Faculty Campus Service Decisions at a Catholic Liberal Arts University

Sarah Jane Kilmer, PhD, and Stephanie Sowl, PhD

Abstract

This study examines how gender stereotypes, social roles, and institutional context influenced faculty members' decisions around campus service work at a Catholic liberal arts institution. Overall, results from interviews, document analysis, and key artifacts showed that participants embraced and were committed to campus service work inside of an institution where the mission of the university largely centered around service and wherein campus service was broadly defined. The findings from this study demonstrate that there are different ways of making decisions about campus service work and expands on the understanding of decision-making regarding campus service. By focusing on campus service decisions among twenty-one study participants within a single Catholic liberal arts institution, this study makes contributions to knowledge about how gendered institutions, gender stereotypes, social roles, and Catholic higher education values all contribute to campus service decisions.

Introduction

Universities have long defined the duties of their faculty according to the three pillars of research, teaching, and service. Academic reward systems, such as tenure and promotion, consider the quantity and quality of faculty members' work in each of these areas, but it is well understood that tenure and promotion criteria tend not to favor the three

Sarah Kilmer, PhD is the Associate Director for the College Park Scholars International Studies Scholars program, University of Maryland

Stephanie Sowl, PhD is a Program Officer at the ECMC Foundation, Division of Higher Education

JOURNAL OF CATHOLIC HIGHER EDUCATION – 41:2, 2023, 126-150.

pillars equally.[1] Numerous studies indicate that faculty service engagement, while factored into tenure and promotion reviews, is generally weighed less heavily than research and teaching.[2] Furthermore, while teaching and research responsibilities are often clearly defined or well understood through university norms, professional service expectations tend to be much more ambiguous.[3] Even when service engagement is defined for faculty, it is often discouraged due to the common perception that it takes too much time away from the research productivity that enables career advancement.[4]

Research on faculty service engagement is relatively sparse compared to the research on faculty teaching and research roles.[5] What the existing research does suggest, however, is that faculty service follows a strongly gendered pattern. In short, women and men[6] are doing

[1] Cassandra M. Guarino and Victor M. H. Borden, "Faculty service loads and gender: Are women taking care of the academic family?" *Research in higher education* 58, no. 6 (2017): 672–94; Kerry Ann O'Meara, "Rewarding faculty professional service," *New England Resource Center for Higher Education Publications* 17 (1997), https://scholarworks.umb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1016&context=nerche_pubs; O'Meara, "Whose problem is it? Gender differences in faculty thinking about campus service," *Teachers College Record* 118, no. 8 (2016): 1–38.

[2] Sharon Bird et al., "Creating status of women reports: Institutional housekeeping as 'Women's Work,'" *NWSa Journal* (2004): 194–206; Guarino and Borden, "Faculty service loads and gender"; O'Meara, "Whose problem is it?"; Kelly Ward, *Faculty Service Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement*, vol. 29, no. 5 of *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series* (San Francisco: Wiley Periodicals, 2003).

[3] Lucinda Barrett and Peter Barrett, "Women and academic workloads: Career slow lane or cul-de-sac?," *Higher education* 61 (2011): 141–55; Kevin M. Eagan Jr. and Jason C. Garvey, "Stressing out: Connecting race, gender, and stress with faculty productivity," *The Journal of Higher Education* 86, no. 6 (2015): 923–54; K. Hogan and M. Massé, "Tips for service," *Profession* (2010): 220–22; Joya Misra et al., "The ivory ceiling of service work," *Academe* 97, no. 1 (2011): 22–26; Karen Pyke, "Service and gender inequity among faculty," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 44, no. 1 (2011): 85–87.

[4] Misra et al., "The ivory ceiling of service work"; Kelly Ward, *Faculty Service Roles.*

[5] Linda Babcock et al., "Gender differences in accepting and receiving requests for tasks with low promotability," *American Economic Review* 107, no. 3 (2017): 714–47; Lisa K. Hanasono et al., "Secret service: Revealing gender biases in the visibility and value of faculty service," *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 12, no. 1 (2019): 85; Janet H. Lawrence et al., "Is the tenure process fair? What faculty think," *The Journal of Higher Education* 85, no. 2 (2014): 155–92; Misra et al. "The ivory ceiling of service work"; Anna Neumann and Aimee LaPointe Terosky, "To give and to receive: Recently tenured professors' experiences of service in major research universities," *The Journal of Higher Education* 78, no. 3 (2007): 282–310.

[6] By using the terms "women" and "men" or "woman" or "man," we are referring to individuals who have identified being a "woman" or "man" as their primary gender identity, or cisgender individuals.

different kinds of work in higher education institutions, with differential career consequences that are typically to the detriment of women faculty.[7] Scholars have offered numerous explanations for why women faculty engage in more campus service work than men faculty, including how gender stereotypes and social roles contribute to unequal workloads. However, the literature supporting those explanations typically does not consult the actual decision-making process that faculty members employ when choosing to engage in service-related work. Given well understood challenges to women faculty rooted in gender stereotypes and social roles, it is noteworthy that few studies consider the campus service work decision-making processes that men and women faculty employ, particularly within institutional contexts where service engagement is emphasized and expected. Without a deeper understanding of the decision-making mechanisms that faculty members undertake regarding campus service work, we are left with no new strategies or policies that might help to repair the faculty gender service divide among faculty, and efforts to create more equitable faculty work environments will remain stunted.

With these considerations in mind, the purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore how gender stereotypes, social expectations, and institutional context influence campus service decisions by male and female faculty at a small, Catholic, liberal arts institution. By centering the decision-making process in a manner that few other studies in the higher education field have, this study reveals how gender service divides are produced and potentially perpetuated. Perhaps, most significantly, this study focused uniquely on the Catholic-liberal-arts-institution type, to provide a deeper understanding of campus service decisions where significant service expectations already exist for faculty as part of the Catholic higher education mission.[8] By considering the intersection of

[7] Sandra Acker and Carmen Armenti, "Sleepless in academia," *Gender and Education* 16, no. 1 (2004): 3–24; Barry Bozeman and Monica Gaughan, "Job satisfaction among university faculty: Individual, work, and institutional determinants," *The Journal of Higher Education* 82, no. 2 (2011): 154–86; Sara McLaughlin Mitchell and Vicki L. Hesli, "Women don't ask? Women don't say no? Bargaining and service in the political science profession," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 46, no. 2 (2013): 355–69; Stephen R. Porter, "A closer look at faculty service: What affects participation on committees?" *The Journal of Higher Education* 78, no. 5 (2007): 523–41.

[8] Sandra M. Estanek et al., "Assessing Catholic identity: A study of mission statements of Catholic colleges and universities," *Journal of Catholic Education* 10, no. 2 (2006): 199–217; Jeremy Stringer and Erin Swezey, "The purpose of a student affairs program within Jesuit higher education," *Journal of Catholic Education* 10, no. 2 (2006): 181–98.; Andrew John Thon, *The Ignatian Perspective: The Role of Student Affairs in Jesuit Higher Education* (Jesuit Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1989);

this distinctive institutional backdrop with gender stereotypes that exist everywhere, the research had implications for faculty and leaders within Catholic higher education, for liberal arts institutions, and for our understanding of gender roles in academia more broadly. Before beginning our literature review, some common definitions:

- By *campus service* we mean "service to the institution as a means to conduct institutional business."[9] Examples include committee work, program development, work supporting student groups, engagement in administrative work, and involvement in shared government.
- By *professional or disciplinary service* we mean service to one's discipline or professional organization "as means to maintain disciplinary associations and their work."[10] Examples include editorship roles, journal-reviewing roles, and acting as a chair or president of an academic conference.
- By *community service or engagement* we refer to university involvement with external communities, bringing disciplinary expertise to bear on societal problems.[11] Examples include service-learning, participatory action research, consulting, community-engaged scholarship, and civic service.

Literature Review

This study examined how gender stereotypes, social roles, and institutional context influence faculty members and their campus service decisions at a Catholic institution. We examined three themes in the literature: (1) women faculty and campus service work, (2) decision-making by women faculty in the face of biases, and (3) how the context of a small, Catholic, liberal arts institution shapes decisions around campus service.

Women Faculty and Campus Service Work

Empirical research indicates that female faculty spend more work time than their male colleagues on campus service activities that are

Rich Whitney and Mark Laboe, "Grounding Student Affairs in a Catholic Charism: The Journey of One Faculty Member in Connecting Curriculum with Mission," *Journal of Catholic Education* 18, no. 1 (2014): n1.

[9] Kelly Ward, *Faculty Service Roles,* iv.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid.

not heavily rewarded within academic systems.[12] Several reasons exist for this division of labor that tends to harm the career advancement of women faculty. First, female faculty are *asked more often* than their male colleagues to engage in service-related activities.[13] It is common practice within research-focused institutions for women faculty to be over-recruited for participation on university committees, especially at institutions where they are underrepresented and a diverse committee is sought.[14] Second, Pyke notes that women can be stereotyped as crucial, or *better-suited*, participants in caretaking duties that often involve a high degree of engagement with student advising and mentoring, as well as campus service.[15] Writing letters of recommendation and providing general educational and career advice are often hidden under the umbrella of teaching. Yet such advisory services can result in faculty members spending large amounts of time on work that is not as clearly rewarded within the tenure and promotion system.[16] Finally, in addition to being asked more often to do service work and being perceived as better caretakers, women faculty may *choose to accept more* campus service requests than men do because of commitments they hold to people such as colleagues, former students, or issues like diversity and inclusion.[17] By choosing to be engaged in campus service and teaching,

[12] Coleen Carrigan et al., "The gendered division of labor among STEM faculty and the effects of critical mass," *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 4, no. 3 (2011): 131; Albert N. Link et al. "A time allocation study of university faculty," *Economics of education review* 27, no. 4 (2008): 363–74; KerryAnn O'Meara et al., "Asked more often: Gender differences in faculty workload in research universities and the work interactions that shape them," *American Educational Research Journal* 54, no. 6 (2017): 1154–86; Sarah Winslow, "Gender inequality and time allocations among academic faculty," *Gender & Society* 24, no. 6 (2010): 769–93.

[13] O'Meara, "Asked more often"; O'Meara, "Whose problem is it?"; Shelley M. Park, "Research, teaching, and service: Why shouldn't women's work count?" *The Journal of Higher Education* 67, no. 1 (1996): 46–84; Karen Pyke, "Faculty gender inequity and the 'just say no to service' fairy tale," *Disrupting the culture of silence* (2015): 83–95.

[14] O'Meara, "Whose problem is it?"

[15] Pyke, "Faculty gender inequity."

[16] Misra et al., "The ivory ceiling of service work"; O'Meara, "Asked more often"; A. M. Padilla, "Research news and comment: Ethnic minority scholars; research, and mentoring: Current and future issues," *Educational Researcher* 23, no. 4 (1994): 24–27, https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x023004024; Caroline Sotello Viernes Turner, "Women of color in academe: Living with multiple marginality," *The Journal of Higher Education* 73, no. 1 (2002): 74–93.

[17] Kevin M. Eagan et al., "Engaging undergraduates in science research: Not just about faculty willingness," *Research in higher education* 52 (2011): 151–77; P. D. Umbach, "The contribution of faculty of color to undergraduate education," *Research in higher education* (2006): 317–45.

women faculty may find agency in these tasks, recognizing opportunities to advance issues in which they feel particularly invested.[18]

In addition to these interactional explanations for women's greater participation in campus service, there are also structural influences such as a faculty member's rank or discipline. Rank, for example, is largely influential on workload decisions. Because women faculty remain underrepresented at higher ranks, they may feel uncomfortable or vulnerable in declining to accept non-research-related work, especially if the request comes from a male colleague of a higher rank.[19] A faculty member's discipline will also directly impact the amount of service work faculty perform. Women faculty tend to be present in greater numbers in disciplines that are considered less prestigious and more feminine (e.g., social work, education, nursing),[20] which can then impact the kinds of work and tasks that women are asked to perform.[21] Even in disciplines where male faculty outnumber female faculty, such as the STEM fields, several studies indicate that male faculty members spend more time conducting research than do their female colleagues, while female faculty spend more time than their male peers on campus service work, teaching classes, and mentoring responsibilities.[22]

---

[18] Benjamin Baez, "Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe," *Higher Education* 39, no. 3 (2000): 363–91; O'Meara, "Asked more often"; C.A. Stanley, "Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly white colleges and universities," *American Educational Research Journal* 43, no. 4 (2006): 701–36, https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312043004701; Sotello, "Women of color in academe."

[19] O'Meara, "Asked more often"; William G. Tierney and Estela Mara Bensimon, *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe* (New York: Suny Press, 1996); Yonghong Jade Xu, "Faculty turnover: Discipline-specific attention is warranted," *Research in Higher Education* 49 (2008): 40–61.

[20] C. M. Cress and J. Hart, "Playing soccer on the football field: The persistence of gender inequities for women faculty," *Equity & Excellence in Education* 42, no. 4 (2009): 473–88, https://doi.org/10.1080/10665680903284523.

[21] Anthony Lising Antonio et al., "Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty," *The Review of Higher Education* 23, no. 4 (1997): 373–97; Judith Glazer-Raymo, "Taking stock: Perspectives on women and leadership in higher education in the UK and the US," *Society for Research into Higher Education News* 41 (1999): 8–10.

[22] Sharon Bird et al., "Creating status of women reports"; Albert N. Link et al., "A time allocation study of university faculty," *Economics of education review* 27, no. 4 (2008): 363–74; Misra et al., "The ivory ceiling of service work"; Sarah Winslow, "Gender inequality and time allocations among academic faculty," *Gender & Society* 24, no. 6 (2010): 769–93.

Decision-making

A review of the extant literatures describes several ways in which women faculty can experience biases within higher education institutions, given the conventional gender status and social roles that persist in academia.[23] Faculty members and university leaders who work within higher education institutions experience and communicate several different decision biases because of their environment. Facing the biases that stem from gender stereotypes and social roles, women faculty members confront an ongoing conflict between their roles as professors and leaders within their classrooms and departments, and the way students and colleagues view them. Even within departments and disciplines where female faculty tend to outnumber male faculty (e.g., education), masculine cultures may downplay the achievements of women and may question their success.[24] In this context, women faculty develop numerous means of responding to the gendered conditions they face.

The choices women make in this context, and the manners in which they choose to respond, are often non-confrontational. In a study of gender and education, Priola finds that women faculty and leaders within higher education institutions tend to downplay their feminine qualities, to "fit in" with the masculine nature and culture of their department and institution, and to avoid backlash.[25] Women in the study also report separating their personal and work identities, and even choosing not to provide emotional support or communal behavior to others, to maintain a sense of authority. The literature also provides insight into how women prevent, mitigate, or respond to stereotyping, typecasting, and gender-based harassment. Much of the literature refers to this process as "impression management" or self-presentation, whereby an individual attempts to impact or control others' perceptions or impressions of them.[26] A review of impression-management literature suggests that

[23] Laurie A. Rudman and Julie E. Phelan, "Backlash effects for disconfirming gender stereotypes in organizations," *Research in organizational behavior* 28 (2008): 61–79.

[24] Vincenza Priola, "Being female doing gender. Narratives of women in education management," *Gender and Education* 19, no. 1 (2007): 21–40.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Erving Goffman, "The moral career of the mental patient," *Psychiatry* 22, no. 2 (1959): 123–42; Edward E. Jones, *Interpersonal perception* (New York: W. H. Freeman & Co, 1990); P. Rosenfeld et al., "Impression management," in *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Management: Organizational Behavior*, ed. N. Nicholson, P. G. Audia, and M. Pillutla, 2nd edition (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), 163–65.

men and women use different self-presentation and backlash-avoidance techniques, closely following their assigned social roles.[27]

Context of a Small, Catholic, Liberal Arts Institution

While extensive social science research has explored how social roles and gender stereotypes influence gender discrepancies in campus service work within higher education, little research has considered this phenomenon within the context of a small, Catholic, liberal arts institution. Service work, especially service to those less fortunate within society, plays an important role in Catholic Social Teaching, within Catholic higher education, and even in many Catholic university mission statements.[28] The existing gap in the literature provided an opportunity for this study not only to contribute to the research on gender trends in faculty campus service work, gender stereotypes, and social roles, but also to provide insight into campus service work decisions made by faculty members within this Catholic institutional context.

Much of the literature examining faculty members at Catholic higher education institutions centers on Catholic institutional identity and the role faculty play in shaping institutional identity.[29] Zech, in a study of Catholic faculty at 207 Catholic institutions in the United States, found that faculty members at Catholic liberal arts institutions most strongly identified with their school's Catholic mission, while faculty at Catholic research universities perceived the least connection between their own work and the university mission.[30] While literature concerning Catholic faculty members does briefly examine

[27] Rosanna E. Guadagno and Robert B. Cialdini, "Gender differences in impression management in organizations: a qualitative review," *Sex Roles* 56 (2007): 483–94.

[28] Joseph Ferrari and Patrick Janulis, "Embracing the mission: Catholic and non-Catholic faculty and staff perceptions of institutional mission and school sense of community," *Journal of Catholic Higher Education* 28, no. 2 (2009): 115–24; Michael Rizzi, "Defining Catholic Higher Education in Positive, Not Negative, Terms," *Journal of Catholic Education* 22, no. 2 (2019): 1.

[29] John Langan, "Reforging Catholic identity," *Commonweal* 127, no. 8 (2000): 20–23; W. D. Miscamble, "The Faculty Problem. How can faculty identity be preserved?" *American Magazine* (2007), http://www.americamagazine.org/content/article.cfm?article_id=10176; D. Paul Sullins, "The difference Catholic makes: Catholic faculty and Catholic identity," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 43, no. 1 (2004): 83–101.

[30] Charles Zech, "The Faculty and Catholic Institutional Identity," *America* 180, no. 18 (1999): 11–15.

hiring decisions of faculty at Catholic institutions,[31] it fails to explore the "why" behind the decisions faculty members make and does not account for gender differences.

Social and professional interaction and support may differ for faculty members at a small, Catholic liberal arts institution compared to a larger, research-focused university. Studies suggest, for example, that men derive greater satisfaction from academic internal support (e.g., support via department policies or procedures such as research production, which can aid in tenure) which may be more common at research-focused universities—while women feel more satisfied with relational internal support (e.g., support from colleagues, students, or positive interactions, such as mentoring students or colleagues).[32] Kelly and Fetridge also note that assistant women professors feel that better relationships with students contribute to their satisfaction, even though these relationships also create tensions regarding how best to spend their time while working to obtain tenure.[33] Relational questions of this sort can be particularly prominent in a small university setting.

Methodology

We conducted a single case study of one higher education institution, under the pseudonym of Midwest Catholic College (MWCC). To protect the confidentiality of both the institution and the participants, we shall refer to the institution as MWCC throughout the paper, never revealing the institution's true name. The unit of analysis was twenty-one men and women faculty members. We used purposeful snowball sampling to identify participants. Purposeful sampling is used in qualitative research when the researchers are intentional with their selection of participants based on their particular knowledge or experience with the empirical inquiry.[34] Snowball sampling is a recruitment technique used when researchers access participants

[31] Langan, "Reforging Catholic identity"; Miscamble, "The Faculty Problem"; Sullins, "The difference Catholic makes."

[32] Chantal van Esch et al., "The role of qualifications and perceived riskiness on selection: Gendered implications for leadership," *Dismantling Bias Conference Series* 1, no. 6 (2016): 3.

[33] Bridget Turner Kelly and Jessica S. Fetridge, "The role of students in the experience of women faculty on the tenure track," *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education* 5, no. 1 (2012): 22–45.

[34] Rebecca S. Robinson, "Purposive sampling," in *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-being Research*, ed. Alex C. Michalos (Dordrecht: Springer, 2014).

Table X. ***Participant Demographics***

Pseudonym	Gender	Rank	Discipline	Race	Admin?
Erin	Woman	Full	Non-STEM	White	Yes
Steve	Man	Full	Non-STEM	White	No
Kendra	Woman	Assistant	STEM	White	No
Mark	Man	Associate	Non-STEM	White	Yes
Connie	Woman	Associate	STEM	White	Yes
Jane	Woman	Full	Non-STEM	White	No
Janet	Woman	Associate	STEM	White	No
Lynn	Woman	Associate	Non-STEM	White	Yes
Betty	Woman	Assistant	Non-STEM	White	No
Rachel	Woman	Assistant	STEM	White	No
Ingrid	Woman	Assistant	Non-STEM	White	No
Tammy	Woman	Full	Non-STEM	White	No
Lindsay	Woman	Full	Non-STEM	White	Yes
Wilma	Woman	Assistant	Non-STEM	White	No
Greg	Man	Full	STEM	White	Yes
Doug	Man	Assistant	Non-STEM	White	No
Patrick	Man	Full	Non-STEM	White	No
Austin	Man	Assistant	STEM	White	No
Cora	Woman	Associate	STEM	White	No
Marissa	Woman	Assistant	Non-STEM	White	No
Lauren	Woman	Associate	Non-STEM	White	No

Note: An Administrative position is described as a leadership position at MWCC. This could include several different positions, e.g., department chair, dean, associate dean, provost, or associate provost. STEM stands for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics and refers to any subjects that fall under these four disciplines. Non-STEM fields include humanities, social sciences and professional studies.

through contact information that is provided by other participants.[35] Purposeful sampling was used to select participants who were "information rich" and who best provided a connection to the phenomenon of study, and to ensure the inclusion of distinct types of faculty members across gender, career status (rank), and discipline. Additionally, we used snowball sampling to identify participants who met the desired criteria, starting with the initial respondents and having these participants refer additional participants to us.[36] Table X includes a description of participants.

[35] Chaim Noy, "Sampling knowledge: The hermeneutics of snowball sampling in qualitative research," *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 11, no. 4 (2008): 327–44.

[36] Sharan B. Merriam, *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education. Revised and Expanded from Case Study Research in Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 2009).

Data Sources

A key component of a case study design is the use of several different data sources which can be triangulated to help validate a study.[37] We utilized interviews and document analysis as the data sources for this study, along with key artifacts such as tenure and promotion documents and participant CV's.

Semi-structured virtual interviews were conducted on a one-on-one basis with all twenty-one faculty members for a total of twenty-four hours between November 2020 and January 2021. Interviews were audio-recorded and detailed notes were taken. Immediately after each interview, memos were developed, and interviews were fully transcribed.

As part of this study's document analysis, participants' curricula vitae (CV) were reviewed, along with numerous MWCC documents: campus service guidelines; individual department mission statements and teaching criteria; mission and service statements; Nuns of Compassion heritage document; faculty scholar awards; faculty rank and credential documents; Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion statement; and tenure and promotion guidelines within MWCC departments. A total of fifty MWCC and participant documents were collected.

Data Analysis

Interviews and documents were hand-coded, and data were analyzed on an iterative basis through reviewing, re-organizing, and revising the coding structure while also evaluating transcripts and institutional documents several times and keeping revised or new codes in mind.[38] The findings of this study were identified through both inductive and deductive coding. Analysis of findings for both interviews and documents were theory-, concept-, and data-driven.[39] The Stereotype Content Model,[40]

[37] Robert E. Stake, *The Art of Case Study Research* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1995); Yin, "Doing case study research."

[38] Yin, "Doing case study research."

[39] Steinar Kvale, "The 1,000-page question," *Qualitative inquiry*, 2, no. 3 (1996): 275–84; Johnny Saldaña, *Ethnotheatre: Research from page to stage* (London: Routledge, 2016); Yin, "Doing case study research."

[40] J. Xu et al., "A Model of (Often Mixed) Stereotype Content: Competence and Warmth Respectively Follow From Perceived Status and Competition," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 82 (2002): 878–902.

Social Role Theory,[41] and March's Decision Theory[42] guided this study and informed the first viewing of interview transcripts, as well as document analysis. Inductive, data-driven coding analysis helped capture participant decisions that were not related to the study's guiding theoretical frameworks.[43] All codes from the participants, documents and artifact analysis were assembled into different codebooks.

Validity and Credibility

This research study employed various processes meant to ensure that the study met the established common standards for rigor and credibility. When engaging in thematic member checks,[44] interview participants were provided with a summary of the interview's key points once the interview was completed. The interviewer sought out periodic peer review from three different colleagues, which included sharing the interview transcripts, data, findings and codebook. Finally, data were triangulated from several different sources: in-depth interviews, document analysis, and key artifacts. Triangulation was crucial to both the study's credibility and to the mitigation of any biases.

Ethical Design and Trustworthiness

We took several steps to establish an ethical design that would not only maximize credibility and validity from a research standpoint but would also maximize trustworthiness in relation to the study's participants. This included maintaining a careful chain of evidence, carefully documenting the research process, and obtaining informed, written consent from all study participants. Participants were provided with the option of declining participation and removing themselves from the study at any time. Participants were allowed to make comments that are "off

[41] A. H. Eagly, *Sex Differences in Social Behavior: A Social-Role Interpretation* (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1987).

[42] James G. March, *Primer on decision making: How decisions happen* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994).

[43] Saldaña, *Ethnotheatre*.

[44] Member checking, also known as participant or respondent validation, is a technique for exploring the credibility of results in qualitative research. Participants are asked, either during or after the completion of a study, to check results for accuracy and resonance with their experiences. The overall goal of this process is to provide findings that are reliable both as to data and the interpretation of data.

the record," and these statements did not appear in the study's findings. Participants were also given the option to decline to be audio-recorded, although none chose to do so. Finally, all data were stored within a password protected computer, which served as the case study database. In these and other ways, trust was maintained and established through a prolonged engagement with the institution and the participants over the course of several months.

The Impact of Covid-19

We must briefly acknowledge the impact of the COVID-19 global pandemic on the study and its methodological approach. This study was conceptualized in August of 2019, several months before the pandemic began. We had planned to use a research site that would allow us to interview participants in person. However, by the time we were granted IRB (Institutional Review Board) permission to begin interviewing participants in the fall of 2020, severe research restrictions were in place and data collection was forced to be conducted online. Although interview protocol was not altered due to COVID-19, the entirely virtual format allowed us to expand our research site outreach to different geographic areas across the country, and ultimately to MWCC. Whenever applicable, we note any instances in which the pandemic impacted participants and results, for example, changes to campus service guidelines due to COVID-19.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The Stereotype Content Model (SCM) suggests that people are evaluated along the competing dimensions of warmth and competence.[45] Social Role Theory (SRT) suggests that there are conventional roles for men and women and that veering from those roles can have negative social consequences.[46] Women faculty face numerous biases because of these tendencies, including harassment, inequitable evaluations, and typecasting, often responding by trying to "fit in."

The theoretical frameworks of SCM and SRT offer a useful foundation for the specific context of service work by women faculty. Men tend to be assigned agentic roles compatible with leadership and with

[45] Xu, "A Model of (Often Mixed) Stereotype Content."
[46] Eagly, "Sex Differences in Social Behavior."

competence in academia's most noteworthy component, research. Women, meanwhile, are expected to conform to norms of caretaking and displaying greater warmth. This creates both structural expectations and social pressures for women to do disproportionate shares of service within academic departments and institutions. These theoretical frameworks can provide important insights into how female (and secondarily male) faculty make campus service decisions.

To understand the decision-making processes of faculty members as they pertain to social roles and gender stereotypes in a distinctive institutional context, we introduced the two modes of individual decision-making that March describes: rational-choice and rule-following.[47] We then noted in the following section how each of these approaches might apply in the context of campus service work at a small, Catholic, liberal arts institution.

Importantly, these decision-making logics are usually adopted intuitively by decision-makers: some individuals may be more prone to use one rather than the other, but typically individuals alternate between them not with intention but rather as a subconscious reaction to opportunities, constraints, and pressures. They are also fluid, and many decisions draw to some degree on both rational-choice and rule-following logics. Nevertheless, for the purpose of clarity, they were each described as a discrete motivation, per March's baseline characterization.[48]

Rational Choice

Individuals who utilize a rational-choice approach when making decisions follow post-positivist principles, wherein individuals seek as much relevant information as possible, seek to understand the information to the best of their ability, and then work to identify one single best decision. March notes that rational-choice decisions follow a logic of consequence, which identifies four questions:[49]

1. *The question of alternatives*: What actions are possible?
2. *The question of expectations*: What future consequences might follow from each alternative, and how likely is each possible consequence, assuming a particular option is chosen?
3. *The question of preferences*: How valuable (in the mind of the

[47] March, *Primer on decision making,* 57.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Ibid., 2–3.

decision-maker) are the consequences associated with each of the alternatives?
4. *The question of the decision rule*: How is a choice to be made among alternatives in terms of the value of their consequences?

Decision-makers recognize that imperfect information can undermine a rational-choice approach. Put another way, decision-makers acknowledge that decisions involve risk, and they typically try to factor that risk into their decision.

Rule-Following

March identifies rule-following as a second component in decision-making, which complements the rational-choice approach. To describe rule-following, March states: "When individuals fulfill identities, they follow rules or procedures that they see as appropriate to the situation in which they find themselves."[50] In other words, March ascertains that when individuals operate within a given context, they are keenly aware of the norms of membership or belonging associated with that milieu. Unlike the rational-choice approach, which is guided from a logic of consequence, individuals who utilize the rule-following approach do so from a logic of appropriateness. March makes the case that rule-following individuals ask three questions when facing a decision:

1. *A question of recognition*: "What kind of situation is this?"
2. *A question of identity*: "What kind of person am I? Or what kind of organization is this?"
3. *A question of rules*: "What does a person such as I, or an organization such as this, do in a situation like this?"

Identity and role at the individual level are closely tied to individuals' subjective understandings of both themselves and their expectations (i.e., rule-guiding actions and behavior). Different individuals, possibly in alignment with their social and gender roles, embody different roles, and can embody multiple roles within different social contexts.

MWCC's Institutional Context: The Catholic Mission

Although there are several distinctive characteristics of MWCC, perhaps what makes MWCC most distinctive is its mission. The campus

[50] Ibid. 57.

mission statement affirms that the university operates according to a culture of service and care to others, with a particular emphasis on serving those outside of the campus community. Throughout the mission statement, MWCC consistently emphasizes an ethic of care and a heart of service at the core of everything the university strives for and prioritizes. Indeed, service-learning and community service is heavily emphasized in MWCC course curricula, and many faculty members stated that they incorporated service-learning components into their classes, to demonstrate to students that they can be part of something bigger than themselves and their own careers. Faculty at MWCC define service-learning as helping students engage with the content of their courses by creating opportunities for them to serve and interact with community-based organizations, K-12 schools, and regional non-profits.

The institutional mission statement is crucial to the university's identity and service-centered culture, which is grounded in the teachings and values of the Nuns of Compassion and the school's Catholic identity. The MWCC mission statement outlines not only its desire to help students achieve academic excellence, but also explicitly mentions the values of service, respect, and concern for others inside and outside of the campus community, which are all in alignment with Catholic social and intellectual teaching. In fact, there is a special campus office dedicated to fostering and furthering the MWCC mission, which works closely with departments and committees on campus to create new service-learning and community service initiatives, as well as awareness of mission-related issues and Church teachings among students, faculty, and staff. Consistent with the campus mission statement, the guidance of the Nuns of Compassion, and Catholic Social Teaching more generally, MWCC has a strong and robust service-learning program for students, where faculty lead students into the greater community to work on community projects for course credit. This allows students to participate in service work that engages them in the MWCC mission of providing service and care to others.

FINDINGS

The research question that guides this study is: *How do gender stereotypes, social expectations, and institutional context independently and/or in interaction influence faculty members' campus service decisions in a small, Catholic, liberal arts institution?* From the data, three different themes stood out in interviews with faculty: 1) partially gender-sensitive campus service expectations and experiences, 2) the influence

of students and student expectations on faculty campus service, and 3) how faculty members' own personal values and choices influenced campus service and campus service recognition.

Because of the integrated nature of the faculty role within this student-centered institution, participants largely described campus service and service to students together. As such, the findings will be inclusive of those teaching and mentor roles when the participants framed them as campus service work.

Faculty Expectations and Experiences

Women participants who provided copies of their CV's engaged in an average of 5.9 campus service activities during the 2020-21 academic year and an average of nineteen campus service activities over the course of their careers. Men respondents, conversely, served in an average of 1.5 campus service activities during the 2020-21 academic year and an average of thirteen over the course of their careers.

A small number of faculty participants, four of the twenty-one, noted that women were often performing more service work on committees than their male counterparts and that women sometimes face differing service expectations. For example, a male faculty member named Mark—who is a full professor, holds a leadership position on campus, and serves in one campus service role currently—indicated that there are instances where he is one of the few men on a committee full of women. Mark shared this:

> There are committees that I serve on, where I'm the only man in the room. And it's hard to know what to make of that. But it is odd, you know, on some of the committees where I do look around and find that I am the only guy in here, and I ask myself, "How did that happen?" So, I don't really know what might be going on that I could be conscious of, even in my own choices (about committee work). I don't know how to connect it specifically, though I worry about falling into stereotypes. There are times those committees, like the assessment, or the curriculum committee, where sometimes if you're kind of going by gender stereotypes, you might think that there are these social roles that women on the faculty feel obligated to take on. Because these committees are a lot of work. And there's not a great deal of reward there [on those committees]. You know, it's not research work, which some people would say has greater prestige tied to it.

Furthermore, Connie—a former STEM faculty member, with nineteen total campus service positions on her CV, who now holds a

senior-level campus leadership position—said she recognizes that women faculty at MWCC take on a large share of the committee work and specifically leadership roles within committees. Connie stated, "We [the senior leadership team at MWCC] have talked about noticing that when we're sitting on committees, a lot of times it's the women that are in the room and it is women that are taking the lead on committee assignments."

Influence of Students and Student Expectations

Faculty members' service decisions were sometimes influenced by student expectations, as MWCC is strongly student-centered and serves as a Primary Undergraduate Institution (PUI). However, the institutional culture played an important role in this backdrop, as all faculty participants were very aware of MWCC's strong emphasis on teaching and the expectations students would have of them when they joined the faculty and chose this kind of institutional culture. The MWCC document "Description of Teaching Effectiveness" guides faculty on MWCC expectations for classroom teaching, specifically related to mastery of content, teaching strategies, course organization, characteristics of classroom presence, and support outside the classroom. In faculty interviews, most participants described routinely going "above and beyond" for their students, which is emphasized and encouraged by MWCC and the institution's student-centered culture.

Considering MWCC's extremely high teaching standards and student-centered culture, two women participants specifically wondered if their identity as women affected students' perceptions of them, particularly in terms of whether students allowed gender stereotypes and social roles to affect their interactions and the kind of requests they made. Kendra, a junior faculty member who currently serves in ten campus service roles, stated that she is aware of the literature on women faculty, social and gender roles, and student evaluations. She had already given some thought to whether her gender is a factor in how her students view her, which kinds of requests they make, and how she ends up spending a large portion of her work time. When asked if her identity as a woman had ever influenced her campus service decisions, Kendra stated:

> I guess I would say, well, it's getting into perception versus reality territory. But I obviously know the literature on women and emotional labor. And I would say that's a strong factor. That's a perceived strong factor for me. And I guess it's hard to tease out how much of it is people's perception of me as a

> female faculty member, like, surrogate mother kind of territory, and how it could be perceived that I would be more helpful or nice or gentle or whatever, as compared to my male colleagues. But I do think that I get a lot more student requests. I wouldn't say that it affected things like committee service, but I think that it strongly affected how many students approached me for help with things. And I guess I didn't really talk about it much, but in a normal semester, a really large component of my service is helping students with things. I help a lot of students with mock interviews, writing letters of recommendation, advising students on different projects, meeting with students on campus that require logistics. And so, it's that kind of stuff that I think I spend a lot of time doing, like the personal advice and that kind of stuff. And I assume that there's probably a gendered component there. Like I've written seven students' letters of rec, which I think is high, considering I've been at the institution for only a few years.

While the comments made by women faculty did not suggest that they perceived being intentionally taken advantage of or viewed with less respect by students, yet there was some sense that students tended to turn to women faculty more frequently than male colleagues, which created an added service burden. No male faculty members raised the issue of students turning to their women colleagues more often, and this finding is thus consistent with Acker's description of the gendered university, in that those individuals who are privileged are often unaware of the constraint placed on other individuals.[51]

Finally, although there was evidence that student expectations do shape the experiences of women faculty to some degree, as Kendra noted in her comment above, a commitment to student service was common to both men and women faculty, most of whom expressed a desire to excel at teaching above all else in their faculty positions. Both men and women faculty members expressed great pleasure in seeing their students grow during their time at MWCC and esteemed student well-being and their desire to help students as significant determinants in their campus service decisions as well as in the concrete work they were agreeing to accept.

Personal Commitment

MWCC faculty also chose campus service work out of a personal commitment to service and to issues of equity. While a small number of women participants described harmful experiences with gender

[51] J. Acker, "Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations," *Gender & society* 4, no. 2 (1990): 139–158. https://doi.org/10.1177/089124390004002002.

stereotypes and social roles, all twenty-one participants flatly stated that they consider themselves very well supported by MWCC, and that they choose to make decisions in alignment with their own personal values of being helpful, kind, and supportive to others. During in-depth interviews, participants were asked how they made campus service decisions, not whether they intended to provide help or support to others through their campus service decision-making. However, most participants chose to frame their answers through the lens of accepting campus service work requests because they wanted to be "helpful," "kind," and "supportive" to others. In fact, the words "helpful," "kind," and "supportive" appeared 251 times in the twenty-one interview transcripts. Whereas we had asked participants to explain *how* they made campus service decisions, they essentially answered by saying *who* they are as faculty members and what the MWCC institution values and expects. Put another way, their answers collectively indicated that campus service is what faculty at MWCC do. They engage in campus service work for the same reason they do everything else, because they care, and they understand their role both as individuals and as faculty at MWCC in a supportive and helpful campus environment.

The overall data from interviews, participant CVs, and document analysis paint a picture of both women and men faculty participants at MWCC viewing service work as an opportunity to advance their personal priorities, as well as the priorities of the institution, rather than as a burden to their careers. A minority of women participants did note that they sometimes sense they take on additional service because of gender expectations. There is also some imbalance in the share of women rewarded with the rank of full professor (lower than men) and in those serving in administrative leadership roles (higher than men); if the latter are perceived as caretaker duties, conventional social roles for women could be having a subtle effect on decisions around service at MWCC. Nevertheless, the evidence tilts generally in the direction of faculty members of both genders choosing to prioritize service because it is consistent with their values, interests, and the reason they are at MWCC. Furthermore, because MWCC faculty members believe in the mission of the institution, there tends to be greater alignment between their personal interests, institutional expectations, and service to the institution and to others, both inside and outside the campus community.

A caveat to the data presented is that at MWCC, campus service was generally characterized as any task outside of teaching and research, which can include hundreds of different activities, some of

them undertaken in an informal manner. As such, it was nearly impossible to quantify the investment in campus service that faculty members at MWCC made, particularly because some campus service activities were more time consuming and demanding than others. Faculty members at MWCC largely viewed campus service work at MWCC as part of their whole faculty position and in many instances synonymous with why they chose to become faculty at this institution. The institutional context plays a significant role in this regard, so the next section examines how the institutional culture of MWCC affects service decision-making.

IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY AND PRACTICE

Recognition of the Institutional Context

Findings from this study underscore the importance of understanding gender stereotypes and social roles against the backdrop of institutional context and culture. Gender stereotyping, as it is conventionally understood, certainly existed in the MWCC context. However, this study suggests that while gender stereotypes and social roles are present, the institutional context of a university—or, in a more general sense, an office environment or any setting where men and women colleagues work together—has critical implications for how men and women engage, reform, or enact these roles, and how they are perceived by one another.[52] For example, in the MWCC context, it was common that both men and women engaged in campus service work and made campus service decisions that provided help to others. One participant, Mark, noted that to "take the burden off women and be helpful to my women colleagues" he would offer to take minutes and notes during committee meetings, since Mark was cognizant that "women are typically tasked with taking notes

[52] Suzette Caleo and Madeline E. Heilman. "Gender stereotypes and their implications for women's career progress," in *Handbook of research on promoting women's careers*, ed. Susan Vinnicombe et al. (Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2013); Alice H. Eagly and Steven J. Karau, "Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders," *Psychological review* 109, no. 3 (2002): 573; Madeline E. Heilman, "Gender stereotypes and workplace bias," *Research in organizational Behavior* 32 (2012): 113–35; M. E. Heilman and E. J. Parks-Stamm, "Gender stereotypes in the workplace: Obstacles to women's career progress," in *Social Psychology of Gender,* ed. S. J. Correll (Leeds: Emerald Group Publishing, 2007), 47–77, https://doi.org/10.1016/s0882-6145(07)24003-2; Anne M. Koenig et al., "Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms," *Psychological bulletin* 137, no. 4 (2011): 616.

in meetings—that kind of work is associated with secretaries, who are typically women." Mark believed the MWCC culture and environment was welcoming and supportive of male faculty helping others, especially their colleagues. In a different institutional setting and context, say an engineering department at a research-intensive university, it is likely that a committee would be primarily made up of men and this concept of "helping" might not be emphasized. However, it is also important to note that the entire concept of "helping the women faculty" is itself gendered as it recognizes and almost cements the idea that the note-taking work would normally be the "work" of women, which men are now "helping with." Thus, it is important to discuss the enactment of gender roles in deep interplay with localized contexts.

Hiring and Faculty Fit

This study was situated at a small, Catholic, liberal arts institution that maintains a particularly distinctive mission and culture for faculty, staff, and students. MWCC is guided by principles from the Nuns of Compassion, and participants within this study spoke of faculty needing to "fit" within the institutional norms and culture, especially regarding service work, to be successful at MWCC. Given that other Catholic institutions around the United States also hold distinctive sets of values, missions, and institutional cultures compared to secular higher education institutions, it is important for leaders of Catholic institutions to recognize that fitting in (even for those faculty who identify as Catholic) may not be simple for the faculty hired to work at those institutions.[53]

Faculty fit—in any institution, Catholic or not—is often cerebral, relational, scholastic, and deeply tied to the vocational landscape of academic training, which typically involves doctoral training conducted at large, research-intensive universities where publication output is stressed above all else.[54] As a result, while some faculty may indeed seek out opportunities to work at a campus like MWCC because they have a good sense of their own priorities and strengths and are seeking

[53] Don Briel, "Mission and Identity: The Role of Faculty," *Journal of Catholic Higher Education* 31, no. 2 (2012): 169–79; Rich Whitney and Mark Laboe, "Grounding Student Affairs in a Catholic Charism: The Journey of One Faculty Member in Connecting Curriculum with Mission," *Journal of Catholic Education* 18, no. 1 (2014): n1.

[54] Jessica Bennett, *Narratives of fit: Understanding women faculty stories of making sense and finding place in gendered organizations* (PhD diss., University of Maryland College Park, 2017), 250.

a more integrated faculty role, it is likely that this would not be true for all faculty. Some may learn of the culture and the integrated faculty role only later, in the course of their employment, while others may view the culture as an imperfect fit for their priorities and strengths but may accept it as a condition of remaining in good standing. It is difficult to ascertain when faculty fit is natural versus when it is accepted out of necessity for academic employment. As such, it is important that leaders of institutions with strong missions and cultures reflect on what they gain and lose from requiring such strong alignment between faculty interests and culture. Faculty members can contribute meaningfully and valuably even if they do not themselves value all aspects of a university's culture.

An additional point related to policy and practice concerning faculty fit is that assessments of fit within Catholic institutions, especially at the hiring phase, may perpetuate a homogeneous faculty type that could potentially have negative effects on faculty diversity. For example, if the ideal fit is viewed as a white woman in her early 50's who is perceived as helpful, "nurturing," and interested in performing large amounts of campus and community service, hiring committees may easily read agentic or individualistic characteristics as an incorrect fit, even if the individual is committed to the service mission and expected activities within the institution. Thus, too much of an emphasis on proper fit could result in a narrow and discriminatory hiring approach. Hiring committees may also justify passing over BIPOC candidates on the grounds that they would feel overburdened by service demands, as the literature suggests is often the case.[55] Interest in campus and community service work should not be used as a vehicle to discriminate against faculty,[56] and Catholic institutions and their hiring committees must thus work hard to ensure that commitment to the campus community is not used as a code for whiteness or used in other discriminatory ways. In other words, the mission and fit need to be flexible enough to get the right faculty without excluding a diverse and talented group who may help the mission or "fit" evolve to be more expansive in important ways.

[55] D. M. Britton, "The epistemology of the gendered organization. *Gender & Society*, 14, no. 3 (2017): 418–34; Misra et al., "The ivory ceiling of service work," 22–26; A. J. Stewart V. Valian, *An inclusive academy: Achieving diversity and excellence* (Boston: Mit Press, 2018).

[56] Cassandra M. Guarino and Victor MH Borden, "Faculty service loads and gender: Are women taking care of the academic family?" *Research in higher education* 58, no. 6 (2017): 672–94.

Mechanisms to Ensure Equity and Balance within Campus Service Work

There are multiple ways in which departments and institutions can ensure that campus service work is equitable among faculty. Bohnet endorses growing transparency through information dialogue as an answer for improving gender equity and mitigating biases, as well as ensuring women and BIPOC faculty members are not shouldering more than their fair share of this labor.[57] Data can be a powerful tool for awareness, and departments may wish to use time diaries,[58] campus service dashboards, and faculty work activity reports to identify patterns, discrepancies, and allocations of time use in order to assess and determine any gender or race differences in campus service workloads.[59] Studies have suggested that the use of time diaries help faculty identify where they are spending most of their work time and thus identify "time saboteurs," which can help nudge the faculty and their departments into making choices that may produce more equity in campus service work. Campus service dashboards—where campus service activities are recorded anonymously but which identify department, race, and gender—could create new understandings and collective ownership of campus service work, while also helping to foster an environment of accountability for fair service assignments and newly agreed upon cycles of key campus service roles.[60] Beyond department leadership, faculty themselves can also reflect on their own level of service loads: What type of service am I mostly involved in? How does the time commitment of this service compare to other types of service? Is there an area where I could be doing more or am interested in doing more? Do I see more women and BIPOC faculty typically engaged in these roles?

CONCLUSION

In this study, we examined how gender stereotypes, social roles, and institutional context influenced faculty members' decisions around campus service work at a Catholic liberal arts institution. Overall, results from interviews, document analysis, and key artifacts showed that

[57] Iris Bohnet, *What works* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2016).

[58] Dawn Culpepper et al., "Who gets to have a life? Agency in work-life balance for single faculty," *Equity & Excellence in Education* 53, no. 4 (2020): 531–50.

[59] Guarino, "Faculty service loads and gender," 672–94.

[60] Culpepper, "Who gets to have a life?" 531–50.

participants embraced and were committed to campus service work inside of an institution where the mission of the university largely centered around service and wherein campus service was broadly defined. Indeed, campus service work was part of an integrated role for faculty members at MWCC. The findings from this study demonstrate that there are different ways of making decisions about campus service work, while highlighting the fact that contextual factors, such as gender-related norms and institutional priorities, can often influence these decisions. In sum, this study expanded on the understanding of decision-making regarding campus service, an area which often goes ignored in the literature. By focusing on campus service decisions among twenty-one study participants within a single Catholic liberal arts institution, this study makes contributions to knowledge about how gendered institutions, gender stereotypes, social roles, and Catholic higher education values all contribute to campus service decisions. It is our hope that this research will add depth and nuance to the literature regarding campus service work, as we know women tend to bear the brunt of this type of emotional and physical labor. Moreover, it is our desire that other small institutions with distinctive missions and institutional contexts will benefit from it to consider the ways in which their faculty members engage in campus service decisions and activities, so that they might place an emphasis on creating equitable and supportive environments where there is alignment between faculty priorities, institutional culture, and systems of reward and recognition.