, along with faculty outside the subdiscipline. In addition, more adjuncts and lecturers began attending department meetings.

Developing performance criteria for the English department took almost two years, but resulted in a policy that not only defines expectations in all areas, but adopts Ernest Boyer's definitions of scholarship and therefore recognizes certain kinds of service and community engagement as research. Promotion and Tenure Committee members in the department are now expected to assess a candidate's dossier using his/her assigned workload in each area and the definitions of scholarship within his/her discipline. In addition, we borrowed from the University of California-Berkeley's policy on service expectations by rank and created our own, clearly identifying the kinds of activities expected at each level, including full-time nontenure-track faculty.<sup>14</sup> With new

---

13 Our local data gave evidence to what the women in Terosky, et al's study also said: they “blamed their departmental colleagues for their disproportionately high administrative and service workloads; they criticized their senior colleagues for refusing to perform a fair share of service work” (65). They also said that “their ‘local colleagues’ failed (or continued to fail) to guide them in navigating workload distribution, institutional politics, and/or the tenure/promotion process” (65).

14 See also O'Meara, 10.

faculty, I ask that they identify their service goals for the next five years, thinking about their “service agenda” as they do their “research agenda,”<sup>15</sup> and then together we choose appropriate service activities given their roles, disciplinary expertise, the time assigned for service, and the needs of the department/ College/University.

This approach is an example of Phillips and Heinert’s third factor in transforming service: “valuing, supporting, and developing the expertise that is required for sustaining the labor of institutions.” It helps the faculty member and the chair move away from “service-as-sacrifice-for-the-good-of-the-order” and reframe it as integral to achieving one’s overall professional goals, to developing new skills, to contributing one’s unique talents to a particular area, and to fulfilling the goals of the university (see also Jean Filletti). Tenured faculty can mentor junior faculty in these decisions and the chair can facilitate an appropriate distribution of service across all faculty members.<sup>16</sup> When faculty have a degree of institutional literacy, they are less likely to personalize certain decisions, which is a consequence of individualizing our work. And, as a study by O’Meara demonstrates, having clear expectations and criteria can have “a powerful psychological effect in reducing the stress and resentment faculty felt at being under-valued, over-worked, and under-paid”(“Scholarship Unbound” 15 ).<sup>17</sup> In short, faculty, staff, students, and institutions benefit when service is recognized, rewarded, and assigned based on an individual’s expertise as well as the institution’s mission.

Changing our department’s culture and taking emotions seriously is challenging work for a Department Chair, and while it doesn’t relieve the amount of emotional labor in the job, it directs that labor to the productive tensions where theory and practice meet, where outlaw emotions emerge and then

---

15 I ask faculty to respond to the following prompts: 1) List your professional goals for the next five years; 2) List your particular talents and strengths (e.g., detail-oriented, conceptual thinker, task-oriented, etc.; assessment knowledge, curriculum development, online teaching, teaching with technology, etc.); 3) Given your goals and strengths, what kinds of professional development activities and service activities might help you match the two?

16 See Filletti for questions to help a department discuss criteria for assessing service (346) and an example of how to measure service quantitatively depending on the type of institution (349). See O’Meara, as well (11).

17 “The policies made service scholars feel safer, more appreciated and understood, and thereby made them feel more committed and loyal to their institutions” (O’Meara, “Scholarship Unbound” 15).

challenge privilege and hierarchy. As labor, according to sociologists, emotion management serves the bottom line, not the worker. Consequently, privileged emotion managers like chairs often experience emotive dissonance because their ideological orientation conflicts with the values implied in performing emotional labor as a commodity. And yet, I would argue that THAT's the art of administration. That's one reason I continue to enjoy my work as chair, in spite of my experiences. In taking emotions seriously, I try to attend to those that are pushed to the margins or dismissed as threatening or ridiculous. I engage faculty (and staff and students) in critically reflecting on those emotions as they would any other idea as we try to realize our own emotional commitments, our values, our principles.

## **Advocating for Change in Department Chair Roles and Rewards**

The changes that would support the incorporation of emotion work into a more sophisticated vision of academic life would include moving away from the notion of the individual scholar toward a more social model of intellectual activity.

Mara Holt, et al, "Making Emotion Work Visible in Writing Program Administration."

As I was facilitating change in my own department, I had an opportunity in my second term as chair to challenge gendered service more broadly. I was invited to participate in the President's Leadership Academy (PLA)—a semester-long workshop<sup>18</sup> focused "on how leaders effectively move their organizations from the current state to a desired future state that aligns with the strategic mission and vision of Boise State University" (<https://president.boisestate.edu/leadershipacademy/projects/>). Participants were expected to develop a "strategic improvement project," as individuals or in groups, that had impact beyond a single unit; could be launched or completed within the spring term; and resulted in "an improvement or innovation that is tangible, measurable, and aligned with the strategic mission and vision" (<https://president.boisestate.edu/leadershipacademy/projects/>). My project focused on

---

18 Every two weeks we met for about five hours and addressed an aspect of leadership in higher education. We focused on change management, organizational culture, interpersonal and organizational communication, management principles, performance management, problem-solving, innovation, data-driven decision making, and action planning.

recruiting and retaining Department Chairs: to “develop a culture, incentives, and ongoing training for Department Chairs, as well as a way to retain chairs and increase their effectiveness in the ‘New Normal.’”<sup>19</sup>

I gathered research on best practices at other institutions and studies on leadership in higher education; the Director of Professional Development for Academic Affairs and I gathered information about the specific challenges facing chairs at our institution (frequent turnover in chairs and staff; challenges in recruiting chairs; inefficient and ineffective department operations; expectations to lead without training, incentive, or time, etc.); and eventually the Provost convened a task force that included the Vice President for Human Resources, the Provost, the Director of Professional Development for Academic Affairs, and the Employee Learning & Development Manager. We conducted a survey, analyzed data, and developed recommendations which I then was asked to present to the President and the Executive Council.

In making our recommendations, we explained the institutional costs to maintaining the status quo, particularly given our mission, vision, and goals; the significant role that chairs played in achieving the President’s goals; and the benefits we predicted would result if changes were made, including increased productivity and efficiency on an operational level; reduced turnover and greater stability within departments; higher faculty investment in AND participation in change. If we wanted to become a metropolitan research university of distinction, our existing models of the ideal academic worker would have to change.

chairs were too consumed by daily tasks and putting out fires to focus on leadership, so we needed to restructure the way work was done by staff and chairs. chairs also needed a leadership program similar to the PLA, one that developed the skills needed to lead a department. And finally, if we wanted to recruit and retain chairs, we needed a different compensation model, one that didn’t penalize chairs financially or professionally for serving their departments and the institution.<sup>20</sup> We needed, in other words, to align service with the university’s mission and goals, to help faculty develop the expertise

---

19 From the project proposal.

20 At Boise State during this time, IF a Department Chair received a stipend, the amount varied by college, and until 2014, the stipend was excluded from salary raise calculations. When a chair stepped down, his/her salary was essentially the same as if he/she had never served; serving as Department Chair made little if any difference in one’s base salary over the long term. chairs also worked during summer months even though they were not officially on contract.

needed for this particular service, and then reward this highly consequential feminized labor.

Throughout the project we collaborated with chairs, Deans, and other campus members. With the Provost's support, the Director of Professional Development for Academic Affairs and I co-facilitated an Academic Leadership Program for new chairs which spanned an academic year. Around the same time, the Provost began a revision of the university's strategic plan, and one of the five goals that emerged was to "transform our operations to serve the contemporary mission of the university." This goal included restructuring academic departments and revising the roles of Department Chairs, so a broader group of stakeholders were brought together to develop a plan. At the same time, the Provost and the Faculty Senate began reviewing policies and reward structures more generally, but also specifically to address some of the inequities in how chairs were valued and assessed. Administrative labor needed to be recognized within the university's policies, including equitable release time across units, additional compensation for summer work, time for research, and criteria in promotion policies that accounted for being a Department Chair. Our change efforts, as Bird asserts, needed to "address the subtle means by which systemic barriers are constructed and maintained" (Bird 211).

As I noted earlier, institutional change occurs when the values and norms of the status quo are questioned (the mobilization stage) and when the policies and practices that reflect those values and norms are revised to reflect new values (the implementation stage) (Kezar & Sam). In addition, institutional change happens when key administrators participate in and support change efforts, and it happens when policies have accountability measures embedded (Bird 211). Given the changes we were arguing for in Department Chair roles, our reward structures (an accountability measure) needed to demonstrate that the university took Department Chair work seriously and was committed to recruiting and retaining excellent leaders.

Within a couple of years those changes were underway, changes that began to disrupt the gendered binaries on which the ideal academic worker is based. An external consulting firm experienced with higher education conducted an internal assessment of department operations, and several of their recommendations are being pursued. In addition to improving operational issues (e.g., data management, initiatives management, staffing, etc.), the consultants' report also included several recommendations for "Department Chair Remuneration and Support" that became action items for the Provost's Office, including a principled formula for stipend levels across campus (now being considered); changes to contract lengths; enhanced sabbaticals and support for research (both delegated to Deans); and a review of promotion



policies to include reconsidering the “prohibition of counting chair service toward promotion to Professor.”

During this period, the Faculty Senate was beginning to review our Promotion and Tenure Policies, at the request of the Provost, so the recommendation about chair service was forwarded. Dozens of people were involved in the lengthy conversations about this policy, and a final version was approved in 2015. What emerged reflected a significant shift in values and norms. First, the revisions reflected the key principles that Phillips and Heinert identify for transforming gendered service. Notably, the new university policy defines research and creativity using the Boyer model of scholarship, which means that faculty work is now defined more broadly and tied more closely to institutional mission. In addition, the preamble emphasizes that “faculty members seeking tenure and promotion should be cognizant of these plans as they may reflect the University’s and the Colleges’ priorities with respect to professional activities that should be undertaken by faculty.” departments are required to have written criteria for determining promotion to each level and must assess a faculty member’s work based on workload assignment in each area. Now, a candidate must include “a statement describing the relationship between the faculty member’s accomplishments and his/her workload assignments” (from Summary of Changes), which means faculty should be assessed not on the nebulous standard of the ideal academic worker producing research, but on the actual workload expectations in the areas they have been assigned.

Most importantly for this discussion, candidates must now also include “a statement of service philosophy followed by supporting evidence of service accomplishments.” Faculty cannot simply “say no” to service. Instead, a faculty member must explain why he/she has chosen particular service activities and how those choices reflect a philosophy about service. In addition, he/she must demonstrate what has been accomplished, all in terms of university, college, and department mission and goals.

These principles also apply to administrative work (Department Chair, Director, etc.). In the new policy, administrative work must be considered in light of assigned workload:

[I]f a candidate’s workload assignment requires more service (such as serving as Department Chair) and less teaching and research, the expectation for excellence in teaching and research shall not be compromised but the expected volume of teaching and research may be reduced. Faculty asked to fill significant administrative roles, such as Department Chair, should negotiate their performance evaluation criteria and workloads with their

departments and colleges before taking on such roles; these workload assignments shall be considered in evaluating these faculty members' achievements in teaching and scholarship. (<http://policy.boisestate.edu/academic-affairs-faculty-administration/policy-title-faculty-promotion-guidelines/>)

Had this requirement been in place when I applied for promotion, the committee would have had to assess the quality of my research activities within my discipline's standards, the productivity within the less-than-10% of workload I had been assigned since becoming chair, and the qualities of my administrative work.<sup>21</sup>

The new Promotion and Tenure policy inscribes a very different model of an ideal academic worker, one that is based on local context, local values, and local needs while also remaining connected to the institution's broader mission and goals. This ideal academic worker is expected to do more than publish and teach according to incongruous, inequitable, implicitly gendered expectations. In fact, this model disrupts those gendered discourses and the rhetoric of individualized labor. As a result, the emotional labor of service activities, while not directly acknowledged as such in policy, is nonetheless valued, rewarded, and supported.

## Conclusion

Hope is an emotional investment that we develop collaboratively; it is an act of mutuality that is nourished by our collective expectations. Teaching, learning, and administration are not simply intellectual activities that one masters, but a complex blend of emotional and professional issues that involve the whole person.

Laura Micciche, "More Than a Feeling: Disappointment and WPA Work,"

Evaluating and rewarding service, however, requires that faculty members develop institutional literacy—an understanding of the discourses, processes, and power relationships within a university—and that "literacy sponsors" in

---

21 In the past, chairs applying for promotion had to be reviewed by their department first and did not have someone to fill the usual role of a chair during a candidate's application process. Now, "the dean or his/her designee shall take the place of the Department Chair in the promotion process" and the chair's "application shall be forwarded directly to the dean or his/her designee." This separate review process reinforces the chair's authority, no longer puts faculty in the position of evaluating their supervisor, and signals that an administrator's work will be assessed based on clear standards.

the workplace—that is, supervisors and administrators—support that development. The masculine model of the ideal academic worker doesn't require such literacy because its privilege depends on the feminized labor of others. That is, navigating the discourses, processes, and power relationships within a university feels "natural" to those with privilege, but is predicated on ignoring those who often do the work that enables the privileged to maintain degrees of power. And yet if universities are to respond to the pressures of corporatization and neoliberalism, faculty members themselves must change this ideal.

I have been arguing that intellectual engagement with emotions is important to transforming gendered service in the academy, and chairs are well positioned to facilitate such change, depending on their institutional context. Such engagement is not to be confused with "emotional intelligence," however, a term that Shari Stenberg argues is about "harnessing particular emotions so as to produce a subject with 'capacity for skills and efficiency as well as . . . good character and rule obedience'" (5). Certainly as "privileged emotion managers," chairs are expected to perform such labor, but leading with emotional labor is very different. It requires that a chair understand "emotion as a 'tight braid of affect and judgment, socially and historically constructed and bodily lived, through which the symbolic takes hold of and binds the individual, in complex and contradictory ways, to the social order and its structure of meaning'" (Worsham, qtd in Stenberg 2). It requires that a chair take "outlaw emotions" seriously and not view emotive dissonance as simply an inevitable cost of academic labor. We can, as Micciche argues, "use disappointment for a framework for effecting change, however compromised and tempered such change may be" (Micciche 442). We can, that is, enact the other side of disappointment. Hope.

## Works Cited

- Bird, Sharon R. "Unsettling Universities' Incongruous, Gendered Bureaucratic Structures: A Case-Study Approach." *Gender, Work and Organization* 18.2 (2011): 202–230. Web.
- Campbell, Corbin M, and KerryAnn O'Meara. "Faculty Agency: departmental Contexts That Matter in Faculty Careers." *Research in Higher Education* 55 (2014): 49–74. Web.
- Cipriano, Robert E, and Jeffrey L. Buller. *Facilitating a Collegial department in Higher Education: Strategies for Success*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011. Internet resource.

- Carroll, James, and Mimi Wolverton. "Who Becomes a chair?" *New Directions for Higher* 126 (2004): 3–10. Web.
- Enyeart, Christine. *Developing Academic Leaders. Cultivating the Skills of chairs, Deans, and Other Faculty administrators, part II*. University Leadership Council. Webinar aired October 12, 2011.
- Gmelch, Walter H. and Val D. Miskin. "Department Chair Call for Leadership: Part 1" <http://atwood.six-o-six.com/content/department-chair-call-leadership-part-1>
- Hecht, Irene W D et al. "Department Chair Online Resource Center Roles and Responsibilities of Department Chairs." *The Department Chair as Academic Leader* (1999): n. pag. Print.
- Holt, Mara, and Leon Anderson and Albert Rouzie. "Making Emotion Work Visible in Writing Program Administration." *A Way to Move: Rhetorics of Emotion and Composition Studies*. Eds. Dale Jacobs and Laura Micciche. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2003. 147-60. Print.
- Humphrey, Ronald H., Jeffrey M. Pollack, and Thomas Hawver. "Leading with Emotional Labor." *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 23.2 (2008): 151–168. Web.
- Jaggar, Alison. "Love and Knowledge: Emotion in Feminist Epistemology." *Inquiry* 1989: 151–176. Web.
- Krebs, Paula. "Not in Service," in *Over Ten Million Served: Gendered Service in Language and Literature Workplaces*, ed. Katie J. Hogan and Michelle A. Massé, NY: SUNY Press, 2010. Print.
- Lawrence, Janet, Molly Ott, and Alli Bell. "Faculty Organizational Commitment and Citizenship." *Research in Higher Education* 53.3 (2012): 325–352. Web.
- Masse', Michelle A; Hogan, Katie J. *Over Ten Million Served*. State University of New York Press, Albany, 2010. Print.
- Micciche, Lr. "More than a Feeling: Disappointment and WPA Work." *College English* 64.4 (2002): 432–458. Web.
- Mumby, D. K., and L. L. Putnam. "The Politics of Emotion: A Feminist Reading of Bounded Rationality." *Academy of Management Review* 17.3 (1992): 465–486. Web.
- Museus, Samuel D., María C. Ledesma, and Tara L. Parker. "Racism and Racial Equity in Higher Education." *ASHE Higher Education Report*. 42.1 (2015). Print.

- Portath, C. (2009, April). How toxic colleagues corrode performance. *Harvard Business Review*, 24.
- Porter, Stephen R. "A Closer Look at Faculty Service: What Affects Participation on Committees?" *The Journal of Higher Education* 78.5 (2007): 523-541. Web.
- Pyke, Karen. "Service and Gender Inequity among Faculty." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 44.1 (2011): 85-87. Web.
- Ross, Henry H., and Willie J. Edwards. "African American Faculty Expressing Concerns: Breaking the Silence at Predominantly White Research Oriented Universities." *Race Ethnicity and Education* (2016): n. pag. Web.
- Schnackenberg, Heidi and Denise Simard. *Challenges Facing Female Department Chairs in Higher Education: Emerging Research and Opportunities*. 1st ed. IGI Global, 2017.
- Stenberg, S. "Teaching and (Re)Learning the Rhetoric of Emotion." *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture* 11.2 (2011): 349-369. Web.
- Terosky, Aimee Lapointe, KerryAnn O'Meara, and Corbin M Campbell. "Enabling Possibility: Women Associate Professors' Sense of Agency in Career Advancement." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 7.1 (2014): 58-76. Web.
- Tracy, Sarah J. "Locking Up Emotion: Moving Beyond Dissonance for Understanding Emotion Labor Discomfort." *Communication Monographs* 72.3 (2005): 261-283. Web.
- Wharton, Amy S. "The Sociology of Emotional Labor." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35.1 (2009): 147-165. Web.
- Wolf-Wendel, Lisa, and Kelly Ward. "Academic Mothers: Exploring Disciplinary Perspectives." *Innovative Higher Education* 40.1 (2014): 19-35. Web.