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ABSTRACT

GENDER PERFORMATIVITY IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: A CASE STUDY OF FEMALE BACKLINE CLASSIFIED STAFF

Samantha Rose Powers
Old Dominion University, 2012
Chair: Dr. Danica Hays

This case study explored the gendered performances of five female backline classified staff members who work in non-traditional fields within a community college. More specifically, this study defined gendered behaviors at a community college, and explored how these behaviors have affected the identities of women working in non-traditional fields at the community college. This study indicated through documents, observations, and interviews that there was mixed evidence of the degree to which gendered behavior is cultivated at a community college in Washington. Document review, interview, and observation findings showed that women at the community college reported expectations of gendered behavior, gender normative reinforcement, resistance to claiming feminine traits, skills in navigating various roles, and an evolution of women's roles.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The first chapter of this study presented seven areas to orient the reader. First, the researcher introduced the background of the study. Then the researcher stated the problem and defined the terms used throughout the rest of the study. Next, the researcher described the significance and purpose of the study. The researcher then stated the research questions that guided the study. Finally, the researcher presented a brief overview of the methodology used in the study.

The National Center for Education Statistics (2009) designated 61% of community college employees who worked in degree-granting institutions in the United States as “non-instructional staff.” Of this group, 58% were women filling positions from accountants to maintenance personnel to advisors to leaders (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). These positions comprise the classified staff workforce, which is divided into two basic categories: the “front line” classified staff members who interact with students on a daily basis (Bauer, 2000) and the "backline" classified staff members who do not. Backline classified staff members such as security guards, information technology technicians, and custodians keep college processes running smoothly, often out of the public’s view. Many of these backline workers are in “non-traditional” jobs, which, for women, are defined as jobs where the majority of the people working in them are men (U.S. Department of Labor, 2008).

Very few empirical studies have examined individuals who hold non-traditional jobs at the community college. How might gender play a role in work performance, particularly when one works in a field in which the majority of the other workers are of
the opposite gender? Gender performativity is the repetitive practice of speaking, acting, and expressing oneself according to socially accepted practices for a particular gender (Butler, 1990). Research suggests that gender roles affect job performances of employees within the community college (Lester, 2008; Rhoads & Tedrow, 1999). Thus, job performances become gendered performances that change from one professional role to another. Women in male-dominated fields often have certain gender roles that affect their job performances (Lester, 2008). Understanding how a woman's gender role influences job performance may be useful when conceptualizing and responding to organizational culture (Ayers, 2005; Stringer, 2002). Organizational culture could directly impact the job satisfaction and job performance of women within the community college, which can also affect the organizational culture (Allen, 2001; Luthans & Youssef, 2007; Zhang & Zheng, 2009).

**Background**

**Women in Community Colleges**

There is no doubt that the presence of female students and employees in higher education has increased over the last few decades. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2004), in 1971 women comprised 42% of undergraduate students, as compared to 56% of undergraduates in 2004. With this increase in the number of female students, it may be important to understand how women perceive the culture of higher education. Over the past few decades, research has shown various ways in which female students, staff, and faculty view and perform gender in higher education (Acker, 1990; Bailyn, 2003; Benschop & Brouns, 2003; Clark, 1972; Finklestein, 1984; Frye, 1995; Probert, 2005; Toutkoushian & Conley, 2005; Twombly, 1999). However, the number of
research studies devoted to female employees is unrepresentative of the population composition of the community college.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2009), women comprise 54% of the total number of employees working at degree-granting higher education institutions and 61% of the total U.S. classified staff workforce. Previous research has explored how female leaders view and perform leadership in higher education as well as their impact on the academy (Amey & Twombly, 1992; Belle, 2002; DiCroce, 1995; Jablonski, 1996; Kezar, 2000; Olsson, 2002; Piland & Giles, 1998; Singh, Kumra, & Vinnicombe, 2002; Slaughter, 1993; Vaughan, 1989). Still other research has addressed how female students learn and express themselves in the classroom (Bryant, 2001; Centrie & Weis, 2002; Harper & Sax, 2007). A considerable amount of literature has studied women faculty members in higher education, separated into various aspects of the faculty role within higher education. For instance, studies have been devoted to student evaluations of female faculty members and their performances in the classroom (Baker & Copp, 1997; Martin, 1984). In addition, research has explored female faculty (part-time and full-time) members’ careers, supervisor evaluations, tenure tracks, career advancement opportunities, and salaries in comparison to their male counterparts (Armenti, 2004; Bellas, 1997; Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998; Harper, Baldwin, Gansneder, & Chronister, 2001; Menges & Exum, 1983; Palmer, 1999; Perna, 2001; Perna, 2002; Winkler, 2000). Faculty satisfaction with and perceptions of the community college and their roles within it have been extensively studied both qualitatively and quantitatively (Acker & Feuerverger, 1996; Clark, 1998; Hagedorn & Laden, 2002; Riger, Stokes, Raja, & Sullivan, 1997; Townsend, 1998). The socialization and
assimilation of new female faculty members has been observed as well (Dallimore, 2003; Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998). Naturally, this would inspire some to study how the assimilation of new faculty members might affect their performance (Boice, 1993; Lease, 1999). Classified staff members, however, have only recently been studied. Duggan (2008) looked at classified staff perceptions of the community college culture, using peer support, supervisory support, and organizational support as measures of culture.

Lester (2008) studied female faculty members who taught in typically male-dominated fields. Other than Lester's (2008) study, however, few studies address women who work in typically male-dominated careers in the field of education. Some of the studies of female leaders in higher education (Acker, 1990; Twombly, 1999) have addressed the differences between female and male leaders, acknowledging that men still largely dominated the career field. The research should be a reference point for leaders to understand how gender performativity can affect employees (especially classified staff) and women (especially those who work in male-dominated fields), both historically and in current events. Therefore, the research is incomplete without examining the experiences of backline classified staff women working in male-dominated areas of the community college.

**Classified Staff in Community Colleges**

It is important to understand some of the terminology of the population before addressing the sparse literature exploring non-instructional staff. The National Center for Education Statistics (2009) divided higher education staff into two categories: professional staff and non-professional staff. Professional staff account for almost 73% of all public and private two-year college staff and include those assigned to positions in
such areas as executive, administrative, or managerial (5.0%); instruction, research, and public service faculty (57%); graduate assistants (0%); and other professionals who provide academic support (10.5%). Non-professional staff at two year institutions account for the remaining 27% of staff and includes technical and paraprofessionals (6.6%), clerical and secretarial (13.8%), skilled crafts (less than 1%), and service and maintenance (5.7%). This means over 43% of community college staff members do not teach. More than 63% are women, and females comprise the majority in all work groups except for skilled crafts and service and maintenance. Additionally, women comprise 64% of non-teaching and non-executive professional staff, 61% of technical and paraprofessional staff, and 80% of clerical and secretarial staff, contrasting greatly with the 12.5% of skilled crafts staff and the 28.7% of service and maintenance staff who are women (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). Non-instructional staff, then, is chiefly female, except in the skilled crafts and service and maintenance staff areas. Only a small number of studies have examined non-professional staff experiences (Banks, 2007; Bauer, 2000; Christian, 1980), only one (Duggan, 2008) explored non-instructional staff experiences from a gendered perspective, and none have examined the experiences of non-professional staff in non-traditional fields through a feminist framework.

Research has recently begun to explore those classified staff referred to as “front line” workers – those who serve as the first point of contact for prospective and current students, parents, and various college stakeholders – looking at such topics as the impact of job satisfaction on productivity and overall institutional effectiveness (Bauer, 2000; Christian, 1980), classified staff interactions with students as a possible strategy for increasing student success, and professional role ambiguity and its impact on job
satisfaction (Hirt, Esteban, & McGuire, 2003). Missing from this discussion, however, is the “other” group: the backline classified staff whose job duties do not include direct contact with students, parents, or community members, but whose jobs are still important. Some of the departments that include backline classified staff members are Information Technology, Facilities Services, Accounting, Security, and the Research and Planning office. The researcher conducted the study at a college in Washington State. For the purposes of this study, the college is referred to as Washington Rhododendron Community College (WRCC).

**Statement of the Problem**

Gender performativity could directly impact job satisfaction and job performance of female employees within the community college, thereby affecting the organizational culture. This case study used Judith Butler’s (1990) framework of gender performativity to explore how female community college classified staff members working in male-dominated career fields behave and how it affects their identities. The case in this study included classified staff members from a community college located in Washington State. Little research has explored the experiences of community college classified staff members. Classified staff members provide support, sometimes highly visible and sometimes not. Their efforts are an essential component of a community college’s ability to meet its mission, and it is imperative that leaders include the experiences of classified staff members as an essential component to overall organizational goals. Exploring female classified staff member’s experiences in terms of “gender performativity” (Butler, 1990) is vital to understanding the organization and affecting change.
Definition of Terms

The following key terms are used during this research study:

*Backline* refers to employees at the community college whose job descriptions do not require interactions with students. In this study, backline classified staff members include all employees at Washington Rhododendron Community College (WRCC) who are not administrators, faculty members, or non-classified staff union members who are not members of the classified staff union. This term has not yet been conceptualized in the literature and was therefore composed by the researcher based on the definition of frontline classified staff.

*Classified staff* refers to employees of the community college who are not leaders (e.g. presidents, vice presidents, directors, deans) and who are not faculty members (Vaughan, 2006).

*Faculty members* are community college employees who conduct classes and, for students, can be the main face of the community college since faculty members interact with students on a daily basis (Vaughan, 2006).

*Feminism* has experienced many changes over the years. For the purposes of this study, feminism is referred to as a framework through which society is studied and critiqued. In particular, the theoretical framework of this study (Judith Butler's theory of gender performativity) is referred to as a feminist theory because it studies and critiques social interactions in an effort to increase women's participation in society (Butler, 1990; Code, 2004; hooks [sic], 2000; Valenti, 2007).

*Frontline* refers to employees at the community college who interact daily with students and are, in many cases, the first contact a student has with the college (Bauer,
They work in areas such as Advising, Admission and Outreach, Registration and Records, and Cashiering departments at many community colleges (Bauer, 2000).

Gender refers to socially constructed attributes, activities, behaviors, and roles that have been institutionalized within society (Butler, 1990; Lorber, 2009; Lorber & Farrell, 1991). Butler (1990) and Lorber (2009) argued that society needs to move away from identifying only two types of genders when there is a web of genders between and beyond simply “male” and “female.” They also both argue that the selection and performance of prescribed traits for “either” gender further perpetuates and helps to maintain the adopted structure of gender inequality that currently exists in society today.

Gender identity is the self-assignment of a particular gender. Years of research have shown that there are more genders than the usual dichotomous associations (i.e., either male or female). One can select a gender identity based on personal preferences, but are typically influenced by what society deems acceptable (Bem, 1981; Butler, 1990; Lorber, 2009; Lorber & Farrell, 1991).

Gender performativity is the repetitive practice of speaking, acting, and otherwise expressing oneself in accordance with socially accepted practices for a particular gender (Butler, 1990). For instance, it may be socially acceptable in a particular environment for a woman to ask for help with lifting a heavy object, but not a man. Executing these behaviors is a performance of the behaviors deemed acceptable for particular genders.

Gender roles are representations of an identity. Gender roles are socialized and conditioned into youth based on social structures that attempt to outline what behaviors are acceptable for different genders (Bem, 1981; Foroutan, 2009; Huang, 2009; Serewicz & Gale, 2008).
Gendered behavior, in this study, is defined as gendered social practices that embody organizational culture. For instance, the organizational culture may foster an environment where it is acceptable for women to ask for help lifting heavy objects, but not a man.

Identity is used in this study to refer to the self-assignment of a core social role or set of behaviors that dictate(s) the activities and desired attributes of each individual (Butler, 1990).

Job satisfaction is the extent to which a staff member has positive feelings about work and the work environment (McCormick & Nobile, 2008).

Leader is used to refer to top-level leaders (i.e., presidents, vice presidents, and their equivalents) and mid-level leaders (i.e., directors, deans, and their equivalents). The term can also refer to Board of Trustees members and local constituents such as donors (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). This term includes the role of administrator in most higher education institutions, including community colleges (an accredited institution of higher education offering two-year degrees, worker retraining, vocational field training, and transferrable credits to 4-year research institutions) (Cohen & Brawer, 2003).

Male-dominated/Non-traditional jobs are jobs where the majority of individuals holding them are of the opposite sex of the population in study. Since women make up the population of this study, non-traditional jobs are jobs which are dominated by men according to the U.S. Department of Labor’s (2008) statistics. Some examples of nontraditional jobs for women include security guards, drafters, computer programmers, material moving workers, printing machine operators, motor vehicle operators, engineers,
construction managers, maintenance and repair workers, and electricians (U.S. Department of Labor, 2008).

Nonverbal communication includes aspects of kinesics such as facial expressions, position of hands, and stance. Nonverbals also include proxemics such as the use of space through the body and through props and refer to appearance in terms of dress, makeup, hair, and accessories (Lester, 2008; Marshall, 1986).

Organizational culture is a set of characteristics that describes an organization, distinguishes it from others, endures over time, and influences the behavior of the organization’s members (Ayers, 2005). The culture of an organization can be explored by examining events, artifacts, symbols, values, beliefs, and assumptions (Gawreluck, 1993). Wallace (2002) suggested examining an institution’s written policies to identify an organization’s culture.

Social practices are activities performed and roles assumed that define behavior in an individual. These social practices include interactions (both verbal and nonverbal) with fellow coworkers and family members and friends. These practices typically embody the organizational culture of the institution in which they are practiced (Lester, 2008; Lorber, 2009; Lorber & Farrell, 1991). Marshall (1986) stated that social practices can be interpreted through observations.

Verbal communication includes aspects of tone such as pitch, loudness, and intonation. Verbal communication also includes the actual content (e.g., phrases of tentativeness, self-denigration, and power language). Finally, verbal communication includes the use of silence for dramatic purposes (Lester, 2008; Marshall, 1986).
Significance of the Study

Bauer (2000) found attention to staff member needs (such as rewards and recognition, work-life balance, opportunities for growth, training and development, and perceptions of the work environment) will result in positive outcomes such as increased workplace satisfaction and productivity. One way to assess staff needs is to understand how gender is performed at an institution so gendered systems can be identified and improved. For instance, Lester (2008) in her study of female community college faculty found that power structures that could affect female faculty members’ experiences of the community college culture, how work and home life are balanced, how many female faculty members matriculate at community colleges as a result, and how work is distributed amongst faculty members when more than just female faculty are present. Thus, the inequity of distribution of work between males and females may cause job dissatisfaction. Female classified staff members may also be affected by the same power structures that are in place within the community college. The significance of this study was to explore the experiences of female backline classified staff members working in typically male-dominated career fields within the community college environment in terms of gender performativity. Leaders need to know this information to influence job satisfaction, job performance, and ultimately, organizational culture. In addition, this study will add to the discussion in the research about classified staff members who work in community colleges.

Leadership is the ability to influence others toward a common vision (Northouse, 2007). Research has illustrated a vast amount of skills leaders need to possess to maintain their effectiveness (American Association of Community Colleges, 2005;
Northouse, 2007; Stanford-Blair & Dickman, 2005; Wallin, 2002). One such skill a leader must possess is the ability to adapt to their situation to be effective (Hammons, 1990). Leaders should understand the culture of the community colleges in which they work. Just as every two-year institution is its own entity, has its own needs, and lives in its own community, so does each individual within each institution. Once a leader understands the institution, he or she can cultivate a productive and comfortable organizational culture for individuals who work within the organization. This work environment is essential for the classified staff members within the community college who are consistently expected to continue to create and maintain learning environments for students and teaching environments for instructors. Since the literature cites a relationship between job satisfaction and job performance (Henkin & Holliman, 2009; Kim, Twombly, & Wolf-Wendel, 2008; Magoon & Linkous, 1979; Rentsch & Steel, 1992; Rubis, 2004; Van Tilburg 1988), understanding classified staff experiences in terms of gender performativity could affect job satisfaction and, in turn, job performance.

**Purpose of the Study**

The overall purpose of this study was to explore the gendered performances of female backline classified staff members who work in male dominated fields within a community college. Gender performativity is the repetitive practice of speaking, acting, and expressing oneself according to socially accepted practices for a particular gender (Butler, 1990). More specifically, this study defined gendered behaviors at a community college, and explored how these behaviors affect the identities of women working in non-traditional fields at the community college. This case study used documents, observations and interviews to find that gendered behavior is cultivated at a community college in
Washington state despite the appearance of not doing so in the written documents; women at the community college resist identifying with the word feminine and have learned to deftly navigate their various roles; and the role of woman has evolved over time at the community college. This study will also add to the literature base of female backline classified staff members working in male-dominated fields.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions guided the study:

1. *How is gendered behavior defined at WRCC from the perspectives of backline classified staff?*

2. *How does the performance of these gendered behaviors affect female backline staff's identities, if at all?*

**Overview of Methodology**

Creswell (2007) suggested using case studies to develop an in-depth understanding of a unique case. This case study included five female classified staff members employed at a community college in Washington, each of whom works in a male-dominated field. The researcher compiled and coded each participant’s data individually using within-case analysis and then across all individuals using cross-case analysis (Creswell, 2007) to find common themes.

This case study was crafted using the framework of gender performativity (Butler, 1990). Butler posited that people are not born with gendered behavior already programmed but that behaviors are learned activities and attributes that are considered either socially “acceptable” or “unacceptable” (Butler, 1990). In this instance, the learned, “acceptable” social practices of female classified staff members at WRCC were
defined and described. Butler also suggested that identity is not programmed at birth but established when an individual repeats (or performs) a set of social practices so often that the practices become the norm for a person. This repetition makes it seem as though social practices are inherent.

This study had four phases. Phase One was a pilot test of each instrument (the document review, observations, and interviews) using willing participants at the researcher’s institution. These pilot tests informed the researcher of changes that were needed for each instrument before the instruments were used to collect data from the participants at WRCC. Phase Two consisted of a textual analysis of all available plans, policies, procedures, and proceedings/minutes at Washington Rhododendron Community College. During this phase, the researcher explored the culture of WRCC by looking at pronouns used, targeted audiences, gendered language used (such as ‘maintenance guys’), and how often women and in particular, women in male-dominated fields, appear or are the target audience for the documents. In Phase Three the researcher interviewed five backline classified staff workers to explore their gendered social practices and their identities. At the same time, the researcher observed body language movements, or other communicative expressions used during these interviews. Phase Four consisted of follow-up interviews as needed following the transcription of interviews and organization of recorded notes for observations. This fourth phase allowed the researcher to meet again with participants for further clarification.

Conclusion

Research suggests that gender roles affect job performances of community college employees (Lester, 2008; Rhoads & Tedrow, 1999) and that gendered performances
change from one professional role to another (Butler, 1990). Women in male-dominated fields often have certain gender roles that affect their job performances as well (Lester, 2008). Understanding women’s negotiations of various roles within an institution will allow leaders to make decisions on if and how the culture should be changed (Ayers, 2005; Stringer, 2002). Change could directly impact the job satisfaction and job performance of women within the community college, which can also affect the organizational culture (Allen, 2001; Luthans & Youssef, 2007; Zhang & Zheng, 2009). Amongst this population are the female backline classified staff members who keep the college running by providing services which are typically not in plain view of the public. Although indirect, everything the backline classified staff members do has an impact on student learning and faculty teaching. This study will add to the discussion in the literature about classified staff members who work in community colleges. It is the researcher’s aspiration that female classified staff members will begin to emerge as a new focus within the literature. More specifically, it is imperative that readers understand this group of women not only in general, but also in terms of gender performativity. The findings of this study have taken the first steps to achieve this understanding.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter presents research concerning gender performativity in relation to female backline classified staff in non-traditional fields in the community college. Research shows that satisfied staff members are more productive and identify more easily with their organization. Those who identify more easily with their organization are said to have hopes and expectations that are aligned with the goals of the institution (Rentsch & Steel, 1992; Wood, 1976; Zhang & Zheng, 2009). Since women in non-traditional fields have been shown to be less satisfied with the organizational culture than their male counterparts (Adkison, 1981; Mahitivanichcha & Rorrer, 2006), the researcher chose this subpopulation to explore the relationship between self-identity and organizational culture more closely. The exploration of female backline classified staff members in non-traditional fields at a community college has provided insight into how they perform gender and how these performances affect identity. Understanding these effects can improve or enhance interactions among staff members, leaders, faculty, and students. Communication issues between various groups of people or involving someone who might be required to act differently depending on their environment may be solved more easily by understanding these effects. This chapter divides the literature into four main sections: Gender Performativity, Women in Higher Education, Male-Dominated Career Fields, and Classified Staff.

The first section (Gender Performativity) reviews gender performativity and its use in previous studies. In particular, the section describes research studies using it as a framework in educational institutions and the performances of female faculty members in
non-traditional fields and transgender students in the college. Since it is the theoretical framework for this study, it is important to elucidate the use of gender performativity in all aspects of human interaction. Therefore, the section has seven sub-headings: Films and Television, Literary and Written Works, Internet, Males and Gender Performativity, Other Works on Gender Performativity, Education, and Summary and Critique.

The second section (Women in Higher Education) has six sub-headings: Female Leaders and Higher Education, Female Students and Higher Education, Female Faculty and Higher Education, Female Classified Staff and Higher Education, Gender and Policy, and Summary and Critique. This section examines the roles of women in educational institutions and clarifies that research studies on female classified staff are virtually nonexistent. Since a document review of policies, procedures, and proceedings/minutes was used in this study, it also examines the role of women in policy-making at educational institutions.

The third section (Male-Dominated Career Fields) has four sub-headings: Legal Action, Reasons Women Do Not Pursue Non-traditional Careers, Reasons Women Do Pursue Non-traditional Careers, and Summary and Critique. This third section examines the literature on male-dominated fields (or non-traditional fields for women). This is especially important because the research shows that women who persist in these career fields have certain characteristics of which the researcher must be cognizant. In addition, the research has shown that the difference between men and women in terms of satisfaction and organizational identity tends to be greater in non-traditional fields.

The fourth section (Classified Staff) has three sub-headings: Role Ambiguity, Professional Development, and Job Structure. The sub-heading of Job Structure has three
sub-sub-headings: JS-OC – the relationship of job satisfaction to organizational culture, OC-JP – the relationship of organizational culture to job performance, and JS-JP – the relationship of job satisfaction to job performance. This final section of the literature review explores the role of classified staff in the community college. In particular, the section focuses on classified staff members’ satisfaction, performance, and identification with organizational culture.

Gender Performativity

Butler's (1990) book, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, outlined her groundbreaking theory of gender performativity while drawing upon the critical works of feminist, queer, sociological, and psychological theorists such as Julia Kristeva, Sigmund Freud, Luce Irigaray, Jacques Derrida, and Jacques Lacan. Most importantly, however, Butler drew upon Michael Foucault's socially critical theories. Butler postulated that the dichotomous relationship of male to female in terms of biological sex incorrectly dictates how humans define gender. She proposed that humans cannot define gender until society refuses to accept the limited definition of sex as binary. It is from this platform that she stated that there are multiple sexes, multiple genders, and that while humans are born to one of these many sexes, gender is learned. It is latently learned through repetitive acts that mimic societal influences at all ages and stages of life, but particularly when humans are young. Rejecting established norms pertaining to gender roles, Butler argued that gender identity is not predetermined, but learned through role models in early life and accepted practices within work, social, and home life roles.

Butler's (1990) theory of gender performativity was the framework for this study. While over two decades old, this theory encompasses the identity of all human beings
(not just women), thereby creating many sub-theories to pursue and study. Recent additions to the long list of studies using her work as their foundations [i.e. journalist advice pieces (Ingersoll, 2010), military women histories (Taber, 2010), and tenured faculty and gendered performativity (Emery, 2010)] support the validity and usefulness of the theory as a research study framework.

Films and Television

Other research has used Butler’s theory of performativity to analyze cinematic films. Examples include the analysis of the performance of actresses in Todd Hayne’s films (Felshow, 2009), *Being John Malkovich* (Wilson, 2009), *Gone with the Wind* (Stokes, 2007), and Truffaut’s films (Harper, 2006). It has also been used to analyze the performance of actresses in television programs and series such as the *Beebo Brinker Chronicles* (Sky, 2006) and *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy* (Weiss, 2005). These studies found that successful films and television programs require men and women to adopt gendered behaviors that reinforce societal stereotypes. For instance, Stokes (2007) studies the “several coloured costumes that associate with specific gender performances, and each demonstrates a different view of the unhappiness resulting from her usurpation of ‘men’s roles’” (page 1). She found that blue represented a masculine view of female bodies associated blue with “obese, obedient, and objectified” while red represented giving freedom to her passions, but she appeared frustrated, angry and resentful because, in red, Scarlett (the main character) is “incapable of attaining the adoration and respect accorded the blue femininities of Melanie and Bonnie [other female characters in the film].”
Literary and Written Works

In addition to the analyses of various films, television programs, and theater performances, Butler’s theory of performativity has been the central framework used for textual analysis of literary works as well. For instance, Julia Franck’s fictional works were examined through a gender performativity theoretical framework (Hill, 2009), examining mother-daughter relationships. In addition, one study focused on the manifestation of masculinity in the works of male, gay poets in early post-Franco Spain (Holan, 2005) while another focused on the use of one’s body to reject or reinforce gender roles in Atwood’s book, The Edible Woman (Fleitz, 2005). Yet another found that Japanese comics from the 1940’s to the present are a dominant discourse of gender ideology in Japan (Ogi, 2001). Finally, Poluyko (2001) examined texts containing elements of jazz in them finding that they paradoxically reinforced and advocated resistance to acceptable social identities. The examination of these literary works collectively found that gendered behavior is reinforced from generation to generation, and the repetition of these gendered behaviors lead to a belief that differences in gender are inherent.

Internet

Several studies have been conducted in the recent years pertaining to the performance of gender and gender identity on the Internet, weblogs, web-based writings, and social networking sites. For instance, one study analyzed the digital storytelling of students by looking at their discussion board posts, blogs, emails, and writing drafts (Coventry, 2008) while two studies have recently been conducted of MySpace profiles and their users (Aimjeld, 2008; Arca, 2007). Ramon (2009) conducted a study of
weblogs for the construction of and the complication of gender identity. Butler (1990) presents two sides of an ongoing debate about whether gender is determined at birth and “inscribed” on each individual or whether it is a “cultural compulsion to become one (p. 12)” gender. In either case, Butler argues that “one might reasonably suspect that some common linguistic restriction on thought both forms and limits the terms of the debate (p. 12)” about construction and the complication of gender identity. In other words, the study of weblogs (Ramon, 2009), Malaysian bloggers in cyberspace (Yusof, 2009), or cyberfeminist discourse (Pierce, 2007) is limited to the paradoxical language in which it is entrenched. These studies suggest that “gender” is learned by practicing repetitive gendered behavior.

**Males and Gender Performativity**

The researcher found only two studies using Butler’s framework in which the participants were male. Lysaght’s (2002) examined the socioeconomic living arrangements of men in Belfast, Ireland, regarding their proclivity towards violence and how it relates to their identity. Another study investigated the gender performativity of year 11 male students in the United Kingdom and Australia. It drew upon in-depth interviews to create life stories of two boys who became representatives of the entire sample (Youdell, 2000). The findings of both studies reinforced that gender performativity is learned through mimicking and the continued repetition internalizes gendered traits.

**Education**

Most relevant to this study, however, are the studies conducted in the last decade in the education field using performativity as their frameworks. Rands (2009) used
gender performativity to explore the experiences of transgender students and their identity within education, finding that gender-stereotyped education reproduces the gender oppression matrix in the classroom. All students are assumed to fit into a dichotomous classification of gender, that is, to be either a boy or a girl. This is evident when teachers address the class as “boys and girls,” in the common practice of having “boy” and “girl” bathrooms, and when teachers segregate students into “boy” and “girl” groups or lines. More recently, Emery (2010) conducted a study of tenured faculty and gender performativity, finding that institutional cultures reflect and encourage socially designated roles, requiring the education of future female faculty of the difficulties of navigating the various roles.

Lester’s (2008) ethnography explored how female community college faculty members in typically male, vocational career fields performed gender in their jobs and personal lives. In terms of the social practices that define gendered behavior, female faculty members in her study were expected to perform “mom” roles in the classroom. Butler (1990) described these “mom” roles as being emotional, nurturing, and supportive. However, the female faculty members were also expected to adopt masculine traits within their traditionally masculine fields while maintaining the “mom” characteristics. She also explored how this changed between the classroom and department meetings. In terms of gender identity, Lester (2008) found that the repetitive nature of using traditionally masculine traits in the classroom caused her participants to incorporate those traits into their identity. This implies the performance of gender is not independent of identity, especially if it is practiced for many years. The performance of gender will
eventually change how a woman defines herself. This is the backbone of Butler’s (1990) theory of how gender performance affects a woman’s identity.

Summary and Critique

Gender performativity research studies have been conducted all over the world and in many fields. The findings from the analyses of all of the aforementioned research studies reinforce the theory postulated by Butler (1990) that gender is learned and the repetition of gendered behaviors internalizes a crafted identity. Despite this, few researchers have used this theory in education, and even fewer have looked at those who work in non-traditional careers. However, those that have taken place in educational institutions suggest that women are required to act different ways in different environments, especially if the female participants work in non-traditional fields. Leaders must understand this practice to ensure participation of all constituencies on college campuses so that awareness can be promoted, training provided if needed, and conflicts solved from a more knowledgeable standpoint. One way to address it is to ensure female and male faculty members are given equal and characteristically similar workloads at meetings in which both are present and both are in similar fields.

Women in Higher Education

There is no doubt that the presence of women in community colleges has increased over the last few decades. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2004), in 1971, women in higher education comprised 42% of undergraduate students as opposed to 56% of undergraduates in 2004. Over the past few decades, the literature has expanded to show the various ways in which gender is viewed and embedded in higher education (Acker, 1990; Bailyn, 2003; Benschop & Brouns, 2003; Clark, 1972;

**Female Leaders and Higher Education**

For the purposes of this study, leaders are defined as presidents, vice presidents, administrators or comparable counterparts at various institutions. Ferrari and Berte (1969) wrote that 95% of junior college presidents in the United States were men. By 1997, that number had dropped to 84% (Chliwniak, 1997). These statistics indicate that more women are serving in the presidency role.

Research suggests women view leadership differently than men in higher education (Amey & Twombly, 1992; Belle, 2002; DiCroce, 1995; Jablonski, 1996; Olson, 2002; Piland & Giles, 1998; Singh, Kumra, & Vinnicombe, 2002; Slaughter, 1993; Vaughan, 1989). Kezar (2000) stated that “[O]ne of the most compelling studies…illustrated that women’s leadership is associated with a more participatory, relational, and interpersonal style as well as with different types of power and influence strategies that emphasize reciprocity and collectivity” (p. 7). In addition, Kezar (2000) noted a study in which they observed women in action and found that women perform leadership activities differently than men.

**Female Students and Higher Education**

Other researchers have focused on female students and the impact they have on higher education and the impact the academy has on them (Bryant, 2001). Harper and Sax (2007) indicated that women learn how to perform gender roles in school through gender socialization. Centrie and Weis (2002) studied spaces within educational institutions that provide opportunities for students to learn and express themselves. They
wrote,

A space targeted specifically for young women can encourage a political project around gender that enables them to ‘speak their own name’ and hold together for collective health and safety. The group was learning from one another and from trusted adults about performing gender in ways that are radically different from what is assumed to be their destiny; they could challenge scripts about women that are embedded in the dominant society (p. 31).

While Centrie and Wcis’ (2002) study focused on both gender and ethnicity, it illustrates the similar experiences of female students at community colleges.

**Female Faculty and Higher Education**

A considerable number of researchers have studied women faculty members in higher education, separated into various aspects of the faculty role within higher education. For instance, there have been studies devoted to student evaluations of female faculty members and their performances in the classroom (Baker & Copp, 1997; Martin, 1984). In addition, research has explored female faculty (part-time and full-time) members’ careers, supervisor evaluations, tenure tracks and career advancement opportunities, and their salaries in comparison to their male counterparts (Armenti, 2004; Bellas, 1997; Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998; Harper, Baldwin, Gansneder, & Chronister, 2001; Menges & Exum, 1983; Palmer, 1999; Perna, 2001; Perna, 2002; Winkler, 2000). Faculty satisfaction with and perceptions of the community college and their roles within it have been extensively studied both qualitatively and quantitatively (Acker & Feuerverger, 1996; Clark, 1998; Hagedorn & Laden, 2002; Riger, Stokes, Raja, & Sullivan, 1997; Townsend, 1998). The socialization and assimilation of new female
faculty members has been observed as well (Dallimore, 2003; Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998). Naturally, this would inspire some to study how the assimilation of new faculty members might affect their performance (Boice, 1993; Lease, 1999). Collectively, the research in this area shows that institutions of higher education are places in which gendered behavior is reinforced by the culture. When new employees arrive, they are assimilated into this culture of gendered behavior, or they are not successful.

**Gender and Policy**

An important element of gender in community colleges is the inclusion of women in policy writing. Wallace (2002) sees the policies and practices of an institution as the discourses of truth. She states that while Foucault argues that these “truths” are open to contest and transformation, they are actually not. She argues these “truths” or policies and practices that have been stable over time tend to stay that way and it is more difficult for employees to try to transform the policies and practices than to simply assimilate. Wallace (2002) is highlighting an important area for consideration when it comes to women in higher education. Since men have traditionally written policies in the past (Marshall, 2002), the symbols, addressed audience, tone, values, beliefs and examples are masculine. Noddings (1990) illustrated this point earlier with her concept of “writing out females”:

> Arguments about language appear in feminist legal theory as they do in feminist theory in general. Spender (1980) and Daly (1973, 1978, 1984) have argued that men have seized and kept the power of naming for themselves. The result has been that women are held to a male standard, encounter difficulty in articulating their own experience, and are simply left out of descriptions (and prescriptions)
purporting to be universal. Bender (1988) discusses the "reasonable person" standard in tort law as an example of male naming and the implicit male norm underlying it. Noting that the standard was originally stated in terms of a "reasonable man," she suggests that the change in words from "man" to "person" does not eliminate sexism in the concept. If the generic use of "man" failed to capture universal experience, so does "person" when the entire body of legal thought surrounding the notion of a "reasonable person" has grown out of male experience and has been articulated by male theorists. Female experience simply disappears. (p. 396).

While Noddings (1990) is talking particularly about legal theory through a critical feminist framework, policies and procedures at higher education institutions have gone through the same iterations of change from the feminist movements in the 1970s until now. The researcher in this study examined policies, procedures, proceedings/meeting minutes to ascertain the organizational culture with this in mind.

Summary and Critique

The research shows that women experience education in different ways than men. Many studies have been done on the experiences of students, leaders, and faculty members. Yet, there is very little literature on female classified staff within higher education. It is important for leaders to know how people interact differently from the top down. Conflict can be better understood and many different leadership approaches can be tested to ease conflict or to institute change. This information leads to the point that women must be included on policy decision-making. In this manner, leaders can involve women from all areas of the college to ensure policies and procedures reflect the
Male-Dominated Career Fields

Male-dominated career fields, also known as non-traditional career fields for women, are defined as career fields in which the majority of the people who work in them are men (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009). In fact, if women make up 15% or less of a particular career field, they are referred to as “tokens” (Kanter, 1977). Historically, non-traditional fields for women include business (Beckerman, 1987), information and computer technology and systems (Ali, 2001; Oakes, 1990; Thom, 2001), law, medicine, academia (Mahitivanichcha & Rorrer, 2006), and fields highly associated with math and science such as engineering (Foley, Levinson, & Hurtig, 2000; Zelden & Pahares, 2000). According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2009), these career fields are still non-traditional for women. In addition, career fields currently considered non-traditional for women include security guards, printing machine operators, janitors and building cleaners, first line supervisors of mechanics, installers and repairers of media, maintenance and repair workers, grounds maintenance workers, financial analysts, producers and directors of arts, designs, and graphics, marketing and sales managers, shipping, receiving and traffic clerks, and administrators and leaders in many fields, including education (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009). Following the baby boomer generation’s demands of different kinds of education (Howe & Strauss, 2000) and the feminist movements that began in the 1970s, the trend of women entering into male-dominated fields changed over time due to laws put into place.
Legal Actions

The Vocational Education Act (VEA) of 1963 authorized a major expansion and redirection of vocational education. Its goals were to increase enrollment (specifically targeting the baby boomer generation) and to improve the kinds and quality of vocational training (Kliever, 1965). Later, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 mandated that educational institutions provide opportunities for participation in all educational programs regardless of sex (Klein, Ortman, et. al., 1994). However, Title IX is not violated if under-enrollment is caused by lack of student interest, and it also did not require positive steps to make programs sex fair or to encourage women to enroll in non-traditional fields of study (Bornstein, 1979; Mertens, 1984). Therefore, in 1976, sex equity amendments were added to the VEA in an attempt to attract more women into vocational fields (Klein, 1987) and later, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1984 was enacted with a goal of preparing women for “male” jobs (Marshall, 2002). These legal actions caused a trend of women entering typically male career fields of study and obtaining jobs in male career fields upon graduation (Frye & Grady, 1978; Lyson, 1981), but these career fields still did not see the increase in numbers expected.

Reasons Women Do Not Pursue Non-Traditional Careers

So why then, did male career fields not immediately experience increases in female employees? Eccles (1986) stated that “[w]omen, like men, select their major life roles and activities from the variety of options they consider appropriate” (p. 19). Studies have shown that cultural socialization that occurs during childhood, through a person’s formative years, and even through their years in higher education (Adkison, 1981;
influences career choice. Women are explicitly told at an early age that they can be anything, but are subtly sent messages that traditional female roles are preferred (Novack & Novack, 1996). For instance, there could be a lack of same sex role models for students interested in non-traditional fields or course content could contain examples of only one sex (Schwartz, 1980). In addition, counselors may not advise students of all of their options due to previous students’ lack of interest or personal bias (Fry & Grady, 1978). Further, there are many schools offering home economics (a culturally feminine course) and shop (a culturally masculine course) at the same time, forcing students to choose one or the other. This is referred to as the "hidden curriculum" (Epp, 1993). Sometimes, in addition to being subtly discouraged and undermined by teachers, counselors, and leaders in school and parents at home (Eccles & Midgley, 1989; Moorosi, 2010; Pajares, 1996; Zeldin & Pajares, 2000), young women also experience reinforcement of sex roles and a reputed fear of “success” when compared to men (Schwartz, 1980). Some argue that if “success” is not defined as prestige in an occupational structure attained by income and power and focuses instead on social responsibility and helping others (or some combination of the above), findings would show that women are not afraid of “success”, but simply measure it differently (Ali, 2001; Eccles, 1986; O’Leary, 1977; Wilson & Shin, 1983).

Studies also show that women who resist assimilation do not remain in non-traditional fields due to career socialization. Career socialization refers to the assimilation of new employees to the point where they either attrite or conform (Adkison, 1981; Curtis, Zanna, & Campbell, 1975; Keay, 2007; Noddings, 1990; Peng & Jaffe,
Keay (2007) found that female physical education teachers adopt masculine attributes after being socialized by tenured physical education teachers at one institution. This type of socialization leads to what Peng and Jaffe (1979) referred to as “occupational inheritance”. Occupational inheritance refers to children being encouraged to enter one field of study by a parent’s explicit or subtle encouragement. In the same mentorship capacity, it also refers to tenured employees within organizations encouraging newer employees to conform to certain acceptable behaviors within their career fields.

Actions can be taken to promote the harmonious collaboration of ideas typically thought of as masculine and feminine to prevent women from having to choose traditionally feminine career fields. In fact, many action plans have been outlined (Epp, 1993; Klein & Bogart, 1986; Wallace, 2002; Schwartz, 1980). These plans suggest getting rid of the hidden curriculum (i.e. forcing students to choose between home economics - typically teaching how to cook, or industrial arts - typically teaching how to work with wood or metal), looking critically at policies through a feminist framework, recommending and reinforcing “success” to female students, changing curriculum content, obtaining same-sex role models, re-educating counselors, and re-educating parents. However, “there is a need to recognize and address [the socialization of women] as a societal problem and not simply a problem within educational administration” (Mahitivanichcha & Rorrer, 2006, p. 510). This change will take time. In the meantime, it is important to examine the reasons women persist in non-traditional fields of study and careers to understand how these career fields affect them. Leaders can then understand how to address them and pursue inclusion in college activities.
Reasons Women Do Pursue Non-Traditional Careers

Despite all the forces working against young women, there are some who remain interested, have the ability, and persist into these fields of study, into the career field, and remain. Women who pursue career fields heavy in science and mathematics retain an interest and inclination towards mathematics and science from an early age (Matyas, 1986; Zeldin & Pajares, 2000) and are heavily influenced by the number of related courses they take in high school (Ethington & Wolfle, 1988). Other influences on women who persist in non-traditional fields include self-confidence, academic ability, life-goal orientations, work-orientations, and extent of educational planning (Hackett, 1995; Peng & Jaffe, 1979; Stage & Maple, 1996, 1987; Schunk, 1991; Zeldin & Pajares, 2000). Linn and Hyde (1989) conducted a study measuring achievement and why it occurred. The characteristics of the women who were said to have attained success fell into cognitive, psycho-social, and physical abilities. Cognitive abilities included verbal ability, spatial ability, quantitative understanding, and an inclination towards science. Psychosocial abilities included aggression, confidence, interest, and social abilities. Even though women are discouraged from an early age to enter into non-traditional fields, these women pursue them anyway, causing shifts in career fields to be increasingly female, such as educational leaders (Gardiner & Tiggeman, 1999; Willard-Holt, 2008).

The Bureau of Labor Statistics found that 62.6% of leaders in education are female. Although a career field in educational administration is becoming increasingly female, women in these positions are still forced to battle masculine expectations and foundations already in place (Willard-Holt, 2008). For example, Epp (1993) noted that while she supported the identification and promotion of qualified women into these
positions, women needed to be prepared to answer questions about what their husband thinks of their acceptance and how it will affect their children and families. This comment, which lacks support from the literature, reinforces the established stereotype that women who move into administrative positions are heterosexual, largely responsible for the children, and subservient to the men in their households.

Studies have found that women do perform leadership differently than men (Amey & Twombly, 1992; Belle, 2002; DiCroce, 1995; Jablonski, 1996; Olson, 2002; Piland & Giles, 1998; Singh, Kumra, & Vinnicombe, 2002; Slaughter, 1993; Vaughan, 1989). Sherman (2000) suggested that institutions embrace alternative leadership styles to prevent the “coping” strategy (Martin, 1993) women must adopt in these positions. Martin (1993) argued that women are forced to combine two opposing sets of values: those taught to them as young children and those required of leaders in education. Tedrow and Rhoads (1999) examined the “coping” strategy discussion and found that female education leaders are forced to pick one of three survival methods in their positions. The first is to adapt to their situation, which usually involves them adopting more masculine traits, promoting hierarchy, efficiency and productivity, separate their personal and professional lives, and tend to minimize gender issues. Those who choose to reconcile the two are typically seen as “just one of the guys”, promote harmony and shared decision-making, find “appropriate” mixtures of personal and professional lives, and recognize gender issues and the effects they can have on their leadership, while also recognizing that challenging them have a time and a place. Finally, those who choose to resist the typically masculine values adhere to the feminine values they admire, promote relationships and empowerment, use their personal lives as a way of relating to their
superiors, co-workers and subordinates, and see no problem acknowledging personal lives of employees since it is an integral part of everyone’s lives.

Summary and Critique

The research shows that despite legal action to prevent the contrary, there are still very clear divides in certain fields between men and women. Women in non-traditional fields are expected to act certain ways in home and professional roles. The contradiction between two different roles can weigh heavily on a woman’s satisfaction or clarity about her own identity within a given field. There are no studies that focus on female classified staff members in non-traditional fields. As the population within the community college that is frequently discounted (Duggan, 2007), it is important to identify contradictions between different roles that might be occurring for these women. This could provide opportunities to increase job satisfaction and effective alignment of personal expectations with institutional goals.

Classified Staff

Classified staff refers to employees of the community college who are not leaders and who are not faculty members (Vaughan, 2006). This group is also referred to as non-instructional staff (Duggan, 2008), non-professional staff (NCES, 2009), support staff (Banks, 2007), and student affairs professionals (Hirt, Esteban, & McGuire, 2003). The staff makes up 35% of the employees at WRCC. They serve the college in a variety of positions including clerical positions, craft workers, technical staff members, and trades workers (NCES, 2009). Many of the studies examine mid-level managers such as directors, deans and administrators (Hisle, 1988; Pitts & Thomas, 1988; Smith, 1983). Very few researchers have studied non-management classified staff (Banks, 2007;
Christian, 1980; Duggan, 2008). None have studied backline classified staff. Non-management backline female classified staff members were the focus of this study.

**Role Ambiguity**

Classified staff members are sometimes expected to perform undefined tasks and are not given an orientation upon beginning a job (Hirt, Esteban, & McGuire, 2003). This phenomenon is referred to as role ambiguity (Christian, 1980; Getzels & Guba, 1954; Hisle, 1988; Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, & Snoek, 1981; Pitts & Thomas, 1988; Reetz, 1988; Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970; Smith, 1983; Stead & Scamell, 1980). Role ambiguity has been studied as it pertains to mid-level managers and leaders more (Hisle, 1988; Pitts & Thomas, 1988; Smith, 1983) as compared to research with non-management classified staff (Robbins, 1983). However, aside from one study that found that directors, deans, and chairs feel no ambiguity (Pitts & Thomas, 1988), the results for the studies are similar. Role ambiguity can be caused by unresolved conflict, conflicting messages from various constituencies on campus about classified staff duties (Coll & Rice, 1993), lack of involvement in decision-making, working conditions (Christian, 1980), lack of orientations, too much bureaucracy, limited authority, lack of professional development opportunities, and lack of room for innovation (Hirt, Esteban, & McGuire, 2003). Christian (1980) and Robbins (1983) found that role ambiguity for counselors in educational settings can have adverse effects on job satisfaction, job performance, and can cause burnout. This suggests that leaders should clearly define roles and duties and should take action to make this information available to classified staff employees as soon as they begin working.
Professional Development

Almost 30 years ago, Riches (1982) found that classified staff members see themselves as less important than faculty, leaders, and students, suggesting the internalization of messages coming from others. However, that perception is changing and further studies of classified staff members have found they are incredibly important to the continued operations of colleges and need to be afforded the same opportunities as faculty, leaders, and students (Coll & Rice, 1993). Since the lack of professional development is one cause of role ambiguity and leads to decreased job satisfaction and performance (Christian, 1980), it is important to explore. However, the study of the importance of and opportunities for professional development of classified staff has only just begun (Banks, 2007; Huiskamp, 2008). Huiskamp (2008) found that the benefits of providing professional development for classified staff members include gaining knowledge, personal improvement, social enjoyment, attaining career/educational goals through support and encouragement, equity access, and opportunities. These findings led Huiskamp (2008) to recommend providing and supporting opportunities for informal learning and networking and providing a wide range of personal and professional development activities at various times. Managers should seriously consider providing these opportunities for professional development to classified staff to avoid adverse effects on turnover intentions (Alexandrov, 2007; Bauer, 2000).

Job Structure

In reviewing the literature of organizational culture, job satisfaction, and job performance, it became clear that these three notions are interdependent and difficult to
consider on their own. The researcher created a Job Structure Concept (JSC) to help visualize the relationships between the three notions (Figure 1).

Figure 1

The relationships are labeled for ease of identification. For instance, the job satisfaction to organizational culture relationship is labeled JS-OC, while the relationship among organizational culture and job performance is labeled OC-JP, and the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance is labeled JS-JP. Some studies emphasize the relationship between all three notions (Lester, 2009; Rentsch & Steel, 1992; Rubis, 2004; Zhang & Zheng, 2009). Others focused on two of the three relationships. For

An organization's events, artifacts, symbols, values, beliefs, and assumptions define its culture (Gawreluck, 1993). Gawreluck (1993) and Mardanov et al. (2008) found that there are three distinct subcultures at educational institutions. Those subcultures exist within the non-instructional staff, faculty, and managerial areas. When the culture within these subcultures aligns with the mission, vision, goals or strategic initiatives of an institution, the college is defined as successful (Locke, 2005). Accordingly, the more aligned with the institution's mission, vision and goals a subculture is, the more poised for change the institution is said to be (Bates, 2004; Craig, 2004; Kezar & Eckel, 2002; Locke, 2005; Messer, 2006; Van Wagoner, 2004). Leaders should be aware of how their strategies might translate into actions for their subordinates. If those actions violate the cultural norms of the campus, the desired change might not occur (Kezar & Eckel, 2002).

Job satisfaction is defined as the extent to which a person's hopes and expectations about his or her job are fulfilled (Gillet-Karam et al., 1997; Hollon & Gemmill, 1976; Rentsch & Steel, 1992). It is also referred to or has similarities to engagement (Bates, 2004), morale (Magoon & Linkous, 1979), "hearts and minds" (Rubis, 2004), and decreased interpersonal conflict with the organization's hopes and
expectations (Henkin & Holliman, 2009). Job satisfaction has been extensively studied in organizations by measuring organizational commitment, turnover rates, stress levels, burnout rates, involvement, vandalism, violence, the occurrence of “silos”, and many more (Hollon & Gemmill, 1976; Magoon & Linkous, 1979; Rentsch & Steel, 1992). Factors that may contribute to job satisfaction include, but are not limited to pay, communication, coworkers, supervision, promotional opportunities, job security, job tension, autonomy, educational level, gender, role ambiguity, environment, financial climate, and professional development opportunities (Happ & Yoder, 1991; Hollon & Gemmill, 1976; Milosheff, 1991; Murray & Murray, 1998; Pigge & Lovett, 1985; Rentsch & Steel, 1992; Thompson, McNamara, & Hoyle, 1997; Van Tilburg, 1988). The level of job satisfaction can affect organizational commitment, turnover, job performance, attitude, and identification with and involvement in the organization (Rentsch & Steel, 1992; Wood, 1976; Zhang & Zheng, 2009).

Job performance is best defined by a person’s efficiency, productivity, problem-solving capability, and adaptability within a certain job (Rentsch & Steel, 1992). While these are not the only components of job performance, these are the key elements that will be discussed within the job structure concept. Since job performance is accomplished by the repetition of certain acts, it is important to note its similarities to gender performance. Job performance is learned during the first years of employment and this process is similar to the socialization of employees (Hollon & Gemmill, 1976). The repetition internalizes certain behaviors and attitudes and makes it seem as though they were inherent from the first day on the job. In actuality, these acts are learned through mimicking surrounding individuals. The person that a staff member becomes
throughout this process is their professional identity. Since gender was shown to be related to job satisfaction and job performance (Duggan, 2007; Lester, 2009), job performance is, in fact, gendered. One might be able to see this more clearly when studying women who work in male-dominated fields.

**JS-OC**

The first relationship in the JSC is the mutual JS-OC relationship. Increased job satisfaction or positive perceptions of one’s job have been found to create a positive organizational culture (Edwards, 1998; Henkin & Holliman, 2009; Mardanov et al., 2008). Conversely, organizational culture can have an impact on job satisfaction (Chieffo, 1991; Hollon & Gemmill, 1976; Lester, 2009). For instance, Chieffo (1991) found that leaders’ behaviors and characteristics can be major influences on organizational culture. Subordinates see their actions and either identify with them or feel a sense of cognitive dissonance. Further, Duggan (2007) found that the proportion of men to women in an organization, gender of the leadership, and access to networks impact men and women differently within an institution. The individuals whose job satisfaction tend to be the highest have hopes and expectations that align with the goals of the institution and their leadership, have access to networks, and are the least likely to leave their jobs (Barnes, 2010).

**OC-JP**

The second relationship in the JSC is the mutual OC-JP relationship. Gazir (2007) argued that culture has a powerful influence on the way jobs within an organization are performed. He found that this is in large part due to communication. Lester (2009) found that the use of both formal and informal power can have an effect on
job productivity. Zhang and Zheng (2009) stated that "job satisfaction can strengthen people's identification with, involvement in, and emotional attachment to their organization. This identification in turn influences how well people perform at their job" (p. 345). Conversely, job performance has a direct impact on organizational culture. Tenured employees socialize new employees (Hollon & Gemmill, 1976) simply by being present. Tenured employees are a new employee's example for job performance. In addition, frontline classified staff members can send messages to new students about an organization's culture (Alexandrov, 2007; Bauer, 2000), while students may pick up on the organizational culture of an institution from an instructor in a classroom (Magoon & Linkous, 1979; Wood, 1976).

**JS-JP**

The final relationship in the JSC is the mutual JS-JP relationship. While one researcher found that the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance is spurious (Bowling, 2007), job satisfaction has been found to be significantly related to job performance in many studies. These studies have shown that when participants feel satisfied with their jobs, they perform well; however, when participants are not satisfied, they do not perform as well (Henkin & Holliman, 2009; Kim et al., 2008; Magoon & Linkous, 1979; Rentsch & Steel, 1992; Rubis, 2004). Van Tilburg (1988) showed that the converse relationship was also demonstrated. She ascertained that through extrinsic and intrinsic rewards, job satisfaction is raised.

**Summary and Critique**

Gender is an underlying theme within the JSC. It has been shown to be a factor in all three of the relationships and independently within each notion of job satisfaction,
organizational culture, and job performance (Duggan, 2007; Gillett-Karam et al., 1997; Hollon & Gemmill, 1976; Lester, 2009;). Only three research studies have addressed job satisfaction in classified staff members (Banks, 2007; Bauer, 2000; Duggan, 2008). In fact, some researchers claim to have explored "staff" within the college and have used the term to refer to faculty members only (Magoon & Linkous, 1979; Wood, 1976). The majority of research studies were conducted in the instruction and student areas. It makes sense that because the results of so many studies were similar that the job structure concept would still hold for classified staff. However, this is an area that needs to be further studied.

This study’s focus was female backline classified staff members in non-traditional fields and how they perform gender in their professional roles. Since job performance is so closely related to gender performance and can even be a new, interdependent relationship on the JSC, it was imperative to outline job performance. Since job performance, job satisfaction, and organizational culture are intrinsically intertwined, it was necessary to elucidate them in this literature review. Further, organizational culture was addressed through the document review in this study.

Conclusion

Gender performativity is an essential component to a woman's identity. This is true for women in all fields, but especially in non-traditional fields. If a woman is expected to act differently in various domestic and professional roles, she may become unsatisfied or disillusioned with an organization. Women are still the cultural minority in non-traditional fields. The research shows that women experience education in different ways than men. This is true for leaders, faculty, students, and classified staff. Conflict
can be better understood and many different leadership approaches can be tested to ease conflict or to institute change. Women must also be included on policy decision-making to have more comprehensive, balanced policies.

Although female classified staff members are greatly affected by gender performativity, there are no studies that research this relationship. Job satisfaction, performance, and organizational identity make up the job structure concept. The job structure of any classified staff member affects and is affected by gender. It has been shown to be a factor in all three of the relationships and independently. It has been even further studied in relation to women in male-dominated fields. The majority of research studies were conducted in the instruction and student areas. It stands to reason that because the results of so many studies were similar that the job structure concept would still hold for classified staff. The contradiction between two different roles can weigh heavily on a woman's satisfaction or clarity about her own identity within a given field. It is important to identify contradictions between different roles that might be occurring for these women. This could provide opportunities for improvement of satisfaction and aligning personal expectations with institutional goals.

This study's focus was female backline classified staff members in non-traditional fields and how they perform gender in their professional roles. Leaders must understand this phenomenon to ensure participation of all constituencies on college campuses. Combining the research that has been done on women in education and non-traditional fields with research that has been done on classified staff members has provided the foundation for the study. The study of this foundation through the framework of gender performativity has sanctioned the study in the framework's time-tested credibility.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This study explored the gendered performances of female backline classified staff members who work in non-traditional fields within a community college. This case study used documents, observations, and interviews to explore gendered behavior at a community college in Washington. This chapter describes the methodology that was used to define gendered behavior and its effect on the identities of women working in non-traditional fields at the community college.

Research Design

Qualitative research is a method of study that employs in-depth investigation of the “how” and the “why” of a particular phenomenon (as opposed to the “who”, “where”, and “when” typically addressed by quantitative research) (Creswell, 2007; Hays & Singh, 2011; Jurs & Wiersma, 2005; Patton, 2002). Qualitative research is also used to “follow up on quantitative research and help explain the mechanisms or linkages in causal theories or models” (Creswell, 2007, p. 40). Some of the relationships in this study have been studied extensively, such as the relationships among job satisfaction, job performance, and organizational culture (Bates, 2004; Bowling, 2007; Chieffo, 1991; Edwards, 1998; Gazir, 2007; Gillett-Karam et al., 1997; Happ & Yoder, 1991; Henkin & Holliman, 2009; Hollon & Gemmill, 1976; Kim et al., 2008; Mardanov et al., 2008; Milosheff, 1990; Murray & Murray, 1998; Pigge & Lovett, 1985; Rentsch & Steel, 1992; Rubis, 2004; Van Tilburg, 1988; Wood, 1976; Zhang & Zheng, 2009). Others, however, have been studied very little (Duggan, 2007, 2008; Lester, 2009), or not at all (such as the relationship of gender performativity to identity in a nontraditional working
environment). Qualitative inquiry can be used to address areas of literature that have not yet been explored or have only been explored in a quantitative way (Patton, 2002). The researcher chose a qualitative research design to address the exploratory nature of the study (Patton, 2002).

**Research Paradigm**

Since Butler’s (1990) theory of performativity (a feminist theory) was used as the theoretical framework for this study, a research paradigm of feminism was a natural fit. Feminism as a paradigm is an extension of social constructivism and examines how norms are internalized and manifested in participants and their lives (Hays & Singh, 2011). Researchers who choose this paradigm reject the notion that objectivity on the researcher’s part is possible, and instead acknowledge the researcher’s preconceptions and biases formulated before the study begins. In addition, “feminists seek to address and dismantle methods by which patriarchy may play into qualitative inquiry” (Hays & Singh, p. 16). Therefore, studies that begin with this agenda in mind typically have assumptions that are identified by the researcher.

**Case Study Tradition**

When choosing a research tradition, researchers must consider their research questions and the phenomenon under study (Creswell, 2007; Hays & Singh, 2011; Jurs & Wiersma, 2005; Patton, 2002). When researchers wish to answer the “how” and “why” questions about participants or phenomena in their natural contexts, the case study tradition is a logical choice (Hays & Singh, 2011). The case study tradition has three requirements: (1) the case must have boundaries, (2) the case must have working parts, and (3) the case must indicate patterned behaviors (Hays & Singh, 2011). Creswell
(2007) suggested using case studies to develop an in-depth understanding of a unique case while Yin (2009) recommends using the case study tradition to study a phenomenon in a particular context. One way to explore the gender performativity of female classified staff in a particular community college is through the use of the case study tradition. The case study included five participants from a community college in Washington State. Each participant in the case was a backline classified staff woman who works in a male-dominated field.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions guided the study:

1. *How is gendered behavior defined at WRCC from the perspectives of backline classified staff?*

2. *How does the performance of these gendered behaviors affect female backline staff’s identities, if at all?*

**Context**

In the fall of 2009, a total of 3,561,428 employees were working at degree-granting institutions in the United States. Of the employees, 44% were classified staff members, 39% were faculty members, and 17% were leaders (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). Congruent with the national average, WRCC employs a high number of classified staff. Of all WRCC employees in 2011, 47% were classified staff members, 36% were faculty members, and 17% were leaders. WRCC opened its doors for classes in 1946, offers state-approved professional/technical programs and a four-year nursing degree. The college is located at the main campus in one county, one branch campus in the same county approximately 20 miles away, and one branch campus in a
separate county approximately 40 miles away. WRCC serves a local population of about 280,000. The institution is 1 of 34 Washington state community and technical colleges and is accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities.

**The Students**

Approximately 30,000 students enroll at the institution every year. Table 1 and Table 2 outline the FTE and head count trends at WRCC.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>2,103</td>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>5,753</td>
<td>6,037</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>5,083</td>
<td>5,883</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>5,577</td>
<td>5,757</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,516</td>
<td>20,183</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Total Headcount Trend*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>4,269</td>
<td>4,837</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>8,538</td>
<td>8,923</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>8,492</td>
<td>8,523</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>8,739</td>
<td>8,796</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30,038</td>
<td>31,079</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants – Classified Staff

Table 3 shows the departments in which the 165 classified staff members at WRCC work. There are male-dominated departments on campus in which females work, but were not asked to participate because they serve a clerical role within the male-dominated department. The decision to exclude women in clerical positions was guided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics’ (2009) list of male-dominated fields. Women in clerical positions are not considered women working in non-traditional careers. For instance, one woman who works in Central Receiving was not asked to participate because she serves in a clerical position.
Table 3

*Classified Staff By Department*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising and Counseling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Campus Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Receiving</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare Development Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Support Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicating Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Administrative Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Administrative Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Equipment Technician*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Helpdesk*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Media</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Web Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Administrative Support (Adult Basic Education)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Administrative Support (Business and Technology)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Administrative Support (Early Head Start)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Administrative Support (Learning Resource Center)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Administrative Support (Math, Engineering, Science, and Health)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Administrative Support (Social Sciences and Humanities)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Support Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural/Student Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach and Admissions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records and Registration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running Start</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * = a department from which a participant was chosen.*
WRCC employs 165 full-time classified staff members. The researcher asked for volunteer participants from the 15 employees at WRCC who fall into the category of backline classified staff women who work in male-dominated fields. Identified by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2009) as male-dominated fields, these women work in the 10 following departments at the college: (1) Athletics, (2) Central Receiving (3) Custodial, (4) Duplicating Services, (5) Grounds, (6) Information Technology Equipment Technician, (7) Information Technology Helpdesk, (8) Information Technology Media, and (9) Safety and Security. The researcher crafted the study based on the assumption that at least five of these women would volunteer. This provided variation in the types of positions held by each participant.

The researcher asked six people from the sampling frame to participate in this study. The researcher chose these six people because of the 15 who qualified, these were the women who expressed interest. Initial interest was garnered by holding informational sessions with women in various departments. For instance, the researcher spoke to the women in the custodial department regarding the study. Only one expressed interest following the discussion. Therefore, when she was asked to participate, she agreed. The researcher discussed the study with other departments as well, including Athletics, Central Receiving, Duplicating Services, and Media. Following the discussion, the women in these departments did not express interest in participating. Of the six who were asked, five agreed. The five participants worked in male-dominated departments including the: (1) Grounds Department; (2) Information Technology Equipment Shop; (3) Information Technology Helpdesk; (4) Custodial Department, and (5) Security Department. The researcher then followed up with a formal email requesting their
participation. The researcher took measures to protect the identities of the participants. Confidentiality was further achieved by using pseudonyms to refer to each participant throughout this study. In this manner, readers could not later identify them. The groundskeeper was referred to as Nancy, the IT shop technician as Caroline, the IT Helpdesk technician as Maya, the custodian as Silvia, and the security guard as Linda.

**Measures**

The researcher collected data using a textual analysis tool for the document review, an interview protocol for the interviews, and an observation checklist for the observations during the interviews. The following sections outline each measure in the study. Each section includes a description of and scholarly support for the creation or adaptation of the instrument.

**Textual Analysis Tool**

McKee (2003) stated that textual analysis is when “we make an educated guess at some of the most likely interpretations that might be made of that text” (p. 55). The researcher developed a textual analysis tool (Appendix A) based on McKee’s (2003) work and incorporating Gawreluck’s (1993) list of descriptors of an organization (i.e. symbols, values, beliefs, assumptions, artifacts, events, and intended audience). The textual analysis tool was divided into three sections that examined the (1) origin of the document, (2) content of the document, and (3) textual features of the document (symbols or gendered words used). The researcher used this tool to analyze every document. The origin section described who wrote the document or who was present during the document’s inception. The second section examined the actual content of the document, including identifying the intended audience. The final section of the textual analysis tool
examined the textual features of the document. For example, the researcher closely
examined pronouns used, including the use of the word "he" in reference to all
employees.

Interview Protocol

Creswell (2007) purported the importance of determining which interview type
will be the most useful to answer the research questions. The researcher crafted the face-
to-face interview (Appendix C) for the second data collection method to expand upon the
themes noticed in the document review. The interview protocol was a locally designed,
14-question interview focused on the effect of gendered behavior on the participants’
identities. However, the researcher also used the interview to validate findings from the
document review about organizational culture and to explore gendered behaviors and
their effects on identities. For instance, one question asks for a description of the
participant’s best day and worst day at the college. The question was left intentionally
vague with the aspiration that the participant will discuss identity issues due to gendered
behavior that is considered acceptable at WRCC. The researcher used probing questions
that guided the participant to the topic of identity issues, but was cognizant of the
wording so as not to influence the responses. The interviews took one hour to one and a
half hours each.

Observation Checklist

The researcher observed the participants using Marshall’s (1986) checklist
(Appendix B) to observe verbal communication and nonverbal communication. Each
component required the researcher to record the method, a description of the method, and
any further comments the researcher perceived were important. The verbal component
distinguished tone based on pitch, loudness, and intonation. The checklist was also used to detect content based on phrases of tentativeness (such as “I guess”), apologies, self-denigration, niceties, power language (such as aggressiveness), metaphors, and exhibiting naïveté. Nonverbals were observed in kinesics (the study of facial expressions, use of hands, stance, and legs) and proxemics (the study of space utilization by humans in behavior, communication, and social interaction) (Marshall, 1986). Furthermore, nonverbals were observed in the participants’ appearances, such as dress, makeup, hair, or accessories. The final section of the checklist allowed the researcher to observe reactions such as distraction or engagement that can occur through eye contact, body position, hand gestures, head nodding, verbal agreements, interruptions, or the lack of any of the above reactions. Since body language is an important aspect of gendered performances, it was important to be present with the participants during the interviews and to use the observations to interpret their responses.

**Researcher Biases/Assumptions**

One limitation of this research study is researcher bias. Torff (2004) stated that "qualitative work is subject to researcher bias and too often blurs the line between research and advocacy" (p. 25). Additionally, Johnson and Christensen (2008) suggested that the researcher is a limitation of qualitative research because qualitative studies tend to be exploratory and open-ended. The researcher has a potential bias since she is a member of the female backline classified staff at her community college and has a vested interest in giving classified staff a voice within the literature and within the higher education community. She also identifies as a global feminist (someone who advocates
for equitable status of women everywhere, no matter what race, class, ethnicity, age, country of origin, etc.).

While she took measures to step outside this personal bias whenever possible, her partiality to this cause might have presented itself through her interpretations of observations or interview responses. The researcher used a research journal for the duration of the study for this purpose. Creswell (2007) stated that using a journal during a research study can enrich the analytic process by making implicit thoughts explicit. He also states that this type of self-reflection can document the researcher's personal reactions to observations and interview responses. By making these reactions and thoughts evident to the researcher, it was easier for her to identify any biases that arose and to reduce them by looking at data from different perspectives. The document review, observation notes, and interview transcriptions, codes, and themes may have been affected by the researcher’s ideals and beliefs. To reduce the impact of this limitation, the researcher took measures to treat each document, each observation recording, and each participant similarly by using the same instrument each time.

Another strategy the researcher used to increase trustworthiness was what Johnson and Christensen (2008) referred to as “reflexivity” throughout this study. Reflexivity is when a researcher engages in critical self-reflection about his or her potential biases and predispositions. The researcher used a research journal for the duration of the study for this purpose and referred to the journal during the process of data analysis. The journal included schedule information, a methods log which described decisions and the rationale for them, and reflections on the researcher’s thoughts, feelings, ideas, questions, concerns, and frustrations as the research process unfolded.
The reflection found in the journal became a reminder about “where the author is coming from” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). The following topics are a sample of the entries that appeared in the reflexive journal. First, the participants know the researcher fairly well. This could mean that the relationship might have influenced their answers. The participants could have been using words or giving the researcher answers that they thought she wanted to hear. Additionally, because the researcher is an employee of WRCC and knows the departments at WRCC fairly well, it could have influenced her probing questions in a manner that may have influenced the answers to the questions. Furthermore, the participants’ jobs and lives do not exist in a vacuum. Some of the questions about how they would treat people could not be completely objective. Long-standing relationships or history of interactions with people on campus could have influenced their answers. Finally, generational differences between the researcher and the pilot participants could also have been a factor. For instance, because the pilot participants were both above the age of 50, some words, such as ‘feminist’ could have different meanings to them than to the researcher.

Creswell (2007) stated that qualitative research begins with assumptions. This study began with the assumption that job satisfaction will positively affect job performance, which in turn will promote a positive organizational culture that is inclusive of all employee groups (Lester, 2009; Rentsch & Steel, 1992; Rubis, 2004; Zhang & Zheng, 2009). Many factors influence job satisfaction (and therefore job performance and organizational culture) (Happ & Yoder, 1991; Hollon & Gemmill, 1976; Milosheff, 1991; Murray & Murray, 1998; Pigge & Lovett, 1985; Rentsch & Steel, 1992; Thompson, McNamara, & Hoyle, 1997; Van Tilburg, 1988), but how often are gender
performances examined in relation to job satisfaction? Since job satisfaction, job performance and organizational culture are interrelated (Lester, 2009; Rentsch & Steel, 1992; Rubis, 2004; Zhang & Zheng, 2009), and job performance is a gendered performance (Butler, 1990), then job satisfaction, gender performance, and organizational culture are also likely connected. The second assumption of this study was that job behaviors are gendered, and these behaviors are more overt in non-traditional fields within a community college (Lester, 2009; Rentsch & Steel, 1992; Rubis, 2004; Zhang & Zheng, 2009). A third assumption of this study was that there are fields that are traditional and non-traditional by gender (U.S. Department of Labor, 2008). Finally, there were questions included in the interview that were left intentionally vague with the assumption that the participants would discuss their experiences pertaining to gender performativity in their non-traditional field within the community college. In some cases, this did not occur immediately. The researcher crafted and used probing questions that guided the participants to this discussion. For instance, if the participants did not volunteer the information themselves, the researcher asked the probing questions: (1) "How long have you been at the college?", (2) "How long have you been in this department?", and (3) "Why did you choose this position?" when beginning the interview and asking the question, "Tell me about your background at this college."

The researcher expected to find that the documents and interviews would produce findings that indicate a culture of gendered expectations at WRCC. However, even though two out of the 121 documents at WRCC used gendered language, the documents indicated a culture that was largely gender neutral. Additionally, the researcher began this study with the assumption that the document review findings would be similar to the
findings produced from the interviews and observations. However, since the researcher did not begin the interviews until after the document review findings were analyzed, coded, and themed, the researcher adjusted her assumptions about the institution before the interviews began. The interviews began with the assumption that the social culture would be as gender neutral as the written culture. The interview protocol and observation checklist used during the interviews were not adjusted since the questions were already neutral in nature. The researcher adjusted her assumptions again as the interviews progressed because the assumption that the social culture would be similar to the written culture proved inaccurate during the first interview. However, the researcher's initial assumption that there would be a culture of gendered expectations at WRCC at the beginning of the study was proven true by the interviews.

**Data Collection**

This qualitative research study used a case study approach to define gendered behaviors at WRCC and describe how these behaviors affect the identities of female backline classified staff members who work in non-traditional fields. This qualitative approach allowed the researcher to compile comprehensive personal data about the women in the study (Creswell, 2007). The researcher employed qualitative techniques including textual analysis of plans, policies, procedures, meeting minutes and proceedings, face-to-face interviews, and observations of women during interviews. The following describes the data collection procedures the researcher used in this study. Since the data collection was broken down into four phases, this section has four sub-headings that discuss (1) piloting the instruments, (2) document review procedures, (3) interview procedures with observations, and (4) follow-up interview procedures.
Data Collection Procedures

The researcher contacted the participants in person before any consent forms were signed. The researcher explained the purpose of the study to each participant but did not explain the instruments in detail. The researcher made this decision to keep the participant’s behaviors, attitudes, and responses as candid as possible. If the participants did not know exactly what information was being sought, they were less likely to try to react the way they might have thought they were expected to act or, conversely, less likely to try to avoid acting the way they normally would. After the data collection process, participants were sent an email thanking them for their participation (Appendix D).

Phase one. Phase One involved piloting the textual analysis tool, observation checklist, and interview protocol using willing participants and sample documents. The researcher piloted the document review using documents available to her from a local similar institution. She performed a textual analysis on a policy, procedure, and minutes of a meeting/proceeding. From this, she evaluated the usefulness of the tool by evaluating if the findings indicated gendered expectations. Additionally, the researcher piloted the observations and interviews using willing participants at the community college in which she works but who are not a part of the participant population. These pilot participants were not part of the original sampling frame due to their job titles. The pilot participants worked in clerical positions within the male-dominated departments. Although they worked in the male-dominated departments, their jobs are not considered non-traditional according the US Department of Labor (2008). Afterward, she analyzed the results of the interview responses and the recorded observations from the pilot
participants and determined that there were no changes needed on the interview protocol or observation checklist.

**Phase two.** Phase Two included an analysis of all plans, policies, procedures, and minutes that were available to the researcher by public means (i.e., the website and any published materials that are meant for the community college population at large) and were available to the researcher through her contacts at the institution. The textual analyses of the plans, policies, procedures, and proceedings/meeting minutes of WRCC took place before any of the other data collection methods. Wallace (2002) stated that these types of documents can give a reader insight into the organization's culture. The researcher used the textual analysis tool to conduct the document review. The researcher acquired written permission from the president's office at WRCC to use their policies, procedures, and proceedings/meeting minutes in the document review (Appendix E). The interviews began only after the documents were reviewed and a reasonable interpretation of the culture at WRCC had been written based on organizing and coding the documents to identify themes.

**Phase three.** Phase Three, the interview, provided an opportunity to attain the participants' views of their social practices, and to discuss how the performance of acceptable social practices affects their identities. The researcher conducted an interview that lasted about an hour to an hour and a half with each participant. The researcher scheduled the interview using an email invitation (Appendix I) ahead of time for each participant. She obtained informed consent from each participant before interviews began (Appendix H). Next, she conducted interviews in a private location and audio-recorded the interview. The interviews took place after the textual analysis was coded to expand
upon the themes that emerged. Phase Three also consisted of conducting observations. Originally, the researcher planned to observe participants in various different environments, separate from the interview. However, the president of WRCC did not approve the observations for this study. He stated that during the current economic downturn, he did not feel it was a good idea to have a person sitting in various environments documenting what employees were doing because it could look like an audit of people’s jobs in anticipation of layoffs. Therefore, the research study design was changed to include observations only during the already planned interviews. The document review detailed a background against which the interviews and observations were measured.

Phase four. Finally, Phase Four consisted of follow-up interviews. The researcher left this phase as optional in the event that a follow-up interview was needed on any questions that emerged from the interview transcriptions, organizations, or reflections. Following organization, transcription, and coding of the interviews, the researcher needed to conduct one follow-up interview with one of the participants to clarify ambiguous information. The follow-up interview was conducted over the telephone. Patton (2002) stated that “[i]n my experience, people who are interviewed appreciate such a follow-up because it indicates the seriousness with which the interviewer is taking their responses” (p. 383).

Data Analysis

During data analysis, there were five questions that Hays and Singh (2011) recommend returning to frequently during the data analysis process:
1. What data have I ignored and/or neglected to analyze that might contribute to the understanding of this case(s)?

2. What in my analysis of this case(s) is indicating a finding that appears to go against major identified findings?

3. Does my analysis reflect the most important findings I have identified in the case?

4. Where am I leaving my expertise as a researcher out of the data analysis?

5. How might my research tradition guide me to return to my data collection and analysis and shift the lens with which I analyze my data? (p. 11).

The researcher visited these questions at the beginning of data analysis and during data analysis. Notes and ideas were recorded in the research journal that was kept throughout the duration of the study (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). In addition, Hays and Singh (2011) recommend researchers develop data analysis plans at the start of a study. Figure 2 illustrates the data analysis plan for this study.
Creswell (2003) stated that qualitative research is inductive, with the researcher generating meaning from the collected data. In this instance, the researcher generated meaning from the data collected through the document review of the community college's plans, policies, procedures, and meeting proceedings/minutes. She also generated meaning by coding the raw data and drawing themes from the observations of and interviews with the participants. She did this through categorical aggregation and direct interpretation. According to Creswell (2007),

in categorical interpretation, the researcher seeks a collection of instances from the data, hoping that issue-relevant meanings will emerge. In direct interpretation, on the other hand, the case study researcher looks at a single
instance and draws meaning from it without looking for multiple instances (p.163).

The researcher used categorical interpretation for themes common to all the women who participated in this study. Direct interpretation was used when drawing meaning on themes that emerged within an individual woman’s narrative. In addition, the final product of the analysis incorporated the views of the participants (emic) as well as the views of the researcher (etic) (Creswell, 2007). Some of the observations and responses required interpretation by the researcher. This is where the views of the researcher played a pivotal role. She had participants explain as much as possible so her bias was minimized.

Patton (2002) commented that documents, or what he refers to as “material culture,” are rich sources of information about organizations. The document review helped the researcher assess the culture of the institution at WRCC by examining the symbols, assumptions, values, and beliefs that appeared in the documents. In addition, Creswell (2007) advised researchers to obtain permission to utilize public documents within research studies. The researcher obtained permission from WRCC to use the plans, policies, procedures, and proceedings that are available. The textual analysis tool was designed to ensure that the researcher analyzed each document by the same set of standards and that she did not overlook any information. The researcher used the tool as a checklist and completed each section of the tool. Once she did this for all the plans, policies, procedures, and proceedings that were available to her, she coded and themed the documents by themselves and then compared them to the others.
Interviews comprised the second method of collecting data. Jurs and Wiersma (2005), Patton (2002), and Creswell (2007) all claim that interviews are an invaluable way of conducting in-depth probing of a particular issue. Interviews allow the researcher to see the issue from the participants’ perspectives. The interviews in this study allowed discussion with the participants about how the performance of gendered behavior affects their identities. Using personal memos during interviews is an invaluable way to remember what was said and to record observations of nonverbal expressions (Creswell, 2007; Patton, 2002). Interviews were transcribed verbatim. For each participant, the researcher organized and coded recorded memos and interview transcriptions together. The researcher used codes to identify common themes within each interview. Finally, the researcher cross-analyzed the interviews to find common themes among all of them.

Patton (2002) suggested there are limitations to how much can be learned from what people say. Observations are important because they combine what people say with direct participation in and observation of the phenomenon of interest to understand fully the complexities of many situations. In this study, that phenomenon was the performance of gender. He even argued that “participant observation is the most comprehensive of all types of research strategies” (Patton, 2002, p. 21). In addition, Creswell (2007) outlined issues that arise from observation methods. Some of these issues are remembering to take notes, recording quotes accurately within the notes, keeping from being overwhelmed at the interview with information, and learning how to funnel the broad amount of information into a narrow snapshot in time of the phenomenon in question. The researcher took precautions against these issues by using an observation checklist to remember to take notes before entering the interview. She also made every effort to write
as quickly as possible to record accurate quotations in the notes. In addition, the researcher piloted the observation checklist in other environments to get used to the amount of information that can be recorded during one interview and to practice narrowing the notes into themes and into a narrower picture, one that can be communicated to the reader. She organized and coded the data into major themes that were revealed in the notes. She then cross-analyzed the notes to identify themes that emerged across all the observation sessions.

The researcher used the same procedure during the coding process for the document review, observation sessions, and the interviews. The researcher coded each data collection method separately to identify the major themes within each one, then together to identify major themes across all methods. The researcher analyzed the textual analysis, observations, and interviews using a data-driven approach with coding inductively derived from the raw data. Developing a manageable classification or coding scheme was the initial step of analysis. Organizing and classifying the qualitative data constructed the foundation for extracting meaning from the data, frameworks for interpretation, and conclusions. The development of the codes and categories required the discovery of patterns in the data that could be further sorted into subcategories. The researcher read the raw data to identify common themes and employed Boyatzis' (1998) structure of a useful, meaningful code to label each theme. Then she examined each theme by noting the frequency within the documents. The researcher determined the themes based on specific quotes as well as interpretations of observations.

The researcher coded each data collection method for each participant individually using within-case analysis (Creswell, 2007) and then together to identify
themes specific to each participant. A cross-case analysis (Creswell, 2007) of all five cases identified common themes to define gendered behaviors and their affects on the identities of the female population at the institution in which the research study took place.

**Trustworthiness Strategies**

Lincoln and Guba (1985) identified four major components of trustworthiness. The first component, credibility, is similar to internal validity in quantitative studies and requires the researcher to look across all transcripts, documents, and notes to find similarities. The second component, transferability, is the ability to transfer the methods of a study to different contexts with different participants. The third component, dependability, is similar to reliability in a quantitative study and refers to the ability of a future researcher to follow the decision logic of the original researcher. Finally, confirmability, similar to objectivity in quantitative studies, is the researcher’s self-critical attitude (reflexivity) about his or her preconceptions and how they might affect the results of a study. The researcher used confirmability by acknowledging how her preconceptions may have affected the data collected through the textual analysis tool, the observations, and interpretations of the interviews. The researcher ensured transferability by using an observation instrument that has been used in various other studies. Future researchers can cite the use of the Marshall’s checklist in various studies and transfer it to their data collection methods. The review of the textual analysis tool by a subject matter expert and the step-by-step description of the instruments and methods used exercised dependability. Looking at each participant independently and then looking at similarities
between the participants through cross-case analysis addressed credibility and
confirmability.

Additionally, the researcher made use of an external auditor to further increase the
trustworthiness of this study. The researcher asked the external auditor if he would be
willing to perform this duty. The external auditor willingly agreed. The external auditor
has a degree in environmental studies with an emphasis in politics and policy from the
University of California, Santa Cruz. His degree required a bachelor’s thesis. The
external auditor’s thesis was titled *Sex, Gender and the Environment*. It is a treatment of
the intersection of the development of feminist and environmental philosophies and the
implications for the future of the environmental movement. His work experience has
focused in administration, data management and analysis. After a career in the
environmental movement in California, he moved to Washington State where his focus
shifted to the medical industry. In February of 2007, he took a position at WRCC, where
he has served as the Executive Assistant to the Vice President for Administrative
Services. In this capacity, he serves as the Rules Coordinator for the College. This
position is the official manager of all policies for the Board of Trustees of the College
including those that become part of the Washington Administrative Code. He serves as a
subject expert for administrative members throughout the College as they develop and
modify both Board sanctioned and administrative policy.

Textual analysis is a methodology that is typically considered subjective (McKee,
2003). Similar to writing history, interpretations of the texts are dependent upon the
perceptions and biases of the interpreter. The researcher acknowledged that her
perceptions and biases might have influenced the interpretations of the plans, policies,
procedures, and proceedings she analyzed. McKee (2003) advised researchers to gather meanings from texts based on what is likely to be seen in them, not what should be seen in them. These meanings should be validated by a larger context. For instance, if a triangle symbol is used and is typically interpreted and largely accepted as a symbol of homosexuality (Jensen, 2002) then the context in which the symbol is used could have homosexual implications. Additionally, the researcher had a subject-matter expert review her textual analysis tool.

The subject matter expert received a doctorate in educational leadership and reviews articles for the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal about Women in Higher Education. On January 4, 2011, the researcher contacted the subject matter expert via email. The researcher described the study, its purpose, and the purpose of the document review. She attached the textual analysis tool that she had crafted based on Gawreluck’s (1993) description of characteristics of an organization and McKee’s (2003) book describing how to create a textual analysis tool. She asked the subject matter expert to review the tool to see if it was a viable instrument to use in the field during the study. The subject matter expert made three suggestions pertaining to the tool. The first was to make the question “Who is the intended audience?” more specific. Her reasoning behind this was to be able to address that if it was a policy or procedure for a group of people in an area of the college that typically is female-dominated, the language or the wording may look different than a policy or procedure that is intended for an area of the college that is typically male-dominated. She also suggested adding a question that directly addresses gender such as “What assumptions about gender are implied by this document?” Her example of an assumption was the use of “maternity
leave” instead of “parental leave” in an area typically dominated by women. This might differ from an area that is typically male-dominated. These suggestions were incorporated into the textual analysis tool.

Marshall and Rossman (2011) stated that observation is the “systematic noting and recording (from highly structured, detailed notes to holistic descriptions) of events, behaviors (and the meanings attached to those behaviors), and artifacts (objects) in the social setting…” (p. 79). Marshall’s checklist has been used in previous studies. For instance, Lester (2008) used Marshall’s checklist to observe verbal and nonverbal communication between female faculty members in typically male-dominated career fields and their students and other faculty members, proving the tool still useful in data collection.

The document review and the observations helped the researcher collect data from her perspective (Creswell, 2007). The interviews explored the participants’ perspectives by incorporating the participants’ opinions and descriptions (Creswell, 2007). One disadvantage of personal interviews is the possibility of interviewer bias, which occurs when the interviewer’s personal feelings and attitudes or the interviewer’s race, gender, age, or other characteristics influence the way questions are asked or interpreted. Women talking to female interviewers may express different opinions than they would to a male interviewer (Ary, et. al., 2006).

In addition to using the above strategies of trustworthiness, the researcher conducted a pilot study of each instrument. First, the researcher piloted a document review on a set of plans, policies, procedures, or proceedings available to the researcher at her institution. Next, the researcher conducted pilot interviews with female backline
classified staff members who do not qualify as participants in this study. Finally, the researcher conducted practice observation sessions using the observation checklist during the interviews. By doing this, the researcher gathered information from the pilot study participants about the clarity and length of the interview before the interviews were conducted with the participants at WRCC.

**Piloting the Textual Analysis Tool**

The purpose of piloting the document reviews was to see if the process outlined in the proposal worked, to assess how long each document review might take, and to see if themes emerge from the documents using the textual analysis tool. The process used to analyze the document was successful. Themes identified from the document reviews and an organizational cultural assessment could be assumed. The researcher presented the findings to the external auditor to see if trustworthiness was intact. The auditor was tasked to check for statements or interpretations that seemed biased and to question the researcher about them. The auditor found that interpretations were largely objective, but encouraged the researcher to still include her biases so that any reader could understand that interpretations are never entirely objective. The time that it took to evaluate this pilot document was one hour. Time was allotted to complete the reviews of the rest of the documents for the campus, to analyze them, and to have the external auditor check the findings before moving onto the interviews for the study. The textual analysis tool successfully guided the researcher’s focus throughout the process to allow for analysis of many aspects of each document. No changes were made to the textual analysis tool.
Piloting the Interview Protocol and the Observation Checklist

The purpose of the pilot interviews as to measure the length of time each interview would take, test the audio recorder, make sure the questions made sense to the participants, and to make sure the questions were extracting the information desired. The interviews took one hour to one and a half hours each. The pilot participants struggled with the question “What does it mean to you to be a woman,” but after further prompting and assurance that there is no wrong answer, the pilot participants were able to answer the question. The interviews indicated themes that are relevant to the study and extracted the information needed to begin to paint the picture of what it means to be a woman who works in a male-dominated field at WRCC. There were no changes made to the interview protocol. Additionally, the observational checklist was used during the interviews with the pilot participants. The checklist proved useful in assessing the participants’ reactions to certain questions. The researcher did not make changes to the observational checklist following the pilot interviews.

Ethical Treatment of Participants

The researcher took several steps to protect the participants. First, she kept all notes from observations, recorded responses from the interviews, and transcriptions strictly confidential and in a locked file to which only the researcher has access for five years. After the five years, she will then shred or destroy all materials. Additionally, she removed all identifying information. Creswell (2007) stated that researchers need to be aware of work relationships that can be compromised during research studies. The researcher had to be cognizant of her work relationship with the participants and put aside any knowledge of situations she may have had before the interviews. Additionally, she
had to make it clear to each participant that the work relationship would not be affected by participation in this study. There was no way to know if the participants believed this guarantee. Therefore, the trust needed to begin was a limitation of this study and is included in the "Limitations and Delimitations" section of the study in Chapter Five. All procedures required consent before initiation. In addition, the researcher emphasized that there would be no repercussions if participants chose to remove themselves from the study at any point in time.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

This chapter presents the findings of the study. First, analysis of documents is presented. Identified themes within and across documents are outlined. Then, five participant narratives are presented. Identified themes within and across participants are outlined and compared. The cross-case themes were then compared to the themes that were identified in the documents to see how the written culture at WRCC compares to the culture according to the participants.

The Written Culture of WRCC

The researcher reviewed all policies, procedures, processes, and meeting minutes available to her for the overall institution and for the departments in which the participants worked before interviews were conducted. There were seven types of documents that were reviewed: (1) overall institutional policies that have been submitted to the Washington Administrative Code (WAC); (2) overall institutional policies that have not been submitted to the WAC; (3) overall institutional procedures; (4) work plans for upper level administrators that apply to the whole institution; (5) meeting minutes and proceedings; (6) union contracts; and (7) departmental level documents for each of the departments from which the participants were chosen. Appendix J shows a list of the 121 documents that were reviewed. The researcher reviewed all of the documents that exist for WRCC that pertain to the overall institution. There are more policies and procedures that exist at the department level for departments other than the ones from which the participants of this study were chosen. For instance, the Instruction division has documents that apply only to faculty. However, since faculty members were not
participants in this study, those policies and procedures were not reviewed. All policies and procedures were reviewed for the Custodial, Security, and Grounds departments. The Director of the Information Technology department provided policies and procedures for the Helpdesk and the Equipment Technician sections of the Information Technology department that she perceived would not compromise security of the college. The researcher asked for as many of the policies and procedures that would not compromise the security of Information Technology department to be provided. The Director of Information Technology provided three documents to the researcher.

The textual analysis tool was divided into three sections that examined the (1) origin of the document, (2) content of the document, and (3) textual features of the document (symbols or gendered words used). The researcher used this tool to analyze every document. Approximately 30 minutes was spent on each document, depending on the length. However, the researcher spent approximately one hour and six hours on the work plans affecting the institution and union contracts, respectively. The origin section described who wrote the document or who was present during the document’s inception. The second section examined the actual content of the document, including identifying the intended audience. The final section of the textual analysis tool examined the textual features of the document. For example, the researcher closely examined pronouns used, including the use of the word “he” in reference to all employees.

Overall Institutional Policies Submitted to WAC

The researcher reviewed 17 overall institutional policies that had been submitted to the WAC. WAC’s are “regulations of executive branch agencies that are issued by authority of statutes. Like legislation and the Constitution, regulations are a source of
primary law in Washington State. The WAC codifies the regulations and arranges them by subject or agency” (Washington State Legislature, 2012). The documents ranged from one sentence to 13 pages of smaller text. One document among the 17 overall institutional policies that had been submitted to the WAC, “Acts of Hate/Bias Policy,” used the commonly believed binary of gender. This policy states, “Incident response will incorporate to the extent appropriate, input from the victim on her/his needs and thoughts on how to best address the matter” (policy number 200-22, page 3). The language used in this document reinforced a gender binary. Additionally, the feminine pronoun occurs first in this statement. This could suggest that the policy makers were envisioning these acts of hate or bias occurring to women more than men.

Thirteen of the 17 documents did not affect classified staff. These 13 documents either affected the entire institution or only the upper echelon of administration such as the president or the Board of Trustees. The remaining four documents of this type do not directly address classified staff, but imply a burden upon them without recognition. For instance, policy number 600-01, “Withholding Services for Outstanding Debts” states that

Where an outstanding debt is owed to the college, the college shall notify the individual in writing of the amount of the outstanding debt and shall further explain that the services will not be provided until that debt is satisfied, unless it is stayed or discharged in bankruptcy (page 1).

The classified staff members who work in the Cashiering section of the Financial Services department perform this particular action of notification. These four documents that have implied work for members of the classified staff do not acknowledge the burden
of this work. In the same manner, policy number 200-16, the “Parking Policy,” outlines
the guidelines for enforcement, fines, and impoundments, which are all performed by the
classified staff members of the Safety and Security department. These performed tasks
by the classified staff members of the Safety and Security department are not
acknowledged within the policy itself.

Overall Institutional Policies Not Submitted to WAC

The researcher reviewed 37 overall institutional policies that have not been
submitted to the WAC. Some of the documents were intended for multiple audiences.
For instance, policy number 100-07, the “Award of Tenure,” was intended for both
faculty members and upper administration because faculty members need to know the
requirements they must meet and upper administration must know the requirements
against which to measure when considering faculty members for tenure. Therefore, when
outlining the documents and the intended audiences, they may not add up to the exact
existing amount. Twelve of the 37 documents were intended for all constituencies:
administrators, faculty, classified staff members, and students. Another twelve of the 37
documents were intended for upper administration including the President, the Board of
Trustees, or other exempt administrative positions, such as the Public Information
Officer. Three of the 37 documents were intended for faculty members, while seven of
the 37 documents were intended for students. Classified staff members were addressed
directly in two of the 37 documents.

However, 15 of the documents implied required work for classified staff
members, but did not acknowledge this work. For instance, policy number 200-04,
“[WRCC] Guidelines and Policy on Notification of Sex Offenders” states that
notification via email and bulletin boards to all employees and students will be
performed. The person who performs this at WRCC is a classified staff member within
the Safety and Security Department. Additionally, six of the 37 documents use language
that reinforces a gender binary. For instance, policy number 200-20, “Sexual Harassment
Policy” states that sexual harassment, “may involve the behavior of a person of either sex
against a person of the opposite or same sex.” Finally, there are two documents of the 37
that use gendered language that support a masculine view of society. For instance, policy
number 100-06, “Acceptance of Certain Classes of Gifts,” states, “The Board of Trustees
authorizes the President or his designees to accept the following classes of gifts to the
College…” The use of the word “his” to refer to the President’s designees meant that the
writer and approvers of this policy have made one or both of two assumptions. The first
assumption is that the president of the College will always be male. The second
assumption is that the word “he” or “his” is an accepted pronoun that can be used to refer
to all genders at WRCC. Additionally, policy number 600-03, “Tuition and Fee Waivers
for Classified State Employees,” states, “Full-time, permanent, classified state employees
who desire to enroll under the provision of his section shall not be required to pass any
financial need…” This policy further demonstrates that the word “he” or “his” is an
accepted pronoun to refer to the men and women of WRCC.

Overall Institutional Procedures

The researcher reviewed 26 overall institutional procedures. As with the overall
institutional policies, some of the documents were intended for multiple audiences and
the documents may not add up to the exact existing amount. Ten of the 26 documents
were intended for all constituencies, including administrators, faculty, classified staff, and
students. Eight of the 26 documents pertain to upper administration such as the President, the Board of Trustees, or directors for more specific policies. For instance, procedure number 100-09-02, "Naming of Structure of Living Individual" involves upper administration and the Director of Facilities in order to decide on the best name for a building under construction. Seven of the 26 are intended for faculty members and four for students.

Classified staff members are mentioned as one of the constituencies in one of the 26 documents. However, there are 14 of the 26 overall institutional procedures that require unacknowledged actions by classified staff members. For example, procedure number 200-15-03, "Course Materials Faculty and Division Coordination" implies work for the bookstore staff, which are mostly classified staff members, but does not mention this work in the procedure. Two of the 26 documents directly mentioned and were intended for classified staff members, including procedure number 200-21-01, "Use of Force Procedures" and procedure number 200-12-01, "Implementing a Proposed Policy or Policy Revision." Eleven of the 26 documents used language that reinforces a gender binary. For instance, procedure number 200-21-01, "Use of Force Procedures," states "...when an officer makes a citizen's arrest and is delivering that person to a public officer competent to receive him or her into custody."

Work Plans Affecting Overall Institution

The researcher reviewed two work plans that apply to the overall institution. The first document is the Board of Trustees 2011-12 Work Plan. The goals influence the entire institution, but the intended audience is the Board of Trustees. Tenure, sabbatical, and program reviews are all emphasized in this plan. Beyond the Board of Trustees, the
intended constituent is clearly faculty. The second work plan was the President’s 2011-12 Work Plan. This plan directly mentions students 12 times and faculty once. Yet, it creates work for classified staff members five times and does not directly mention them once. For instance, the President’s 2011-12 Work Plan states “Open the new parking on [Rhododendron] Avenue and work within the City…to install a stop light…” This implies there will be much work on the part of the Safety and Security Department and the Facilities Department, but it is not recognized.

Meeting Minutes Affecting Overall Institution

The researcher reviewed three meeting minutes that were available to her. There were no meeting minutes available at the departmental level. At the overall institutional level, there are three meetings that occur on a regular basis. Those meetings are the Board of Trustees meeting that occurs once a month, the President’s Council meeting that occurs once a month and the President’s Cabinet meeting that occurs once a month. No social interaction was recorded at any of the meetings. The topics did not cover a specific group on campus, but rather the campus as a whole. For instance, it addressed topics such as the budget committee tasks, grants, diversity advisory committee, and mission changes. The intended audience of the Board of Trustees meeting is upper administration. The intended audience of the President’s Cabinet and President’s Council meetings is all constituents. The language in the meeting minutes was not gendered and did not reinforce a gender binary.

Overall Institutional Union Contracts

The researcher reviewed the two union contracts that are used at the WRCC campuses. One contract is specifically written for classified staff and one is written
specifically for faculty members. The union contract for the faculty members included information regarding recognition, nondiscrimination, benefits, compensation, grievances, and leave. The union contract for the classified staff members included information regarding nondiscrimination, workplace behavior, hiring procedures, temporary appointments, performance evaluations, hours of work, overtime and leave, uniforms, drugs and alcohol in the workplace, use of electronic devices, and grievance procedures. There was no gendered language used or any language used that would reinforce a gender binary.

**Department Level Documents**

The researcher reviewed 34 documents written by the departments from which the participants were chosen. Fifteen of the 34 were written for and by the Safety and Security Department. Fifteen more documents were written for and by the Facilities Department, which would apply to both the Custodial and Grounds divisions of the Facilities Department. One more document was written for and by the Custodial division within the Facilities Department. Finally, three of the 34 documents were written for the Information Technology Department. None of the department level procedures used gendered language or language that reinforced a gender binary.

**Characteristics**

The researcher identified common characteristics across all documents. After the documents were analyzed, four categories were aggregated from the findings. The four identified categories were: (1) Outdated documents; (2) Limited acknowledgment to Classified Staff; (3) Reinforced gender normative; and (4) Gendered language. The four categories are described in the following sections.
**Outdated documents.** After reviewing the 121 documents of WRCC, it was clear that there were 15 documents that had not been updated in quite some time. For example, policy number 200-08 pertained to life threatening illnesses. Instead of leaving the language vague so that the document is timeless and can refer to more recent illnesses such as avian flu, swine flu, or MRSA, the document specifically outlines policy regarding admittance and hiring of students and employees with AIDS and HIV. This suggests that the policy may have been a reaction to fear at a time when not many facts were known about these illnesses. This is confirmed by the last date of review for this policy: 1988.

**Limited acknowledgment to Classified Staff.** Of the five types of documents that pertain to the college as a whole (overall institutional policies submitted to the WAC, overall institutional policies not submitted to the WAC, overall institutional procedures, work plans and meeting minutes), classified staff members were given implied work more than they were recognized as a stakeholder in any of these documents. Of the 85 documents that applied to the overall institution, classified staff members were specifically mentioned in eight of them. For instance, the Board of Trustees 2011-12 Work Plan states, “The Board engaged in discussions with members of the Task Force regarding the Task Force’s evaluation of responses where respondents rated themselves satisfied or very satisfied with advising services…” The advising services staff is made up of full-time and part-time classified staff members. Twenty-five of them were directed toward the entire college population including administrators, classified staff, faculty, and students. Twenty-six of the documents required that work be done that is typically performed by a member of the classified staff, but did not acknowledge the
work that they would have to do to carry out the directives. For instance, policy number 200-02, “Rental of [WRCC] Facilities”, states,

It shall be the policy of [WRCC] to allow rental of the [WRCC] facilities when they are not previously scheduled for College use by non-college organizations or individuals upon approval by the President of the College and in accordance with administrative regulations (page 1).

This sentence implies work for the facilities staff (largely made up of classified staff) and the room schedulers (who are all classified staff members). In addition, the approval of the president of WRCC needs to be in writing and this document needs to be filed. The person who files this paperwork is a classified staff member. This trend suggests that classified staff members are not present during policy-making. If they were present, the work to carry out the directives in the policies and procedures that apply to the overall institution would be acknowledged.

**Reinforced gender normative.** Policy number 200-20, Sexual Harassment Policy, written and approved in 2010, states, “Sexual harassment may involve the behavior of a person of either sex against a person of the opposite or same sex…” In Chapter Two, Butler’s theory was presented. One premise of her theory is that the normative view of only two genders and two sexes existing is incorrect. This policy demonstrates that WRCC’s policy writers may subscribe to this normative view and the policy reinforces the normative view to any readers. However, the researcher acknowledges that any policy would be difficult to compose outside of this normative view.
Gendered language. The document review revealed two documents out of 121 that contained gendered language. In fact, the documents appear to be written from a gender-neutral perspective or to have had gendered words and pronouns stripped from more recent versions that were reapproved. The two documents containing gendered language hint at what may be a culture where using masculine terms to refer to men and women is accepted within the institution. However, because less than 2% of the documents indicate this kind of culture, the researcher determined that, on paper, WRCC has a culture of equality between men and women and does not typically employ the use of gendered language. The two documents containing gendered language could have been anomalies or could have indicated a change in WRCC's culture over time. After determining this culture of equality, the researcher began the interviews with participants to see if the social, non-written culture matched the documented culture and to determine the culture according to the participants.

Conclusion

The information garnered from the documents informed the approach with the participants during the interviews. The researcher began interviewing with the assumption that the culture of equality that was largely found in the documents would be similar to the social culture that would be described by the participants during their interviews. However, the researcher did not provide this information, did not change any of the questions in the interview protocol, and did not use language that would indicate the findings from the documents.
The Interviews

The researcher conducted interviews with five female classified staff members who hold the positions of: Nursery/Grounds Specialist 4, Information Technology Equipment Technician, Information Technology Helpdesk Technician, Security Guard, and Custodian. The researcher conducted interviews to determine gendered behaviors at WRCC and how performing these behaviors affect the identities of women in male dominated departments. The following are the narratives of the women who participated in this study. Themes arose in each narrative, some of them common across narratives, others specific to only the individual woman. Therefore, while the first three headings in each narrative pertain to the same three concepts: (1) socially acceptable practices in each woman’s department; (2) navigating the environment, and (3) each woman’s identity and the effects of gendered behavior on their identity, other themes appear in each individual narrative that do not appear in the Common Themes section that follows. For instance, Nancy’s interview revealed experiences of gender discrimination. This appears as a theme in her section, but not in the other women’s sections because others did not elaborate on experiences of gender discrimination. After narratives are presented, themes across narratives are articulated. Then, themes are compared to those revealed in the document review. Finally, the researcher questions are addressed in the Conclusion section.

Nancy – The Groundskeeper

When Nancy came into the room for her interview, she sat directly in front of the interviewer in a chair, with her knees almost touching the interviewer’s. She used her face and hands to express the meanings of her words. Her legs were crossed and she
made consistent eye contact. Having come directly from work, her hair was up in a loose bun and had small pieces of grass in it. She did not wear makeup or accessories. She was dressed in jeans, boots, and a sweatshirt. Nancy had a very loud tone and pitch throughout the duration of her interview. She did not use phrases of tentativeness, nor did she apologize or use niceties. She also used head nodding to nonverbally agree or head shaking to nonverbally disagree with the interviewer, but only as a secondary means of communication to her verbal agreements and disagreements with the interviewer. She did not focus on written expectations, but instead focused on more abstract, social expectations. When answering questions, she used the word “I” to explain her experiences.

Nancy is the full-time classified staff member in the position of Nursery/Grounds Specialist 4. This means that Nancy is the supervisor of the Grounds department within the Facilities Department. Nancy started out as a part-time hourly, seasonal employee at WRCC. This meant that she could work up to 1,050 hours in a six-month time period and when she reached the limit, she was done until her hire date recurred. When asked how she came to be in her current position, Nancy replied,

I got lucky, to be honest, because the only time [positions] open is, unfortunately, when somebody dies or somebody leaves, which is very rare. [Her predecessor] decided to leave…which opened a position in grounds. My director…and my supervisor…both encouraged me to apply. I did…and I got it…that was October 14th, 1998.

Nancy turned down a full time position with a local landscaping company to work in the part time position at WRCC. She is in charge of one full-time male staff member
in the Grounds department, and anywhere from two to eight student employees of varying ages, genders, and advancement in their careers. A typical day for Nancy begins at 7am and includes cleaning the grounds on campus of debris left from students or inclement weather, raking or mowing depending on the season, and performing supervisory duties for her staff member and students. Her day may also include cleaning gutters, pulling weeds, pruning, doing special projects assigned to her including renovating an area of the grounds or preparing bouquets or floral arrangements for special events (both indoors and outdoors).

Nancy’s best day is when she won the WRCC Employee of the Year award. She stated that the recognition made her feel appreciated. Nancy’s worst day is when she was denied a “desk audit” for which she had applied. Desk audits are position reviews that are requested by an employee to demonstrate that they are working in a higher class of responsibility than the class under which they were initially hired. This can result in increased recognition for responsibilities assumed and an increase in pay. Supervisors are asked for input for desk audits when employees request them. Nancy’s supervisor stated that she “was the worst employee ever” and she was devastated. When asked why her supervisor wrote this about her, she stated, “Women were not to be of upper management positions.” When asked how she knew this, she said that the gentleman who denied me and said those horrible things about me was ex-military, and he had been in the military before women were allowed in the military as well and was very adamant and very strongly opinionated about that as well…Women were to be at home.
She stated that there was a male counterpart within her department at the time who was also trying very hard to get promoted and she felt that her supervisor was discriminating against her in order to position her male counterpart for promotion instead of Nancy, even though she had earned three separate awards during her first five years when her male counterpart had not. This incident occurred in the early 2000’s and Nancy feels that the culture at WRCC has changed and she has not felt discrimination since her previous supervisor left the institution. Additionally, she states that the landscaping industry itself has changed to include many females. When she first started her career in the landscaping business, “women were very few and very far between.”

Socially acceptable practices in the grounds department. It is acceptable for a woman to ask her male counterparts for help in the Grounds department with lifting heavy things. Nancy stated,

One always has to keep in mind that men are indeed stronger than women, but women can be very strong too…it may take two of us to lift something up that would only take one man to lift up, but I have not been able to not do a job that a man has been assigned to.

Nancy stated that this situation is different than what occurred many years before with her supervisor because while her male counterpart may treat her differently than other men in the wider department (Facilities), he does not do so in a way that feels condescending to her. When interacting with female co-workers within the Facilities department, Nancy reported feeling like an outsider. She is used to spending her time with men in the department and interacting with mostly men on campus. Nancy states that men in the department are sometimes “skittish” around her because they are afraid of
“crossing the line”. She states that one supervisor does not give her credit for all the tasks she performs and she feels it is because she is a woman. She feels this way because she has observed him treating other women in the department this way, but not her male counterparts.

**Navigating the environment.** Nancy said that she does exhibit different behaviors in different environments at work. She said that she is more “politically correct” in division meetings, she has an office voice, and she even has a telephone voice because that is what she was taught to do in the office when she was younger. However, when she is out in the field, she is loud and she is a “social butterfly”, but she is adamant about “putting out the work” (or, getting her assigned tasks completed). Nancy said, “[t]here are many, many eyes and I’m always aware of the eyes. I guess it’s my goal to please, and I take pride in my work.” She stated that someone from home would be very surprised to see her at work because her home roles contrast so greatly with her work roles.

**Nancy’s identity.** Nancy viewed her main role at work as that of “mentor.” She is authoritative and professional at work. It has evolved since she first started. She says that she used to be a “mom” figure to her students and employees, saying that she used to get involved personally.

I used to be extremely lenient when I first got hired…everybody came to me with their personal problems, you know, and back then I tried to be friends with them all. You just can’t do that. Throughout the years you’ve got to have structure, you’ve got to have rules, you’ve got to have guidelines that you have to just set for everybody. You can’t treat each person individually to an extent. So yeah, I
used to get so personally involved with their problems. It was too nerve-racking.

It was like I had 20 kids... When it came to terminating people, there were hard feelings and people would actually try to lash out and cost me my job.”

Nancy has many roles outside of work: mom, daughter, grandma, aunt, and single woman. When asked which represented her best outside her job, she hesitantly specified that it was single woman but only because she felt as though she had yet to define herself outside her job.

Nancy states that being a woman means “being able to wear dresses and skirts and high heels... because that is so the opposite of my job.” Nancy states that when she was a child, her being allowed to wear pantsuits was a “big step” and that later she was allowed jeans. Nancy is very aware of the differences between her roles in various environments at work. For instance, when she is in the office, she uses her “office voice.” When she is in the field, she is a “social butterfly” with colleagues, and authoritarian with her students. While navigating these different environments by playing certain roles may be unclear or even invisible to some women, Nancy seems very aware of the fact that she must pick a certain role to perform depending on where she is.

**Gender discrimination.** Nancy has experienced discrimination due to her gender by men on WRCC’s campus. She stated that a male supervisor treated her differently because she is a woman. However, she stated that she is treated differently because she is a woman by her co-workers as well, but that her co-worker does not behave this way in a condescending manner. For Nancy, the delivery method of discrimination makes a difference when she is determining severity or aligning it with a traditional definition of discrimination. She does not associate the behavior of her co-worker with discrimination
even though he is treating her differently because she is a woman, just as her previous supervisor did. She sees her male co-worker’s offers to help her as non-condescending. Because the intent behind his offers seem benign compared to her previous supervisor’s malicious intent, she did not see it as gender discrimination.

**Caroline – The Information Technology Equipment Technician**

When Caroline spoke with the researcher, she sat on a couch across with a cat curled in her lap. She was soft-spoken and sometimes inaudible on the recording of the interview. She used phrases of tentativeness such as “um’s, yeah’s, and I guess’s”.

When describing processes she performs at work, she consistently used the words “we” and “us.” Her hands were typically petting the cat, but she did use the occasional gesture to express her verbal meaning. Her legs were folded beneath her on the couch. She was dressed in jeans, shoes, and a sweatshirt. She had sporadic eye contact. Often, her primary means of communication was a head nod, a facial expression, or an eye movement expressing an answer.

Caroline is a part-time classified staff worker in the Information Technology equipment shop, commonly referred to on campus as the “IT Shop.” There are approximately 12 part-time or student employees working in the IT Shop. There is one male full-time employee who oversees the 12 part-time/student employees and one male full-time employee who supplements the 12 part-time/student employees within the IT Shop. Caroline is the only female in the IT Shop. Caroline started attending WRCC in the summer of 2008. The reason she went back to school was because she was unhappy at her job and there was no room for upward mobility. When her husband suggested studying computers, she matriculated to WRCC. She started in her position at WRCC in
the summer of 2010 because it was in line with her studies and she could get the practical side of her curriculum. She saw that there was an opening in the IT Shop, applied for it, and was surprised to be picked because she thought that her supervisor was looking for someone more experienced. A typical day for Caroline begins with checking I-Support (the system used to queue customer-generated and internally-generated tasks to the technicians) at 9am. She usually receives a brief from the full-time male technician who works beside her. When she receives her tasks (typically four or five) for the day, she is dispatched to the appropriate location and attempts to troubleshoot and fix the computer with the problem. When she does so, she goes back to the IT Shop to write up the actions she took in I-Support. Caroline does not have a designated supervisor. She reports to one of six males in the departments depending on who is present. Four of these six people are equal in position classification and pay to Caroline.

Caroline’s best day is when she can find the answers to the tasks in her queue. Additionally, Caroline states that the activeness of her day is also relevant. She does not like it to be too slow nor too busy because both instances make her tired. She prefers it somewhere in the middle. Caroline’s worst day is when she cannot find the solutions to the tasks in her queue or when it is either too busy or too slow.

**Socially acceptable practices in the IT shop.** Caroline primarily focused on written expectations at the beginning of this section of the interview. She stated that all technicians in the IT Shop are expected to be on time, to follow up with online tasks submitted by customers, to follow all procedures to the letter, and to try their hardest to troubleshoot problems on their own first and if they cannot figure out to call the IT Shop. After further discussion, Caroline revealed that she felt that even though it is not written,
it would not be socially acceptable for women in the IT Shop to wear low cut shirts or skirts to work:

They didn’t specify, but I feel that it’s not practical to wear a skirt because I’m moving computers through the campus, and I’ll have to sometimes crawl on the ground and get to cables that aren’t reachable, and you know...it’s common sense...I think it’s unprofessional.

She further stated that she thought it was important that women look clean at work in order to keep customers coming back, and that she thought that if she hadn’t looked presentable during her interview with her supervisor to get the job, she would not have been hired. Caroline states that she does not feel like an outsider because of her gender. She does, however, feel like an outsider due to age and lack of common interests. She is 41. Her male co-workers are in their early 20’s to mid 30’s. Her male co-workers have interests in gaming and comics, which she does not share.

**Navigating the environment.** Caroline said there is a noticeable difference between the interaction amongst herself and her peers during lunch than during an IT Shop meeting. During lunch, she and her co-workers are “joking and easy-going.” However, this changes for all of them during IT Shop meetings and they become “quiet and everyone’s more serious.” While in the field, Caroline typically allows her male co-workers to talk to the customers regarding technical problems. However, Caroline does not attribute this to her gender. She believed it is because she has introverted characteristics. She will talk if she needs to or if her male counterpart is quieter than she is. Caroline stated at the time of the interview that she has one male counterpart in the IT
Shop who is quieter than she is. She has not noticed a difference in how customers treat her due to her shyness, her age, or her gender.

**Caroline's identity.** Caroline identified her main role at work as a “friend.” This is true of her co-workers and her supervisors, who all happen to also be on her Facebook page. She considers her customers acquaintances. There have been instances when Caroline has been in the “mom” role in the IT Shop. One particular incident she described included a male co-worker saying that he had not eaten in 40 hours and he did not feel hungry. She told him that he needed to see a doctor no matter how much it cost him and she felt like a mother when she said it.

Caroline states that a family member or close friend would not be surprised to see her at work. She states that she operates in the role of “friend” with most people in her life, excluding her son. She states that this is dictated largely by his behavior: “he doesn’t like to talk to me about stuff. He likes to keep friends and family separate. He doesn’t believe they should be mixed.”

When asked what being a woman means to her, Caroline responded, “A woman has more worries about what society thinks of her.” When asked to expand on this, she referred to our earlier conversation about appearances and dress, stating that her job would be in jeopardy if she did not dress professionally or appropriately for her job.

**Difficulty connecting.** For Caroline, connecting to her co-workers in the IT shop has proved difficult. However, she believes that this is not due to gender differences. She believes that there are two reasons why this has occurred. The first is because there is a significant age difference between her and the eldest man in the shop (approximate 10 years). She attributes at least some of the distance between her and her male
counterparts to this age difference. Another reason is because she lacks common interests with her male counterparts. She states that they are interested in video games and comic books, while she is not. Additionally, Caroline’s shyness could be a barrier for her when trying to relate to her co-workers.

**Activeness of the day.** The activeness of her day makes a difference for Caroline. She does not like the day to be so busy that she gets stressed out. However, she does not like the day to be so slow that she feels bored. Since she states that her best day is when the activity falls somewhere in between too busy and too slow, the activeness of her day affects her job satisfaction.

**Unconscious team concept.** Caroline answered most of the questions using the pronouns “we,” “our,” and “us.” This suggests that her perception of the IT Shop is that of a team. She does not seem aware of the fact that she does this, however. She did not identify her relationship with her coworkers as being that of a team. In fact, when giving more specific examples, her description of completing tasks often described what she would do when she was on her own. Yet the use of these plural, possessive pronouns suggests that she conceptualizes the group of people who work in the IT Shop as a team, and that she is a member.

**Maya – The Information Technology Helpdesk Technician**

Throughout the interview, Maya was calm in demeanor. She did not seem nervous, her voice was loud, her tone firm. She did not use phrases of tentativeness or apologies, nor did she display naïveté during her interview. She used facial expressions and hand gestures to support her verbal statements. She sat across the table from the researcher with her legs crossed and her hands in her lap. She wore a long sweater with
jeans and ankle boots. Her jewelry included necklaces, earrings, bracelets, and two rings. Her hair was down and styled straight and she wore light makeup. She used a head nod a couple of times to agree with something the interviewer interpreted, but she mostly used verbal responses.

Maya is a full-time classified staff employee at the Information Technology Helpdesk. There are three full-time employees (two female, one male), and anywhere from two to ten student employees at the Helpdesk, depending on the time of year. The students are varied in age, gender, and advancement in their careers. Maya began going to school at WRCC in order to facilitate a career change. As she studied at WRCC, she gained student employment in the Information Technology department working at the Helpdesk. Soon after she began as a student in IT, a part-time position opened up at the Helpdesk. Maya applied for this position and got it. Soon after she began working as a part-time employee for the Information Technology department, a full-time position opened. Maya applied for this position and was hired as a full-time employee into the Information Technology department working at the Helpdesk. A typical day was undefined for Maya, but always begins at 7:30am. She stated that each person at the Helpdesk has individualized projects to which they are all assigned, but that each day is different than the last. Since she is the first person who arrives at the Helpdesk on weekday mornings, her first duty is to deal with any problems that may have arisen the evening before or early in the morning.

Maya's best day at WRCC is a day in which she is given a problem at the beginning of the day and she is able to figure out the problem and fix it by the end of the day. Maya stated that the worst day is having to deal with what she refers to as "political
stuffs.” Maya was referring to reorganizations causing unrest amongst the staff, office conversations about layoffs, office conversations about other people, and anything else that is not directly related to the performance of her job. She stated, “anytime that politics become involved, I try to avoid it as much as possible.”

**Socially acceptable practices at the Helpdesk.** Maya stated that written expectations are high for everyone. She stated that the dress and appearance of everyone is not written, but that it is the same for everyone. She initially stated that women are required to lift as much as men according to the conditions under which they were hired. However, she later said that women “will get help [from men] if it’s something really heavy, just because that’s our choice.” Additionally, Maya states that men have some behaviors excused simply because they are men. When asked what she meant by this, Maya stated,

One instance that comes to mind is multi-tasking. I can handle three, four, five jobs at the same time without any problem. Most of the men in the department cannot. They focus on one thing. And that sometimes is excused because they are guys - their organizational skills are lacking.

Maya says that there is a noticeable difference between how men and women handle assigned projects. She states

Most of the women will try to work together to solve whatever is going on. A lot of the men will want to take and fix it on their own...we are a team and we want to learn how everything works together, but a lot of times they don’t want to take the time to explain it, they just want to see if they can fix it and be the hero.

Maya subscribes to specific behaviors at work:
I don’t talk down to people, I am not antagonistic, I try to keep things on an even keel, I don’t get upset. I am not a person that gets upset anymore, it’s not worth it… I watch other people that just get so uptight and upset about stuff, and I don’t do that. And I think that it helps, in dealing with other people, to not have that aggression… I will listen to people at the Helpdesk and they talk to the customers and it’s almost like they are talking down to them and I try 100% not to do that and not get into the IT mindset of using jargon and a lot of people do that, but I think [my behaviors] have helped me.

Maya also stated that she is “not very good at sucking up.” She said that she will compliment people who she “respects and admires, but that is a little different – I don’t really call that sucking up – you respect that person. If it’s just to do it because you think it’s going to get you ahead, there is no way.” This attitude made her unsuccessful in her previous job because she “didn’t get the promotions” that were available. She states that the environment is different at WRCC from her previous job and that she does not feel that she has to “suck up” to her supervisors at WRCC.

Navigating the environment. Maya stated that her behavior when she is in more formal settings, such as a departmental meeting, is absolutely no different than her behavior when she is working at her desk. Her interactions with her coworkers at the helpdesk are the same as her interactions with her supervisors or coworkers she may not see on a daily basis at the departmental meeting. Maya states, however, that it is has not always been this way for her. She used to act differently according to whom she was talking to, in terms of position within the institution, not gender. However, she stated that “life changes; you learn… I don’t try to make people like me anymore.”
Additionally, she stated that the culture of WRCC has noticeably changed in recent years in terms of acceptance of women.

It used to be a lot worse. There was a real distinction three or four years ago to where I could tell somebody something, then...a guy would tell them and they would believe him even though I just told them the same thing. That happened quite often. But I really don't run into that very often anymore. I think it's a matter of you prove yourself, because we work with the same people for so long, eventually the started to realize that maybe you do actually know what you are talking about.

Maya attributes some of this change to a change in gender of the Information Technology Department's director. The current director is a woman. However, Maya also believes that this is where some of the double standards for men come from. She is referring to the discussion about men being told that they can do one project at a time because men cannot prioritize more than one project at a time.

Maya's identity. Maya identified her major roles at work as mother and as friend. She states that “we work with a lot of students...you want to encourage them; you don’t want to crush what little confidence they have and so I think that’s where the mother role comes in...” Maya also states that she serves as a friend in the workplace:

A lot of the people that work here and the students who come in [to the Helpdesk] have personal issues, and sometimes when they decide they want to share them, I will listen. And I think that’s one difference between the male/female role also, because I don’t think that most of the students would go to the males in our department and do that [because of] the tough guy thing.
Maya, through years of change and personal reflection, states that her behavior at home does not differ from her behavior at work and that a friend or family member would not be surprised to see her at work. However, she later stated that she is not as tactful at home as she is at work. She gave an example of someone at home refusing to believe that she had done something and Maya having a conversation where she has to tell that person that she had. She states that if this happened at work, she would have to be much more creative in helping a coworker arrive at the same conclusion.

To Maya, being a woman means being strong. She states that caring is important as well, but emphasizes her belief in the strength of women, “because we can do anything, you know.”

**Changing perceptions.** Maya has changed over the years due to personal experience. She has ceased trying to act the way that she is “supposed” to act, and is comfortable with being herself. She refuses to “suck up” to supervisors, even if they encourage it. Combined with the way Maya has perceived the culture of WRCC to have changed over the years, she is very comfortable with her position in the college. There has been a change in the gender of the leadership of her department within the last three years and a mission to make her department more efficient and transparent to the rest of the college. Because of this, she states that there has been a shift in how people respond to women who work at the IT Helpdesk. The change in leadership from male to female has seen both a wider acceptance of women within the IT department. However, it has also led to an inequality of expectations of men and women. For instance, men are not expected to be as organized or as skilled in multi-tasking as the women in the department are. Maya feels that part of this is because the IT Director has this opinion of men’s and
women’s abilities. The process improvements that have been done within the IT Helpdesk department and the communication of these improvements to the wider campus community has, in Maya’s opinion, helped to prove the capabilities of all members of the department. She gave an example of a customer calling to get help and when she told him something, he did not believe her. He called right back and had one of her male co-workers tell him the same information and he believed him. Since the improvements and the communication began with the rest of the college, however, she has not run into this issue.

Conscious team concept. Maya identified her concept of the IT Helpdesk area as that of a team. She says that it can be difficult to get her male counterparts to participate in a teamwork frame. Butler (1990) states that networking and making connections is a feminine concept. It is a concept that it is nurtured in female children and has come to mean feminine within our society. Maya’s belief that a collaborative team would improve efficiency supports this claim. Unlike Caroline, Maya is very aware that she perceives the ideal working environment as collaborative.

Silvia – The Custodian

During the interview, Sylvia sat across the table from the interviewer with her hands on the table and leaning forward. All of her responses were verbal, with facial expressions and hand gestures to compliment the verbal responses. She used a firm tone and a loud voice throughout the interview. She did not use phrases of tentativeness, nor did she apologize. She wore jeans and a blouse with a sweater over it and boots. She had her hair styled straight and down. She wore light makeup and had few jewelry pieces on including a necklace and a ring. She nodded her head during responses but only as a
secondary gesture to her verbal responses. She had consistent eye contact throughout the duration of the interview.

Silvia is a full-time classified staff member who holds the position of Custodian 1. She is one of 16 full-time custodians in the Custodial section of the Facilities Department at WRCC. Of the 16 custodians who work at WRCC, five of them are female. Silvia has been at WRCC for just over two years. She was previously working two part-time jobs as a custodian at local private companies. She saw an advertisement in the local newspaper for a full-time position as a custodian at WRCC, she applied, and she was hired. She wanted to have a full-time position somewhere local so that she could feel more like part of the team than a part-time position allows: “I had missed being...able to build relationships...” She also wanted more structure and benefits that were not included in her part-time positions. A typical day for Silvia begins with checking in with her supervisor at 2pm. She will check if he needs her to do any special projects and will let him know that she has arrived. She will also check in with the academic division that is located in the building that is her responsibility to clean. She then will take a break after four hours; have lunch two hours after that and then work for the rest of the night. Recently, the director of Facilities has also assigned her to special projects that require her to ask many questions of other custodians to create documents for the director.

Silvia’s best day was when she was asked to do the special assignment for the director of Facilities. The reason this was the best day for her is

Because I got to use the skills I haven’t used in a while. It kind of broke up the monotony. This kind of work can be really, really dull. So it’s nice to able to use your brain at work...I mean it’s so mindless to me...I have been doing this kind
of work for almost 30 years and I can do it blindfolded...I don’t really have to think about what I am going to do next, it just comes naturally to me and I am a really organized person.

Silvia’s worst day was one during which an altercation occurred with a coworker at a branch campus during her first year. Silvia’s job was to be the afternoon custodian at a branch campus with very little supervision. Her routine was exactly the same as the morning custodian’s, so that the same areas were being cleaned twice a day at this location. According to Silvia, the morning custodian began to not do his job because he knew that she would follow in the afternoon and do it for him. When she confronted him about this, he had an emotional response and involved their supervisor. Silvia said, “I was really upset.”

**Socially acceptable practices in the custodial department.** Silvia claimed that cleanliness is a written demand of all custodians. This is their primary function at the college. Unwritten expectations of custodians at the college include presence and safety. Occupants of buildings respond better to the custodians when they have met them and remember them. Silvia says that female custodians are expected to have their areas cleaner than their male counterparts. When asked why, Silvia replied,

I don’t know why that is. I just know that there are a thousand excuses when guys don’t do their job. I have even heard upper management say that they know that they are screwing off and they know they are not doing their job and they do nothing about it, not anything until somebody above them makes them do something. When it comes to us women...I missed one classroom because I was
out of time and got called out on it. I have an eight-hour [scheduled day], plus a
two-hour [scheduled day] and work eight hours in a day.

Silvia has been accomplishing 10 hours of work in an eight-hour day by cutting
back on her breaks and lunches, and simply working harder and faster than she sees her
counterparts working. While Silvia was working in a previous building from her current
one, she received what she perceives to be disparaging remarks from managers regarding
her dress and appearance. "So in retaliation, I started wearing skirts to work daily."
Once she moved to a different building, she began working in jeans and nice blouses
instead of skirts. She states that she is more comfortable in jeans and tops, but that she
was wearing a skirt every once in a while at first to test the culture, and then she
increased the frequency that she wore skirts as a statement to the managers who made
disparaging remarks to her. In terms of lifting heavy objects, it is acceptable for women
in the custodial department to ask men for help.

Navigating the environment. Silvia said that she acts differently during training
than in the field with her fellow custodians. She states that if management is present at
the training, the custodians act completely counter to how they act in the field. She states
that there is unrest in the field, but during trainings, the custodians act as though they are
a team with no problems. Silvia states that there is one female custodian in particular
who she avoids because her behavior is not something that Silvia wants near her. This
particular female custodian is also part of a group of custodians who have identified
Silvia as a culprit due to her special assignment from the director of Facilities. Her
questions and reporting directly to the director for this project have put a suspicious light
on Silvia in their eyes. Additionally, she states that there is a male security guard who
makes frequent remarks in her direction that make her uncomfortable. She avoids this person as well. Silvia has learned that the behaviors that make her successful at work are to stand up for herself and to share her ideas, even if it means sharing them repeatedly until they are heard.

**Silvia’s identity.** Silvia stated that she is more reserved at work because you have to be, you have to be. I mean, you can’t just say what you want to say, when you want to say it. You can’t just do what you want to do. There are times I want to throw a tantrum but I don’t. At home, I can. I can just be me at home. Here, it’s a different hat. You walk in the door and it’s like, ‘Okay, I am here now and this is the role I play.’ I come to work to work and to try to get along with people and do my job and do my best. So in order to do those things, I have to keep myself in check.

Despite the fact that Silvia said that she acts differently at home than she does at work, she stated that a friend or family member would not be surprised to see her at work. Of the many roles that Silvia has in her life, the one she identifies with at work is that of mediator. No matter what role she is playing at home (i.e. mother, daughter, sister, wife, grandmother, friend), she is always the mediator in her family, so this role comes easily to her at work as well.

Some people bounce stuff off of me and I value that role because it gives me an opportunity to look at how I feel about what they are saying and I can help guide them into not doing something crazy; you know, helping them calm down and maybe see it from a different way, trying to bring some light into it instead of all the darkness and really [let them know] to not take it so seriously…it’s just a job.
When asked what being a woman means to her, Silvia replied, “Freedom.” She said that she would not want to be a man in today’s society:

I think that they don’t know their role. We have evolved so much over time, you know the whole ‘hunter-gatherer’ thing and I think women – we still gather – we still know our role, we know our heart is in our home. And men in today’s society – they are just lost. I watch it in my son and in the men around me and I think they have kind of lost their way. And I think part of it is because women; we have evolved in another direction. We can bring home the bacon. We have a lot of choices and we have kind of taken on some of what they do and I just think they are lost. Men are not evolving in another direction because they have been brainwashed to think that that’s just ‘what women do’…it’s because they were taught to believe that way.

**Femininity as a weapon.** Silvia has experienced a situation in which her dress has received negative comments. When her managers commented on her choice of clothing, it highlighted an injustice for her. The managers expected her to be dressed in a more masculine way simply because of the position she held and the activities required of her. Silvia used behaviors typically identified as feminine as a weapon. She began wearing skirts every day to defy this perceived injustice.

**Linda – The Security Guard**

During her interview, Linda sat next to the interviewer and read along with the interview questions and watched the interviewer make notes. When the researcher was not making notes, Linda made eye contact with her and was engaging. Her tone was firm and her voice was loud. She used phrases that could be considered tentative, such as
Linda is a part-time classified employee who holds the position of Security Guard at WRCC. She is one of two female security guards in a department of 13 security guards. Linda began taking courses in criminal justice at WRCC in 2008. As part of her financial aid requirement, Linda needed to acquire a job. One of her instructors referred her to the Security Department because she thought it would be in line with her area of study. Linda applied for a position working in the dispatch center and was hired. In 2010, Linda applied for a part-time security guard position and was hired. A typical day for Linda begins at various times with taking possession of the keys that are held by the security guard on duty. She then checks the electronic daily log for any needed follow-ups and to get a general sense of what happened during the previous shift. She then checks her email and spends approximately 30 minutes on any paperwork or special assignments. She then walks around all the buildings on campus to see which buildings are locked, which have people still working in them, noting cars in parking lots and getting a general situational awareness of the campus.

Linda’s best day is when she is able to help clients. She prefers it to be a steady flow of incoming calls where problems are easily resolved (such as vehicle unlocks or jumpstarts). Linda’s worst day is when sporadic calls are made to the department and the problems that arise are not easily resolved. For instance, verbal disagreements on
campus or vehicle break-ins that require police involvement. Additionally, medical calls are especially difficult on Linda:

We had the one call in the [WRCC] building that was really really difficult for us to deal with. We had three or four guards on duty and we had to do CPR on this client to keep her going until paramedics were able to get to her. Of course those are the bad ones that we don’t want to ever have to deal with or have happen.

**Socially acceptable practices in the security department.** All security guards are expected to be physically fit, healthy, and to not wear jewelry. All of these expectations are categorized as safety concerns for guards on the job. However, some behaviors are expected or allowed for women that are not expected or allowed for men in the Security department. For instance, women are required to wear their hair in a ponytail or bun to prevent perpetrators from pulling their hair. While there are male guards in the Security department who have long hair, they are not required in writing or in practice to wear their hair up. Additionally, it is considered socially acceptable for women to allow their nails to grow long, while men are expected to keep them short. Conversely, there are expectations or allowances for men that are not expected or allowed of women. For instance, men are expected to be bigger than women in the Security department. Linda stated that the male security guards who have been in the security career for a long time are excused from “pushing themselves.” Linda stated:

Some of the male guards that we work with don’t push themselves to [the full extent of] their abilities, as far as knowing what they should know. I think they kind of have…a big head, as far as they’ve done this kind of work for a long time,
they know what they are supposed to do, and it’s kind of Billy Big Butt Badass type of ‘I know how to do this work and I don’t need to know anything else.’ And that’s one thing that you have to hold yourself to – a standard of knowing as much as you possibly can about it… There’s a lot of things to take consideration as far as knowing the [parking] lot numbers when you are recording things, knowing all the street names around, knowing your direction – northwest – [but] especially lot numbers… There’s even other part-timers that know the lot numbers. I think it’s – as far as pushing yourself hard enough – you need to know your surrounding and gain the mind frame of ‘This is my job, it’s my career, this is what I need to worry about while I’m here.’

Linda credited particular behaviors for making her successful in her job. When addressing male guards who doubt her ability, Linda says that she is able to assert myself and tell them what I think regardless of how they feel about it….I’ll take charge anytime I need to, as far as getting something done…[one male guard] was a little bit irritated that I was able to complete the job my way, but he kind of just got over it really quick[ly] and kind of kept his opinions to himself.

Navigating the environment. Linda has noticed that the interaction with her co-workers is different when set in different environments. When on breaks, she discusses “anything and everything” with her male and female counterparts. However, during formal training, many of the guards do not speak up, even when asked direct questions. Linda does not believe that this is a gendered behavior, but rather a reflection of personality in a formal environment. Those who are shy will not speak up.
Linda refers to women in the Security department as the “underdogs” because she has to navigate a sometimes very masculine environment. She states that there some guards who believe that women “can’t do certain things or can’t hold our own.” She has had male coworkers tell her that “it’s not a woman’s place” to be working in a Security department. Further probing revealed that many of the men who have stated these things to Linda are older men.

I think that part of that might have to do with being set in their ways. They’ve been used to something for so long that that’s the way they expected it to stay and that since women are going into more fields, they aren’t used to seeing women, especially in criminal justice... I think most of the time they’re expecting that women are going to stay in an administrative or a secretarial role or, like in the 1950’s, stay at home and take care of the house, the kids.

Linda’s identity. Linda stated that even though she must frequently exhibit masculine traits at work, there is one trait that she relies on that she considers feminine:

I think one of the things is being able to talk to somebody and hear their side more instead of being demanding or assuring someone that it’s a certain way. I am able to listen to people more and discuss things... it’s definitely easier to talk TO certain people instead of taking AT them, for me, versus some of the men I work with.

This trait has proved useful in de-escalating many security situations at Linda’s job.

Linda identified her main role at work as a combination of being a friend, helper, and authoritarian figure. She says that the relationship she has with the office dispatch
personnel has residual friendly feelings from when she worked in the dispatch office. She sees herself as a helper to her supervisor because he is new at his job and she has helped highlight policies, procedures and processes for him. Her new supervisor has relied upon her for this because of her dispatch office experience. She sees herself as an authoritarian figure when enforcing security policies and procedures with anyone on campus. She states that these roles feel natural to her, and that a family member or friend would not be surprised to see her at work. At home, Linda has assumed the roles of mom, wife, and “handyman.” When she is at home, she is “outside doing the ‘men’s jobs’ – cleaning up the yard and fixing something with a hammer and nail outside…”, but she also continues to do the housekeeping, cooking, and child-rearing.

When asked what being a woman means to her, Linda responded that it meant knowing when to use her masculine traits and when to use her feminine traits. She responded that it also mean that women were now expected to perform both the duties traditionally considered feminine, such as housekeeping and cooking, and the duties that have been traditionally considered masculine in the past, such as “handyman” work or working in a full time job. She responded that being a woman meant that she had to prove herself daily at her job.

**Continuous proof.** Of all the women in this study, Linda’s position requires the most interaction with new people every day. Because of this unique feature in her job, she has to prove herself as equally capable as the men in her department on a daily basis. The situations that arise for the Security department are varied and challenging and are completely different from one day to the next. Even though Linda has proven that she can perform a vehicle unlock in a way different than one of her male counterparts and be
successful on one day, to her male counterparts, that does not mean that she can perform CPR on a person in a school building the next day. This continuous need to prove herself has driven her to identify herself as subjugated and challenged. Linda stated,

I do think that some men that we work with expect that we can’t do as much or take on as much as men and... I think they are wrong personally... Some women can take on more than male figures. I think it’s really hard to be only one of two females working there. You don’t have a lot to correlate yourself with and it feels like you are kind of the underdog...

**Common Themes**

The following sections outline the five findings that emerged in multiple participants’ narratives. Those five findings are described under the following headings: (1) Gendered behavior; (2) Gender Normative Reinforced; (3) Resistance to Claiming Feminine Traits; (4) Skills in Navigating Different Roles; and (5) Evolution of Women’s Roles. The researcher then compared the findings that emerged in the interviews with the participants with the findings that emerged in the document review. This allowed the researcher to see if the written culture was similar to the social culture.

**Gendered Behavior**

At WRCC, different behaviors are more socially acceptable for women than for men. Some of these behaviors are department specific, but all of them demonstrate that socially acceptable behavior is indeed gendered at WRCC. For instance, men and women have different socially expected dress standards in the Security department. Women are expected to keep their areas cleaner than men in the Custodial department. Women are accepted even if they are seen as weak in the Grounds department. It is
considered acceptable for women to act in a motherly role at WRCC. Because students are a main focus of this educational institution, some women find it natural to treat their student workers as children, sometimes even referring to them as “kids.” While some, such as Nancy and Maya, have changed over the years in terms of how they treat their student workers, it is still acceptable for women to assume this role. However, it is uncommon for men to do the same. As Maya stated, “I don’t think that most of the students would go to the males in our department… because of the ‘tough guy’ thing or I don’t think there is as much empathy.”

**Gender Normative Reinforced**

The image of women being weaker than men is a common image in American society (Butler, 1990; Dowling, 2001). Nancy’s statement about men being stronger than women is a representation of American society on a larger scale. Whether or not this is true is something that will never be discovered as long as society exists. Since humans do not raise their children in vacuums, parents will always influence children in learning what behavior is acceptable and what is not. Dowling (2001) states that during a series of tests of parental behavior with children on obstacle courses, she found parents took considerably less time to consider helping a female child than a male child. For instance, a male child was put at the beginning of the obstacle course and told to complete it. For the sections of the obstacle course that proved difficult, the parents took much longer to step forward and help him complete those sections than with a female child who was placed on the same obstacle course. This suggests that gendered behavior is learned from parents and the widespread belief becomes generational. Butler (1990) would argue that
repeating the practices of asking for help from one generation to the next contributes to
the internalization of these behaviors in women.

**Resistance to Claiming Feminine Traits**

Four of the five women in this study were reluctant to identify themselves as
feminine. For instance, Linda stated that she is the "handyman" at home and prefers to
do "men's jobs" when she is at home. However, further discussion revealed that she also
takes care of the kids and cleans the home most of the time, indicating that she performs
tasks that are typically thought of as feminine. Additionally, although she stated that she
is not feminine at work, she wears her hair and her nails long while on duty. These are
traits typically thought of as feminine, and behaviors that are only acceptable for female
security guards at WRCC. Nancy, the exception, identified herself as feminine, but was
also very aware of the different roles she is required to play both in the different settings
in the workplace and at home. The reluctance to identify themselves as feminine could
indicate a negative connotation of the word feminine for women who work in male-
dominated career fields. If a woman identifies herself as feminine, this could be seen as a
weakness to her male counterparts in the workplace and could make integration into the
team difficult. Not being accepted as a member of the team could result in decreased job
satisfaction and poor job performance ratings.

**Skills in Navigating Different Roles**

Four of the five women in this study stated that they do not behave differently at
home than they do at work. However, further questioning revealed that all five of the
women not only act differently in different environments within the workplace, but act
differently at home as well. Their claim of the opposite could indicate that their change
in behavior between different realms in their lives was not visible to them before these interviews. Navigating between these behaviors and their separate roles could have become second nature to these women in a way that makes it unrecognizable to them.

**Evolution of Women’s Roles**

Three of the women in this study stated that they believed that women’s roles and what is considered feminine in American society have changed from generation to generation and throughout the course of their lives. They claimed that it has evolved to include more of the duties that used to be considered masculine, but that traditional feminine duties are also still expected of them. For instance Linda claimed that “women have been expected to keep up the family end of things, but now I think it’s expected to keep up the family end and...your career or schooling.” Additionally, Silvia stated that women “have evolved in another direction – we can bring home the bacon. We have a lot of choices and we have kind of taken on some of what [men] do…” Some might feel burdened by this addition of duties, but the women in this study have felt empowered by the addition of choices.

**Written versus Social Culture**

If one were to only read the documents of WRCC and not interact with the employees, that person might get the impression that WRCC, for the most part, considers all employees to be equal. This indicates a culture of gender neutrality at WRCC. However, after interviewing women who work in male-dominated career fields at WRCC, it is clear this is not the case. The gendered behavior and the forced navigation between feminine and masculine roles that women are assimilated into in male dominated areas at WRCC demonstrate that it is a college where women must not only perform the
 expectations that are written down and explained to her on the first day of her job, but she is also expected to perform socially expected roles that are not written down and may not even be readily apparent to her.

Some of the women in this study claim that the culture at WRCC has changed over time. The document review did not reveal this information. The two documents that used gendered language were last reviewed in 1990 and in 2005. The documents could indicate that there has been no real change in the culture over the last two decades. However, because the participants indicated in their interviews that the culture has changed, it is more likely that the documents have been stripped of gendered language and that not all of the documents have been reviewed or reapproved recently or accurately.

Conclusion

As stated in Chapter One, gendered behavior is defined as gendered social practices that embody organizational culture. For instance, the organizational culture at WRCC fosters an environment where it is acceptable for women to ask for help lifting heavy objects. It may not be acceptable for men to ask for help when lifting heavy objects. The gendered behavior is not a written expectation at WRCC. On written documents, WRCC seems to foster an organizational culture of gender neutrality. However, after interviewing five female backline classified staff members who work at WRCC, the researcher found that social expectations of women are gendered. WRCC does not exist without outside influence. Every employee at WRCC brings with them a set of values and preconceived notions. These values and preconceived notions are manifested in their treatment of others with whom they work. WRCC employs people
who have preconceived notions about what behaviors a woman should and should not perform. These behaviors are communicated to them through reward or punishment. In Chapter Two, a study of adaptation styles was outlined (Tedrow & Rhoads, 1999). The three adaptation styles were to either adapt to masculine traits expected in male dominated areas, reconcile traits needed for various environments, or resist masculine traits expected. At WRCC, a woman who does not resist, but rather adapts or reconciles her behaviors with those of the surrounding individuals is accepted as part of the group. Nancy’s navigation between and knowledge of her different roles in different environments demonstrate that she has reconciled her masculine and feminine traits to suit her needs in varying situations. Because of this, she has been accepted as part of the group and can be considered successful in her career field. If she had chosen to resist her masculine traits, she may have been ostracized.

For most of the women in this study, the performance of gendered behaviors has become automatic. One of the four women resists adopting masculine traits, but the others have chosen to reconcile their feminine traits with their masculine traits and deploy the most appropriate ones in varying situations. They do this with such ease that it has become internalized and has shaped the way they perceive their own identities. They resist identifying with the word feminine. To do otherwise might mean that their integration into the workplace and amongst their male counterparts could be compromised.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Chapter Five briefly states the findings that were outlined and described in Chapter Four. The researcher compares her findings to the collective findings of the studies presented in the literature review. The implications of these findings for WRCC are then presented. Future research studies are then suggested. Finally, the design limitations of the study are outlined.

The finding that emerged from the document review showed that there is a culture of equality at WRCC. Conversely, the findings from the interviews did not support the theme of equality that emerged from the document review. There were five findings that were common across the cases that emerged from the interviews and observations. These five findings revealed that (1) gendered behavior is required at WRCC for women to succeed, (2) gender normatives are reinforced, (3) there is a resistance by women to claim feminine traits, (4) the women have figured out how to navigate the various roles required of them both at their place of work and outside of it, and (5) the role of women is changing both in society and at WRCC.

The Literature

The findings of this study are consistent with the literature. The studies presented in Chapter Two discussed various findings, but collectively found that gendered behavior is apparent in many aspects of life including television and films, the Internet, literary works, and educational settings (Aimjeld, 2008; Arca, 2007; Coventry, 2008; Emery, 2010; Felshow, 2009; Fleitz, 2005; Harper, 2006; Hill, 2009; Holan, 2005; Lester, 2008; Ogi, 2001; Pierce, 2007; Poluyko, 2001; Ramon, 2009; Rands, 2009; Sky, 2006; Stokes,
The findings from the research studies presented in Chapter Two regarding women in higher education (Amey & Twombly, 1992; Belle, 2002; DiCroce, 1995; Jablonski, 1996; Kezar, 2000; Olson, 2002; Piland & Giles, 1998; Singh, Kumra, & Vinnicombe, 2002; Slaughter, 1993; Vaughan, 1989) reinforce the theory postulated by Butler (1990) that gender is learned and the repetition of gendered behaviors internalizes a crafted identity. The findings of this study support the literature regarding gendered behavior and identity. The participants in this study have learned which behaviors are deemed acceptable by WRCC for the female gender. The repetition of these behaviors has become so internalized, that the women who participated in this study characterized it as "automatic."

Additionally, Chapter Two presented research studies that have taken place in educational institutions (Ali, 2001; Amey & Twombly, 1992; Belle, 2002; DiCroce, 1995; Foley, Levinson, & Hurtig, 2000; Jablonski, 1996; Kanter, 1977; Mahitivanichcha & Rorrer, 2006; Oakes, 1990; Olson, 2002; Piland & Giles, 1998; Singh, Kumra, & Vinnicombe, 2002; Slaughter, 1993; Tedrow and Rhoads, 1999; Thom, 2001; Vaughan, 1989; Zelden & Pahares, 2000). Those studies suggested that women are required to act differently in varying environments, especially if the female participants work in non-traditional fields. The results of this study support the literature regarding role performance. The women who participated in this study stated that they perform various roles in the work place and at home.

The literature regarding women who work in institutions of higher education demonstrates that gendered behavior is reinforced by the culture of the institution in which they work (Alexandrov, 2007; Bauer, 2000; Gazir, 2007; Hollon & Gemmill,
1976; Magoon & Linkous, 1979; Wood, 1976; Zhang and Zheng, 2009). When new employees arrive, they are assimilated into this culture of gendered behavior, or they are not successful. The findings of this study support this claim in the literature. The women who participated in this study spoke of reward for behaviors considered appropriate for their gender, and punishment for behaviors that were not considered appropriate for their gender.

Lester (2008) showed that female faculty members were expected to perform “mom” roles in the classroom, but were also expected to adopt masculine traits within their traditionally masculine fields while maintaining the “mom” characteristics. She also found that the repetitive nature of using traditionally masculine traits in the classroom caused her participants to incorporate those traits into their identity. This implies the performance of gender is not independent of identity, especially if it is practiced for many years. In this study, women were expected to perform certain gendered characteristics, such as the mom role, or a more conservative “office type” role in the office or in formal meetings, but were also expected to take on masculine traits while in the field. The women in this study found the identity of feminine as undesirable in the work place. This supports the similar finding in Lester’s (2008) study that the repetition of these gendered traits become incorporated into a woman’s identity. Additionally, the women in this study need to navigate various roles between different environments at work and between work and home. This supports the findings of the literature. This study expands the literature by illuminating an often forgotten segment of the community college employee population, classified staff, in terms of gender performativity.
Implications

Women at WRCC have covert, unwritten behavioral expectations. Additionally, women at WRCC must navigate through various roles at work and these roles sometimes differ from their roles at home. It is important to promote awareness of these findings. Interaction between men and women could be difficult in some cases if members of the institution are not aware that women may be acting one way in one setting, but another way in a different setting. Women could feel stressed by these varying requirements. This could affect job satisfaction and job performance. Changing the culture at WRCC to one in which women do not have to navigate different roles would be ideal. However, WRCC does not exist in a vacuum and values are brought by each employee to the workplace. Therefore, beginning in a place of awareness could reap a more understanding workplace and could decrease the possibility of strained interactions. This could be done through training. This training should focus first on making employees aware of the findings of this study, but not focus on changing them until as many employees as possible are reached. This training could be progressive and interactive.

In Chapter Two, the Job Structure Concept was presented. This concept highlighted the interdependent relationships of organizational culture, job satisfaction, and job performance to one another. Training community college leadership and leadership at other institutions of higher education should include a portion on these relationships. Then the relationships between and the notions of organizational culture, job satisfaction, and job performance can be defined and examined by looking at the institution in which the training is being performed. The results of this study could be used as a tool to demonstrate the underlying concept of gendered behavior and how it
may affect classified staff. Cultural change could then be a possibility for institutions of higher education that practice this training. Additionally, students pursuing degrees in the field of higher education could also be taught this material.

Suggestions for Future Research

The next logical step in the research after this study should measure job satisfaction amongst the women who work in male dominated career fields and determine if job satisfaction is related to the roles they must navigate within work and between work and home. This could be done through a combination of qualitative case studies or survey data collection. A comparative study to men in female-dominated career fields could also strengthen the research in the area of gender performativity. Additionally, examining job performance in relation to job satisfaction and the organizational culture as described in the findings of this study would complete the Job Structure Concept that the researcher outlined and explained in Chapter Two.

Further research would add an important dimension to this study. The study is designed to provide the first step in researching classified staff and to add to the gender studies literature. However, this study does not provide a complete picture. It would be useful to address multiple-level perspectives where the data collection will also include input from co-workers, supervisors, superiors, and customers of the female back line classified staff members. Addressing these other constituents would provide further insight into how these women are received in the male-dominated areas of WRCC. For instance, Linda, the Security guard, stated that when she is in formal trainings with her male counterparts and her supervisor, she is not afraid to speak up and ask questions, despite the fact that most of her coworkers do not. Conducting interviews with her male
counterparts would add another piece of the puzzle to the picture of how women have integrated into their areas at WRCC.

Additionally, a comparison study of men in these career fields or men in women-dominated career fields could provide insight into the gendered behavior that the women in this study show is fostered at WRCC. It could also show if men’s identities have been affected by these gendered behaviors. Some of the women in this study could not identify one role that described them at work. For instance, Linda claimed that she was both authoritarian and friendly at work, depending on her audience. If men are also unable to identify one role in the workplace that accurately describes them, it could mean that all employees at WRCC are forced to perform different roles in different environments. Additionally, if the roles that men claim describe them at work differ greatly from their roles at home, it could mean that they are forced to perform a role in the workplace as well. This could also affect the job satisfaction and job performance for men at WRCC.

Multiple women in this study described women’s roles as having evolved over the last few generations to include masculine duties, such as careers or schooling, in addition to feminine duties, such as keeping the home and raising the children. Silvia even claims that men “don’t know their role...they are just lost.” Interviews with men could help to explore this possible phenomenon.

Additionally, both Linda and Caroline stated that age was a variable that affected their interaction with their co-workers. With three generations of workers currently in the workplace, a research study that examines this could show areas where interactions are strained.
Limitations and Delimitations

Delimitations are bounds that researchers impose prior to the inception of the study to narrow the scope, while limitations are conditions that restrict the scope of the study or may affect the outcome and cannot be necessarily controlled by the researcher (Creswell, 2003; Patton, 2002). The study explored the experiences of backline classified staff members at one institution in Washington State. One community college was chosen for multiple reasons: the researcher has easy access to this particular community college; the researcher has and wishes to maintain strong relationships with her counterparts at this community college; and the researcher will have a prolonged engagement with the personnel at this community college, requiring her to establish rapport with each participant. Additionally, the more time the researcher spends at one community college instead of multiple community colleges, the more she can get a feel for the organizational culture of that college simply by spending time within it. However, the results are limited to WRCC. In addition, the study was designed to explore classified staff women in detail. The study did not, however, have controls in place for extraneous variables. The researcher described the experiences of female classified staff, but could not determine the extent to which other outside factors influenced the findings. Further research is needed to identify all of the factors that influence job satisfaction and job performance of community college female backline classified staff members. However, the researcher purposely chose only one woman from each department to provide variation in the types of positions and to see if there are differences from one department to another.
Volunteer Participants

The participants for this study were voluntary. Research suggests volunteer participants have specific characteristics that may not be representative of the entire population (Lonnqvist, 2007). Participants who volunteer might represent the staff members who have a vested interest in the institution and may bias their responses toward more positive responses to job satisfaction and organizational culture questions. Similarly, participants who volunteer may represent the staff members who have experienced decreased job satisfaction or have an unfavorable opinion about the organizational culture and have been given a chance to voice these experiences. The results are, therefore, limited to the backline staff members who may already be either very satisfied or very unsatisfied with their jobs. The results may also be limited to participants who have already ascertained how to successfully negotiate the different professional roles required at their institution. Similarly, the results could be limited to participants who have had difficulty ascertaining how to successfully negotiate the different professional roles required of them.

Researcher Bias

Finally, the researcher had a personal bias since she is a member of the female backline classified staff at her community college. She also had a personal bias because she identifies as a feminist. While she took measures to step outside this personal bias whenever possible, her partiality to this cause might have presented itself through interpretations of the collected data. To reduce the impact of this limitation, the researcher took measures to treat each document and each participant similarly by using the same instrument each time.
Reflexivity

In addition, the researcher used what Johnson and Christensen (2008) referred to as "reflexivity" throughout this study. Reflexivity is when a researcher engages in critical self-reflection about his or her potential biases and predispositions. The researcher used a research journal for the duration of the study for this purpose and referred to the journal during the process of data analysis. The journal included schedule information, a methods log that described decisions and the rationale for them, and reflections on the researcher's thoughts, feelings, ideas, questions, concerns, and frustrations as the research process unfolded. The reflection found in the journal became a reminder about "where the author is coming from" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 262).

Observation Bias

According to Patton (2002), observations have four main limitations. The first limitation included the observer affecting the situation in unknown ways. This phenomenon is also known as observer effect, or observer bias (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994; Wiersma & Jurs, 2005). The observer minimized this limitation by refraining from speaking during the interviews except to ask questions, prompt when the participants did not answer, or to clarify the participant's words or ideas. The second limitation includes participants acting in an atypical way when they know they are being observed. This is also known as subject bias, or social desirability, and is described in greater detail below. The third limitation includes the selective perception of the observer. This limitation was minimized by using an observation checklist to guide the researcher in looking for similar behaviors in each participant. Patton (2002) states that this could distort the data. The fourth limitation of observations includes the fact that
observers can only observe external factors. Patton (2002) stated that researchers need to supplement observations with another form of data collection to get the perspectives of the participants. To alleviate this limitation, the researcher conducted interviews.

**Volunteer Bias**

Gravetter and Forzano (2009) suggested researchers should view participants in research studies as volunteers. Even if random sampling is used, informed consent requires a participant to acquiesce. However, volunteers are not representative of the entire population. Volunteer participants frequently differ from those who do not volunteer. These characteristics are stratified by level of confidence in the participant. For instance, participants with the highest level of confidence tended to be more highly educated, part of a higher social class, more intelligent, more approval motivated, and more sociable. Additionally, participants with a “considerable” amount of confidence tended to be more arousal seeking, more likely to be female than male, more non-authoritarian, more likely to be Jewish than Protestant or Catholic, and more likely to be non-conforming. Meanwhile, those participants with some confidence tended to be from smaller towns, more altruistic, more self-disclosing, more maladjusted, and younger (Rosenthal & Rownow, 1975). Later, Lonnquist’s (2007) study confirmed these findings and Gravetter and Forzano (2009) reiterated these findings just two years ago.

The implication of different characteristics for volunteer participants than for non-volunteer participants means that findings from the sample used could be different from results that may be found from the population the sample represents, thus making the findings less generalizable even within WRCC.
Subject Bias/Social Desirability

One limitation includes participants answering interview questions based on what they believe the researcher wants to hear (Patton, 2002), preventing the expected candid response. For example, a participant may not have answered candidly about a particular coworker because the researcher worked at the same institution as the participants. The participant may have been worried that the researcher would repeat parts of the conversation to the above-mentioned coworker. The researcher took steps to alleviate the subject bias. She reiterated the confidentiality of the study, reminding the participants of the importance of answering as candidly and as truthfully as possible during the interviews. In addition, she de-emphasized her role as a community college classified staff member and emphasized her role as a doctoral student. One way she did this was to use all of her personal information (e-mail address and phone number) throughout the duration of the study instead of her community college associated information. However, there was no guarantee that the participants believed her when she said that their answers would not affect their work environment. Trust between the researcher and the participants was relied on to make this point clear. This is a limitation of this study.

Generalizability

Jurs and Wiersma (2005), Creswell (2007), and Patton (2002) offer that external validity is the extent to which results can be generalized to populations, situations, and conditions, and external validity is threatened if a study is not generalizable. Since this study employed a case study approach, the researcher probed deeply into each case. Therefore, external validity was sacrificed for a deeper, more comprehensive examination of specific cases in this study. However, the results in this study could be similar to
results that might be found at similar institutions. Additionally, because the sample is so specific, results might be similar on a national level. The population of female backline classified staff members in non-traditional fields at community colleges in the United States could be relatively small.

**Triangulation**

Every case study must have bounds (Creswell, 2007; Patton, 2002). The bounds in the case of this study were the individuals who work with the women who participated. The document review identified the boundaries of the case by revealing who at WRCC was represented in them. These bounds included supervisors and co-workers. The interviews revealed that family members were also one of the bounds of this case. Since the input of supervisors, co-workers, and family members (some male) was not included, triangulation was a limitation of this study.

**Access**

Another limitation to this study was access. Originally, the researcher planned to conduct observations of the participants in various environments on campus. However, the president of WRCC would not allow this. His reasoning was sound, so the study was adapted to incorporate the observations in conjunction with the interviews. Additionally, confidential information could not be garnered. The annual evaluations that each employee receives and another private, confidential documents could have been used to further interpret the experiences of the women in this study.

**Conclusion**

This study explored the gendered performances of female backline classified staff members who work in non-traditional fields within a community college. This case study
involved a document review and interviews with observations to define gendered behaviors at a WRCC and to gain an understanding of how these behaviors affect the identities of women working in non-traditional fields at the community college. The findings revealed that gendered behaviors are defined by the organizational culture and performed by the five women who participated in the study. It also revealed that there are different behavioral requirements for women and men. The performance of these gendered behaviors have resulted in these women resisting identification with what society traditionally considers feminine traits, being able to deftly navigate through the many roles that they perform in their lives, and becoming aware of the evolution of women’s roles in society. This study also began the discussion in the education literature base about female backline classified staff members working in male-dominated fields.

Butler (1990) stated that for a person to be
given gender produces necessary failures...[and] to be given gender takes place through discursive routes: to be a good mother, to be a heterosexually desirable object, to be a fit worker, in sum, to signify a multiplicity of guarantees in response to a variety of different demands all at once (p. 185).
The performance of gendered roles is repetitive throughout a person’s life and permeates the generations. Butler (1990) goes on to say,
The critical task for feminism is not to establish a point of view outside of constructed identities...[but] rather to locate strategies of subversive repetition enabled by those constructions, to affirm the local possibilities of intervention through participating in precisely those practices of repetition that constitute
identity and, therefore, present the immanent possibility of contesting them” (pp. 187-188).

This study is only the beginning of this process. It serves to identify the gendered behaviors that five incredible women perform in male dominated career fields at WRCC. If the research is continued, Butler’s theory can be used as a framework in which to promote understanding and eventually change.
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Appendix A

Textual Analysis Tool

Project Title: Gender performativity in the community college: A case study of female backline classified staff

Analyze the Origin
Who is(are) the writer(s)?

What is the writer's role or position?
Follow-up: Does this position make decisions that have an impact on overall organizational culture?

Is there a list of decision makers for this policy, procedure, or meeting? If so, does it include a representative of the classified staff? Does it include women?

What are the circumstances that prompted this writer to write?

What discipline or discourse community does this text seem to be a part of? (example: instruction, administrative services, or student services)

Analyze the Content
What issue is being addressed?

What position does the writer take?

Who is the intended audience (ex: clerical staff, mid-level staff, upper-administration, faculty students)?

What assumptions about gender are implied by this document?
Follow-up: Is the audience assumed to be dominated one gender over the other? (Ex. If addressing the maintenance department, is the document geared towards men?)

Follow-up: Does the language differ from documents geared towards audiences typically dominated by men? (Ex: maternity leave vs. parental leave)

Are examples used? If yes, are they examples of workers with nontraditional jobs? (example: using a scenario including a woman in maintenance)

Are assumptions pertaining to gender made? If so, what are they? Has any backup information been gathered since the document was written to support any assumptions? (example: women's bathrooms need to be cleaned more often because they get used more often, is this supported?)

Does the document use standards/norms? If detectable, are they masculine or feminine?
Describe them here. In particular, describe what words/phrases/concepts used made a feminine/masculine impression and how.

In meeting minutes, is there anything outside of the topic at hand recorded (i.e. social discussion). If so, are women represented? Are the activities spoken about nontraditional for the gender make-up of the room? (example: talking about watching the football game over the weekend with a majority of women in the room)

Analyze the Textual Features
Are symbols used?
If yes, what are they? Draw/describe them here.
Are these symbols familiar to you?
Are they familiar to a WRCC employee? In other words, are there questions about the meaning of a symbol or do most people in the meeting seem to understand? If it is a policy or procedure, does it use terms that might be familiar to a WRCC employee, but are not to you?
Are typically masculine words used? (example: maintenance guys)
Are typically feminine words used? (example: administrative girls)
What language is used (pay particular attention to pronouns or gendered words)?
Appendix B

Observation Protocol

Project Title: Gender performativity in the community college: A case study of female backline classified staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Tone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pitch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Loudness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intonation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Phrases of tentativeness (&quot;I guess&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Apologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-denigration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Niceties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Power language (aggressive, denigrating phrases, references to experts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Metaphors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exhibiting Naiveté</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Silences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Dramatization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Nonverbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Kinesics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Legs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Proxemetics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Use of Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Props</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Office layout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Dress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Makeup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Accessories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Audience Reactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Distraction or Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Eye Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Body position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hand gestures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Head nodding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Verbal responses/agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Interruption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C

Interview Protocol

Project Title: Gender performativity in the community college: A case study of female backline classified staff

Call the participant a week before the scheduled interview to confirm the meeting time and place.

"I want to thank you for meeting with me today and being willing to participate in this research. The purpose of the study is to find out how female backline classified staff perform gender at this institution and how that affects your identity as a woman. I want you to feel free to share your own opinions and experiences. Please remember there are not any “right” or “wrong” answers to the question. In addition, since we work together, I want to make it perfectly clear that no matter what is said in this interview today, it will NOT have an impact on your job or your work environment. I would like to tape record our conversation if that is okay with you, so that I will have an accurate record. Our conversation will be confidential. I will not use your name in any discussions or in the any writings related to the research, and I am the only one who will have access to the recordings. Is that okay?"

<Be sure to tape record the above paragraphs and the participant's answer.>

"Do you have any questions about this project? Shall we begin?"

1. "Tell me about your background at this college – how did you come to be here?"
   Probing questions:
   • How long at college
   • How long in this department
   • Why did you choose this position

2. "Please describe your best day here. Please describe your worst.

3. "How would you describe the expectations of you in the department and at the school? If at all, how does it differ from the expectations of your male colleagues?"
   Probing questions:
   • Ideal female member of the department
   • Ideal male member of the department

4. "Tell me about your interaction in general with your coworkers."
   Probing questions (if interaction differs between males and females):
   • Explain how the interaction is different.
5. "How do you relate to your colleagues?"
Probing questions:
   - On a problem call
   - At the break table
   - In a division meeting

6. "How do your customers treat you?"
Probing questions:
Is it different from how they treat your male colleagues?

7. "How do your colleagues treat you?"
Probing questions:
Do any of them treat you differently from your male colleagues?

8. "How, if at all, is your behavior different at work and home?"
Topics to be used for probing questions:
   - Would a friend be surprised to see you at work? Why?

9. "Tell me ways you behave at work and how those behaviors have made you successful?"
Probing questions:
   - Think back to your definitions of what is masculine and what is feminine

10. "What role best represents you at your job? Tell me more about that."

11. "What role best represents you outside of your job? Tell me more about that"

12. "What does being a woman mean to you?"

13. "During my observations, I noticed that you (used a certain word, phrase, or adopted a particular body language)." Talk to me about that.

"Thank you for taking the time out of your busy schedule to meet with me today. Is there anything else you feel would be helpful for me to know? ........ Again, thank you very much."
Appendix D

Thank You Email

Project Title: Gender performativity in the community college: A case study of female backline classified staff

Dear [__],

I want to thank you for participating in this study for my PhD coursework. Your willingness to participate has helped me a great deal. I will be happy to show you the submitted manuscript if you are interested in seeing it.

Thank you!

Sam Powers
Appendix E

Document Review Permission

Project Title: Gender performativity in the community college: A case study of female backline classified staff

I, (print)______________________________, give Samantha Powers to review the documents that pertain to her dissertation located at WRCC. This includes meeting minutes, proceedings, and policies and procedures pertinent to her dissertation that were written for employee and student use at WRCC. Further, I give her permission to use her findings from these documents in her dissertation for Old Dominion University.

If you have any further questions about this research, please contact Sam Powers at (360) 475-7811 or at spowe023@odu.edu.

I have read and understand this consent form. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about this study. I voluntarily choose to participate in this study.

Permission Name (Print): ________________________________

Permission Signature: ________________________________ Date: ____________________
Appendix F

Observation Consent Form

Project Title: Gender performativity in the community college: A case study of female backline classified staff

You are asked to participate in a research study by Sam Powers. The purpose of this research is to explore the experiences of female backline classified staff in community colleges. This study is being performed in partial fulfillment of my doctoral coursework at Old Dominion University.

You are asked to participate in an observation session. Your participation will require approximately 1 hour of your time and consent from you to use my observations for the purposes of this study.

There are no known risks to your participation in this study. You may not receive any direct personal benefits from your participation in this research. However, your responses may provide valuable information to assist the college in improving its programs and services for future participants.

Your identity will remain confidential. All records of your responses will be securely maintained at the researcher's home office. Your identity will not be used in any papers or reports that may follow from this research.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You can choose not to participate and can withdraw your consent at any time.

If you have any further questions about this research, please contact Sam Powers at (360) 475-7811 or at spowe023@odu.edu.

I have read and understand this consent form. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about this study. I voluntarily choose to participate in this study.

Participant Name (Print): _____________________________

Participant Signature: _______________________________ Date: ________________
Appendix G

Observation Appointment

Project Title: Gender performativity in the community college: A case study of female backline classified staff

Dear [participant],

I am happy that you have agreed to participate in this study. Would you be willing to have me conduct an observation session on [date] at [time]? I expect the observation session to take about an hour of your time.

Thank you!

Sam Powers
Appendix H

Interview Consent Form

Project Title: Gender performativity in the community college: A case study of female backline classified staff

You are asked to participate in a research study by Sam Powers. The purpose of this research is to explore the experiences of female backline classified staff in community colleges. This study is being performed in partial fulfillment of my doctoral coursework at Old Dominion University.

You are asked to participate in an interview. Your participation will require approximately an hour of your time and consent from you to use your responses for the purposes of this study.

There are no known risks to your participation in this study. You may not receive any direct personal benefits from your participation in this research. However, your responses may provide valuable information to assist the college in improving its programs and services for future participants.

Your identity will remain confidential. All records of your responses will be securely maintained at the researcher’s home office. Your identity will not be used in any papers or reports that may follow from this research.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You can choose not to participate and can withdraw your consent at any time.

If you have any further questions about this research, please contact Sam Powers at (360) 475-7811 or at spowe023@odu.edu.

I have read and understand this consent form. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about this study. I voluntarily choose to participate in this study.

Participant Name (Print): ______________________________________

Participant Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________
Appendix I

Interview Appointment

Project Title: Gender performativity in the community college: A case study of female backline classified staff

Dear [participant],

I am happy that you have agreed to continue to participate in this study. Would you be willing to do an interview with me on [date] at [time]? I expect the interview to take about an hour of your time.

Thank you!

Sam Powers
## Appendix J

### Document List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Policy #</th>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date Approved, Enacted, Revised, Written</th>
<th>WAC #</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Intended Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>100-02</td>
<td>Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Approved Jan 28, 03; reapproved Oct 25, 05; revised Jan 20, 09; published in WAC Feb 28, 09</td>
<td>132C -104-001; 132C -104-002; 132C -104-003; 132C -104-004; 132C -104-006;</td>
<td>WAC'd policy</td>
<td>Outlines the powers of the Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Upper administrative with a focus on their power of the rest of college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>100-04</td>
<td>Legislative Matters and the Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Approved Oct 25, 2005; published in WAC Apr 6, 1978</td>
<td>132C -104-0700</td>
<td>WAC'd policy</td>
<td>Designate d persons to represent WRCC &amp; the Board of Trustees in legislative matters</td>
<td>Upper administration, again talking about powers of the rest of college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>100-05</td>
<td>Olympic College Seal Design and Use</td>
<td>Approved Aug 28, 01; reapproved Jan 29, 08; published in WAC Mar 2, 08</td>
<td>132C -104-040</td>
<td>WAC'd policy</td>
<td>Design &amp; use of WRCC seal</td>
<td>All who use the seal on official business or on promotional materials, does include some classified staff, but mostly upper-admin/exempt, and no one in nontraditional careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>100-06</td>
<td>Acceptance of Certain Classes of Gifts</td>
<td>Approved April 24, 1979, reapproved Oct 25, 2005</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Limitation s of gifts that can be accepted</td>
<td>The president and &quot;his&quot; designees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>100-07</td>
<td>Award of Tenure</td>
<td>Approved Apr 24, 1979, reapproved Oct 25, 2005</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Award of tenure</td>
<td>Faculty members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>100-08</td>
<td>Naming Facilities</td>
<td>Approved Nov 21, 2000; reapproved, Oct 25, 2005</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Facilities naming; which is sometime tied in with who donated for construction</td>
<td>upper admin, vp of admin srvcs, facilities director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>100-09</td>
<td>Naming of Olympic College Facilities with regard to the Olympic College Foundation and Fund Solicitation</td>
<td>Approved Nov 21, 2000; reapproved, Oct 25, 2005</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Facilities naming; which is sometime tied in with who donated for construction</td>
<td>upper admin, vp of admin srvcs, facilities director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>100-09-01</td>
<td>Donor Proposal</td>
<td>Approved Nov 21, 2000; reapproved, Oct 25, 2005</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities naming; which is sometime tied in with who donated for construction</td>
<td>upper admin, vp of admin srvcs, facilities director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>100-09-02</td>
<td>Naming of Structure for Living Individual</td>
<td>Approved Nov 21, 2000; reapproved, Oct 25, 2005</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities naming; which is sometime tied in with who donated for construction</td>
<td>upper admin, vp of admin srvcs, facilities director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>100-09-03</td>
<td>Required Contribution of Building or Structure</td>
<td>Approved Nov 21, 2000; reapproved, Oct 25, 2005</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities naming; which is sometime tied in with who donated for construction</td>
<td>upper admin, vp of admin srvcs, facilities director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>100-09-04</td>
<td>Required Contribution for Room or Laboratory</td>
<td>Approved Nov 21, 2000; reapproved, Oct 25, 2005</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities naming; which is sometime tied in with who donated for construction</td>
<td>upper admin, vp of admin srvc, facilities director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>100-09-05</td>
<td>Recognition of Certain Individuals</td>
<td>Approved Nov 21, 2000; reapproved, Oct 25, 2005</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities naming; which is sometime tied in with who donated for construction</td>
<td>upper admin, vp of admin srvc, facilities director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>100-09-05</td>
<td>Discretion of the Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Approved Nov 21, 2000; reapproved, Oct 25, 2005</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities naming; which is sometime tied in with who donated for construction</td>
<td>upper admin, vp of admin srvc, facilities director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>100-11</td>
<td>Board of Trustees Code of Ethics</td>
<td>Approved Mar 28, 2006</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Duties of BoT in ethics cases</td>
<td>upper admin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>100-12</td>
<td>Board of Trustees Self Evaluation Commitment</td>
<td>Approved Feb 28, 2008</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Writing down requirement of self-evaluation of BoT</td>
<td>upper admin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>200-01</td>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td>Approved 3/28/06, WAC'd 6/18/06</td>
<td>WAC'd policy</td>
<td>Environmental policy requirement</td>
<td>upper admin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>200-02</td>
<td>Rental of Olympic College Facilities</td>
<td>Approved 10/25/05, WAC'd 4/15/68</td>
<td>WAC'd policy</td>
<td>Renting facilities</td>
<td>Upper admin, ISS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>200-03</td>
<td>First Amendment Activities at Olympic College</td>
<td>Approved 8/24/10, revised 7/5/11, published in WAC</td>
<td>WAC'd policy</td>
<td>Where to assemble for 1st amendment activities</td>
<td>Community, schedulers, Facilities director, VP of SS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Approved Date</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>Where to assemble for 1st amendment activities</td>
<td>Community, schedulers, Facilities director, VP of SS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-03-01</td>
<td>200-04</td>
<td>Use of Olympic College Facilities by College Groups and Non-College Groups for First Amendment Activities</td>
<td>7/5/2011</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>Where to assemble for 1st amendment activities</td>
<td>Community, schedulers, Facilities director, VP of SS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-04</td>
<td>200-04</td>
<td>Olympic College Guidelines and Policy on Notification of Sex Offenders</td>
<td>Approved 6/27/06, WAC'd 8/22/06</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Notification of sex offenders in classes</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-06</td>
<td>200-06</td>
<td>Children on Campus</td>
<td>Approved 1/25/05, reapproved 11/25/00</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Unattended children on campus</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-07</td>
<td>200-07</td>
<td>Smoking on Campus</td>
<td>Approved 1/24/89, reapproved 10/25/05</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Smokers everywhere</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-07-01</td>
<td>200-07-01</td>
<td>Life Threatening Illness</td>
<td>Approved 4/1/88</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Life threatening illnesses - AIDS</td>
<td>Students/employees with AIDS/HIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-08</td>
<td>200-09</td>
<td>Use of Facilities</td>
<td>Approved 3/22/05, reapproved 10/25/05</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Using facilities on campus</td>
<td>Managers, except for 2 important ones: facilities &amp; ISS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-09</td>
<td>200-10</td>
<td>Adjudicative Proceedings</td>
<td>Approved 2/28/06</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Adjudicative proceedings requests</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>200-12</td>
<td>Policy Standards</td>
<td>Approved 10/23/07</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>standardization of making policies/procedures</td>
<td>All - but speaks specifically to policy-makers, revisers, organizers, and approvers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>200-12-01</td>
<td>Implementing a Proposed Policy or Policy Revision</td>
<td>October, 2007</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>standardization of making policies/procedures</td>
<td>All - but speaks specifically to policy-makers, revisers, organizers, and approvers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>200-13</td>
<td>Animal Control Policy</td>
<td>Approved 1/29/08; WAC'd 3/2/08</td>
<td>WAC'd policy</td>
<td>Animals on campus</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>200-14</td>
<td>Suspended Operation Policy</td>
<td>Approved 4/22/08</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Suspended ops - very general, see procedure s for specifics</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>200-14-01</td>
<td>Suspended Operation Procedure</td>
<td>Revised 11/24/09</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>Suspended ops procedure s</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>200-15</td>
<td>Course Materials Cost Savings Policy</td>
<td>Approved 5/27/08</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Course materials options to students, buy back, and coordinati on between bookstore and faculty issues</td>
<td>Bookstore employees, no faculty responsibility mentioned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>200-15-01</td>
<td>Course Materials Purchasing Options</td>
<td>5/27/2008</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>Course materials options to students, buy back, and coordinati on between bookstore and faculty issues</td>
<td>Bookstore employees, no faculty responsibility mentioned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Course Materials Buy Back Procedure 200-15-02</td>
<td>Course materials options to students, buy back, and coordination between bookstore and faculty issues</td>
<td>Bookstore employees, no faculty responsibility mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Course Materials Faculty and Division Coordination 200-15-03</td>
<td>Course materials options to students, buy back, and coordination between bookstore and faculty issues</td>
<td>Bookstore employees, no faculty responsibility mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Parking Policy 200-16</td>
<td>Parking responsibilities of all</td>
<td>Safety and security director, classified staff in S&amp;S, students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Parking Procedures 200-16-01</td>
<td>Parking responsibilities of all</td>
<td>Safety and security director, classified staff in S&amp;S, students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Acceptable Use Policy 200-17</td>
<td>WAC'd policy</td>
<td>Use of IT equipment</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Identity Theft Prevention Policy 200-18</td>
<td>WRC</td>
<td>Prevention of Identity theft</td>
<td>Prospective and current students and employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Overall Policy</td>
<td>Approved Date</td>
<td>Prevention of Identity Theft</td>
<td>Prospective and current students and employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-18-01</td>
<td>Identity Theft Prevention Procedures</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>2/27/10</td>
<td>No tolerance for discrimination</td>
<td>Employees and students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-19</td>
<td>Non-Discrimination Policy</td>
<td>WAC'd policy</td>
<td>4/27/10</td>
<td>Sexual harassment prevention and reporting</td>
<td>Employees and students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-20</td>
<td>Sexual Harassment Policy</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>4/27/10</td>
<td>Sexual harassment complaints procedures</td>
<td>Employees and students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-20-01</td>
<td>Harassment Complaint Procedures</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>4/27/10</td>
<td>Sexual harassment complaints procedures</td>
<td>Employees and students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-20-02</td>
<td>Harassment Complaint Procedures</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>4/27/10</td>
<td>Sexual harassment complaints procedures</td>
<td>Employees and students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-20-03</td>
<td>Harassment Complaint Procedures</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>4/27/10</td>
<td>Sexual harassment complaints procedures</td>
<td>Employees and students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-21</td>
<td>Use of Force Policy</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>4/27/10</td>
<td>Use of force to subdue people</td>
<td>Safety and Security staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-21-01</td>
<td>Use of Force Procedures</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>4/27/10</td>
<td>Use of force to subdue people</td>
<td>Safety and Security staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-22</td>
<td>Acts of Hate/Bias Policy</td>
<td>WAC'd policy</td>
<td>4/26/11</td>
<td>How to deal with hate crimes on campus</td>
<td>upper admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-22-01</td>
<td>Acts of Hate/Bias Procedures</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>4/26/11</td>
<td>How to deal with hate crimes on campus</td>
<td>upper admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Code</td>
<td>Student Conduct Code</td>
<td>WAC Reapproved Date</td>
<td>Policy Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000-01</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/24/10</td>
<td>Student Conduct Policy 300-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>065-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/25/05</td>
<td>WACd -120- policy guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>085-03</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/15/20</td>
<td>WACd -120- policy guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>095-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/30/10</td>
<td>WACd -120- policy guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105-05</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/12/20</td>
<td>WACd -120- policy guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/22/20</td>
<td>WACd -120- policy guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125-07</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/22/20</td>
<td>WACd -120- policy guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-02</td>
<td>300-02</td>
<td>300-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documented</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Serving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on of a</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>for</td>
<td>for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Accessing</td>
<td>Accessing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/00</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but NOT staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved 6/27/00

WRCC

Overall Policy

Serving students with disabilities
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>300-03</th>
<th>Procedure for Course Substitution</th>
<th>Approved 6/27/00</th>
<th>WRCC Overall Procedure</th>
<th>Serving students with disabilitie</th>
<th>access services/ADA students/faculty, but NOT staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>300-04</td>
<td>Grievance Procedure</td>
<td>Approved 6/27/00</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>Serving students with disabilitie</td>
<td>access services/ADA students/faculty, but NOT staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>300-03</td>
<td>Transcript Fee</td>
<td>Approved 4/27/04</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Money for transcripts</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>300-04</td>
<td>Refund of Student Development Fee</td>
<td>Approved 8/26/97</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Refund of fees for students who withdraw during refund period</td>
<td>Students/BoT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>300-05</td>
<td>Admissions and Registration</td>
<td>Approved 1/24/06</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Adhering to Admissions and Registration regulations in WAC &amp; RCW's</td>
<td>upper admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>300-06</td>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>Approved 1/24/06</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Location of scholarship information at the college</td>
<td>Students/financial aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>300-07</td>
<td>FERPA</td>
<td>Approved 2/28/06</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>FERPA for students only</td>
<td>Students/upper administration/directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>400-01</td>
<td>Prohibition of Drugs</td>
<td>Approved 9/26/89</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Drug prohibition (manufacturing, distribution, dispensing, possession of or use of drugs) for WRCC employee</td>
<td>All employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>400-02</td>
<td>Employment Contract: Administrative Staff</td>
<td>Approved 4/27/04</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Exempt staff contracts, all must be written, none verbal</td>
<td>HR/president/executive staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>400-04</td>
<td>Alternative Work Schedule Policy</td>
<td>Approved 1/20/09</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Alternative work schedule options</td>
<td>Employees/supervisors considering compressed schedules/telecommuting/HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>400-04-01</td>
<td>Alternative Work Schedule Procedure - Compressed Work Schedules</td>
<td>Approved 1/20/09</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>Alternative work schedule options</td>
<td>Employees/supervisors considering compressed schedules/telecommuting/HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>400-04-02</td>
<td>Alternative Work Schedule Procedure - Telecommuting Procedure</td>
<td>Approved 1/20/09</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Procedure</td>
<td>Alternative work schedule options</td>
<td>Employees/supervisors considering compressed schedules/telecommuting/HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>400-05</td>
<td>Employee Ethics Policy</td>
<td>Approved 3/28/95</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Ethical policy for employees</td>
<td>All employees, and upper administration, especially Bot/president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>500-01</td>
<td>Addition of Courses to Curriculum</td>
<td>Approved 4/14/68</td>
<td>132C -10-030; WAC'd policy</td>
<td>Adding courses</td>
<td>Faculty/ISS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>500-02</td>
<td>Deletion of Courses from Curriculum</td>
<td>Approved 4/15/68</td>
<td>132C -10-035; WAC'd policy</td>
<td>Deleting courses</td>
<td>Faculty/ISS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>600-01</td>
<td>Withholding Services for Outstanding Debt</td>
<td>Approved 2/2006</td>
<td>132C -122-010; 132C -122-020; 132C -122-030; WAC'd policy</td>
<td>Collecting debt</td>
<td>President/students/financial services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>600-02</td>
<td>Tuition and Fee Waiver Policy</td>
<td>Approved 1/24/06</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>No fee waivers</td>
<td>upper admin/administrators/BoT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>600-03</td>
<td>Tuition and Fee Waivers for Classified State Employees</td>
<td>Approved 11/27/90</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>waiver for classes for classified staff</td>
<td>classified staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>600-04</td>
<td>Course and Lab Fee Policy</td>
<td>Approved 5/28/96</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Course and lab fees to cover current and future equipment</td>
<td>Students and faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>600-05</td>
<td>Tuition and Fee Refund Policy</td>
<td>Approved 6/24/03</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Refunding students</td>
<td>students/financial aid/financial services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>600-06</td>
<td>Procurement Policy for Recycled Products</td>
<td>Approved 11/12/91</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>Rules for recycled products</td>
<td>Procurement department and purchasers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>600-07</td>
<td>Debt Policy</td>
<td>Approved 3/27/07</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>College's debt</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>600-08</td>
<td>Financial Reserve Policy</td>
<td>Approved 6/27/06</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>College reserve will be 6-10% of financial budget</td>
<td>Board of Trustees, upper administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>600-09</td>
<td>Olympic College Investment Policy</td>
<td>Approved 11/24/09</td>
<td>WRCC Overall Policy</td>
<td>WRCC’s investment</td>
<td>VP of AS and Director of Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>700-02</td>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Approved 4/15/68</td>
<td>132C -10-015</td>
<td>WAC’d policy</td>
<td>Communications department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Public Records</td>
<td>WAC'd</td>
<td>WAC'd Policy</td>
<td>Public Records Requests</td>
<td>Upper Administration or Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700-03</td>
<td>132C-276-010; 132C-276-020; 132C-276-030; 132C-276-040; 132C-276-050; 132C-276-060; 132C-276-070; 132C-276-080; 132C-276-090; 132C-276-100; 132C-276-110; 132C-276-120; 132C-276-130; 132C-276-190;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Plan</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>Board of Trustees 2011-12 Work Plan</th>
<th>9/27/2011</th>
<th>2011-12 Board of Trustees objectives for the year</th>
<th>Upper administration, board of trustees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Presidents Goals/Work Plan</td>
<td>9/27/2011</td>
<td>President's goals for academic year</td>
<td>Student #1, then faculty, then staff, then administrators, then BoT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>Olympic College President's Cabinet Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>11-Oct-11</td>
<td>Budget committee direction</td>
<td>All employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>Olympic College President's Council Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>10/4/2011</td>
<td>Grants, budget committee, Diversity Advisory Committee, Strategic Initiative #2, Mission change?</td>
<td>All employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>Olympic College Board of Trustee Regular Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>9/27/2011</td>
<td>Student achievement policy, review of GISS data, Work plans for Pres and BoT reviewed</td>
<td>Upper administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Contract</td>
<td>WPEA Classified Staff Union Contract</td>
<td>2009-11</td>
<td>Union contract for classified staff members</td>
<td>classified staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Contract</td>
<td>Association of Higher Education Faculty Union Contract</td>
<td>through 6/30/13</td>
<td>Union contract for faculty members</td>
<td>faculty members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Procedure</td>
<td>Hostage Situations</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S&amp;S How to act during hostage situations</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Procedure</td>
<td>Medical Emergencies</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S&amp;S How to act during medical emergencies</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Procedure</td>
<td>Evacuation Procedures</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S&amp;S How to act during evacuations</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Procedure</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S&amp;S</td>
<td>How to act during</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Procedure</td>
<td>Earthquakes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S&amp;S</td>
<td>act during earthquakes</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Procedure</td>
<td>Chemical Spills</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S&amp;S</td>
<td>act during chemical spills</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Procedure</td>
<td>Hazardous Conditions</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S&amp;S</td>
<td>act during other hazardous conditions</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Procedure</td>
<td>Intruder/Suspicious Persons</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S&amp;S</td>
<td>How to act when there are intruders/suspicious persons</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Procedure</td>
<td>Assisting Persons with Disabilities in an Evacuation</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S&amp;S</td>
<td>How to assist persons with disabilities during emergencies</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Procedure</td>
<td>Inclement Weather</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S&amp;S</td>
<td>How to act during inclement weather</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Procedure</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S&amp;S</td>
<td>What to do during fires</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Procedure</td>
<td>Bomb Threat</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S&amp;S</td>
<td>What to do when there is a bomb threat</td>
<td>Community, employees, students, ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Training Manual/Procedures</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S&amp;S</td>
<td>Training for new members of S&amp;S department</td>
<td>S&amp;S staff only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Parking Decals/Forms/Procedures/Instructions</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S&amp;S</td>
<td>How to handle parking decals</td>
<td>S&amp;S staff only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Graffiti Removal Procedure</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S&amp;S</td>
<td>How to handle graffiti from the</td>
<td>S&amp;S staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Office Shutdown Procedures</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>S&amp;S</td>
<td>Instructing staff in dispatch office on how to shut down office</td>
<td>S&amp;S clerical staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities Operational Instructions: Purchase Requests</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Instructing staff on how to make purchase requests</td>
<td>Facilities staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities Operational Instructions: Snow/Ice Removal</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Instructing staff on how/when to remove snow/ice</td>
<td>Facilities staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities Operational Instructions: Recalling Personnel</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Instructing supervisors on how to recall personnel and what it means to HR</td>
<td>Facilities staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities Operational Instructions: Assignment of Overtime Work</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>How/when to assign overtime</td>
<td>Facilities staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities Operational Instructions: Facilities Work Request</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>What to do when the department receives work requests</td>
<td>Facilities staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities Operational Instructions: Light Tubes, Batteries, and other Items</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Procedures for recycling consumable maintenance equipment</td>
<td>Facilities staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities Operational Instructions</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>How to dispose of chemical hazards</td>
<td>Facilities staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Hazard Communications</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Facilities staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities Operational Instructions: Weekly Work Order Reporting</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Maintenance supervisor, who is classified staff duties for reporting weekly the work order statuses</td>
<td>Facilities staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities Operational Instructions: Interior Paint Standards</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Standardization of paint used and what to offer customers for walls</td>
<td>Facilities staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities Operational Instructions: Clothing Standards</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Standards for what personnel in the department can wear due to safety</td>
<td>Facilities staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities Operational Instructions: Building Lock and Unlock Procedures</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Instructions for what buildings to unlock and when</td>
<td>Facilities staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities Operational Instructions: Roof Leaks</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>What to do when there is a roof leak</td>
<td>Facilities staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Facilities Operational Instructions: Removing Graffiti</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>What to do when there is graffiti that S&amp;S has deemed biased</td>
<td>Facilities staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Facilitie s</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Operational Instructions: Elevator Repairs and Emergency Procedures</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>What to do when there are issues with the elevators on campus</td>
<td>Facilities staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Operational Instructions: Operation of the KILKOM Compactor</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>How to operate the pneumatic trash compactor</td>
<td>Facilities staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial Master Plan</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Where and how to clean areas per custodian</td>
<td>Custodial staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Desk Procedures or Rules</td>
<td>7/23/2008</td>
<td>To instruct employee at the helpdesk about how to act/what to do</td>
<td>Information Technology Help Desk staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Desk Ethics and Security Agreement</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>To instruct employees at the helpdesk about IT ethics and security</td>
<td>Information Technology Help Desk staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Desk Basic Responsibilities</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>To instruct employees at the helpdesk of basic responsibilities</td>
<td>Information Technology Help Desk staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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