



Gender relations in higher education: exploring lecturers' perceptions of student evaluations of teaching

Lloyd Carson

ABSTRACT

Quantitative evidence suggests that higher education students may exhibit gender bias against women when evaluating the teaching of male and female faculty. Qualitative research in this area has been concerned with the broader context of institutional sexism in academia, which has been represented as a pervasive and depressing influence on women lecturers. Relatively little research has investigated university teachers' specific views about student perceptions and behaviour. This study explored this issue qualitatively in a group of British academics. While most of the female academics represented students as having prejudiced views about them, the prevailing understanding in the literature of women university staff as demoralized, alienated and experiencing tension between their occupational and feminine selves was not confirmed. Rather, women appeared entirely confident in their identities as conscientious teachers, a circumstance which related empirically (and possibly theoretically) to an almost unanimous derogation of their male colleagues. No body of literature about male lecturers' views of sexism exists: this study suggested that they contrast markedly with those of their female colleagues. Problematic aspects of women's apparent assiduity about teaching are discussed, as is the other principal area of concern raised by the study, namely the extensive areas of disagreement in outlook between the female and male respondents.

Keywords: gender; stereotype; university; teaching; lecturer; student; evaluation

INTRODUCTION

The recognition that gender stereotypes may play a role in teachers' assessments of students' work has led to the widespread adoption of practices such as the 'blind' marking of examination

Lloyd Carson is a Lecturer in Psychology at the School of Social and Health Sciences,, University of Abertay, Dundee.

scripts in higher education institutions (see Bradley, 1984). Gender bias may also occur when students rate the performance of their male and female teachers. This is an important issue as audit procedures comprising formal evaluations by students of course content and presentation in universities and colleges have become routine. While comparatively little research has been undertaken in the UK, in North America, where students' evaluations may be taken into account in staff tenure and promotion decisions (see Barnett, 1996) a very large corpus of information has been amassed.

Quantitative research on student ratings of teachers has included experimental work based on Goldberg's (1968) method in which typically the gender of the author of hypothetical teaching material has been manipulated. Such research has broadly indicated that teacher gender plays little or no role in evaluations, though where an effect has been detected, it represents a bias against women (for reviews see Swim *et al.*, 1989; Top, 1991; Andersen and Miller, 1997). Analyses of actual rating data have also been carried out. Basow (1995, 1998), in her examination of four years of faculty evaluations, found that female teachers were rated less favourably overall than male. She noted that other factors further influence ratings so that women with say low status positions, teaching 'masculine' (i.e. natural science) subject areas, with predominantly male students, may be significantly disadvantaged.

Though there are fewer recent studies, there is some suggestion that time is eroding gender bias (Fernandez and Mateo, 1997), and some researchers have reported finding higher female evaluations (e.g. Tatro, 1995; Rowden and Carlson, 1996). Christopher and Leskosky (1997) found that female veterinary college instructors, despite working in a 'masculine' subject area, were evaluated better than male, especially on 'low inference' behavioural items such as 'freedom to ask questions in class'. This is consistent with social psychological theory which suggests that stereotypical thought flourishes in conditions of non-specific ('high inference') information such as might occur if students were asked to rate say 'the success in the future' of a staff member. However, it is also consistent with women being rated highly for adhering to the feminine gender role by providing a friendly classroom environment (Langbein, 1994) and the authors note that ratings may relate to the particularly 'feminine' parts of the syllabus women were teaching. Tatro's (1995) findings may also be associated with students' expectations of receiving higher grades from 'nurturant' female teachers. There is the further possibility that high female ratings reflect the phenomenon whereby women who succeed unexpectedly can benefit from an overvaluing of their contribution – the 'talking platypus' effect (Abramson *et al.*, 1977: p. 23). Overall, evidence for gender bias in student evaluations may be summarized as Neath (1996, p. 1364) has done in his amusing 'tips' for academics wishing to improve their teaching evaluations without altering their performance: 'Tip 1: be male'.

Qualitative work in the area has investigated broader issues of concern for women in academia. It provides a background against which to interpret quantitative findings in documenting the apparently widespread and deep feelings of disaffection of women working in a man's world, subject to global and subtle prejudice and discrimination within their institutions. Studies reporting such experiences have examined both North American (Statham *et al.*, 1991; Caplan, 1993; Acker and Feuerverger, 1996; Bronstein and Farnsworth, 1998) and European experiences (Bagilhole, 1993a, b; Bagilhole and Woodward, 1995; Malina and Maslin-Prothero, 1998; Wager, 1998). Gallant and Cross's (1993) single case study of the prolonged and irrevocable process by which a female academic failed to achieve tenure following her attempt to bring a charge of sexual harassment against a male superior, makes compelling reading.

However, there has been little qualitative research into academic staff's perceptions of students' views and behaviour concerning teacher gender. Regardless of whether gender bias

actually occurs, it is not clear whether teachers believe that students evaluate their performance in these terms. Feelings of disadvantage, for example, may not only be dispiriting in themselves to women, but might lead to the adoption of costly coping strategies, such as excessive amounts of time spent in teaching preparation at the expense of research activity. Studies which indicate that students rate their male and female teachers equally could of course be concealing a tendency for female teachers to work harder to achieve 'parity' with their male colleagues. There is evidence that women academics perceive themselves as devoting more time to teaching and service activities than their male colleagues (Acker and Feuerverger, 1996). If these perceptions are accurate, it is not surprising that women submit fewer research funding applications (Loder and Eley, 1998). Whether female staff perceive students to be biased is therefore of considerable interest, particularly given the continuing concern in the UK and elsewhere over women's poor position overall in academia in terms of pay, occupation of promoted posts and so on (e.g. McNabb and Wass, 1997; Committee on Women Faculty in the School of Science at MIT, 1999; Howie, 1999; Swain, 1999).

The study reported below shifts the prevailing qualitative focus away from examining the biased practices of those in formal positions of power in the academic workplace, towards investigating the relationship of academics to their students. It examined the views of 31 female academics within two British universities about student perceptions and behaviour in relation to teacher gender, and addressed the specific issue of student gender bias in evaluations of teaching performance. By incorporating a sample of 17 male university teachers, it also begins to address the neglected issue of male academics' representations of gender.

METHOD

The study

Qualitative information on teachers' views was gathered by means of a self-report postal questionnaire distributed to female university staff actively involved in undergraduate teaching in two traditional British universities. Women's organizations in both universities supplied mailing lists of female teaching staff which provided a basis, in conjunction with the relevant University Calendars, for contacting potential respondents. Mailing was confined to women teaching in traditional (non-vocational areas) of study in order that their occupational status as lecturers was 'uncontaminated' with other job-related identities, e.g. doctor. Eighty four women were contacted, representing around 70% of those employed in such teaching posts. Thirty-one questionnaires were returned; a response rate of 37%. Female recipients were asked to pass on a further copy of the questionnaire to a male colleague of equivalent teaching experience, post and subject area. Seventeen questionnaires were returned by men. There was a disproportionate representation of promoted staff (i.e. senior lecturer, reader, professor) in the sample: promoted women were over-represented and men under-represented. While the data clearly cannot be regarded as representative of teaching staff in these institutions, they nevertheless comprise a valuable resource. They illustrate the views and experiences of a substantial number of British university teachers working in different subject areas (natural science, arts/humanities and social science) and career locations, towards issues about which relatively little is currently known.

Teachers were asked whether they thought that their gender affected: students' written ratings of their own teaching and of teaching in general; students' other behaviour towards them

during formal and informal teaching situations; whether their male and female colleagues had ever mentioned these issues; if male and female teachers put equal effort into teaching and if changes in methods of course evaluation were required. Each topic question was followed by a prompt question encouraging respondents to speculate as to why they held their particular view. The questionnaires incorporated sufficient space for lengthy written responses to be given.

Analysis

The data were arranged initially according to two organizing principles: the gender of the respondent and the respondent's views on the specific issue of gender bias in student evaluations of teaching. Repeated readings of the data both by individual respondent and by individual question indicated that they were sufficiently extensive and interesting to warrant a thematic analysis based upon all references to sexism and gender-related issues in academia to be carried out. The focus of research evolved therefore from providing a description, based on a content analysis, of perceptions about students and their behaviour into a more general account, based upon emergent or grounded categories, of the impact of gender in the lives of university teachers (see Strauss and Corbin, 1990). For example, many references to sexism or insensitivity in male colleagues' behaviour occurred in the women's responses, regardless of their position on student gender bias. These major themes, representing issues of concern to the respondents, form the basis of this account. The theoretical impulsion to this study was therefore to provide an exploratory exposition of certain under-researched aspects of gender and university life, to 'hypothesis test' (see Henwood and Pidgeon, 1995) those aspects described previously in other qualitative accounts, and to 'complement' existing quantitative work in this area (see Pope and Mays, 1996).

RESULTS

Male and female staff's representations of student perceptions were disparate, and are described separately. Quotations are preceded by letters indicating respondents' general subject area: S = social science; N = natural science; A = arts/humanities. Promoted staff are indicated by the prefix P. Numbers refer to individual respondents.

1. Female teachers

Women respondents' accounts of the specific issue of gender bias in student evaluations of their teaching were varied, falling into three major groups. The largest grouping comprised those who represented female lecturers as generally disadvantaged relative to male because of negative stereotyping on the part of students. The second group comprised those who said they were unsure about the reality of gender bias because of a lack of systematic evidence either way, but suspected it played a role, and third, there were those who said that evaluations were not affected by the teacher's gender. A few women said that being female had given them an advantage. Women from different subject domains, seniority and institution were represented in all three major attitude groupings. The women's positions concerning bias in student evaluations were

not a strong guide to their representations concerning sexism in general in the academic world, however. Reference to gender-related issues in their professional lives was made by all but two staff, though those who said that student evaluations were biased had perhaps the strongest convictions about the nature and reality of sexism in academia.

Academic stereotypes; female stereotypes

The view that students have a negative prejudice about female academic staff was put forcefully by some women. Students were said to regard women teachers as less estimable and authoritative than their male counterparts, who were seen as automatically worthy of respect, as 'fitting the academic stereotype in appearance' and whose 'intellectual credibility' was taken for granted:

- S1: . . . they take me less seriously as my (male) colleagues get comments like 'prestigious' and 'impressive', I am seen as more 'warm' and 'enthusiastic'. (In evaluations) I'm 'Ms' rather than 'Dr' while my male colleagues become 'Prof' rather than 'Mr' which is their proper title. Men are taken more seriously they have deep voices, grey hair, fit the image of a professor a young attractive women doesn't, she looks like your typical student!
- S6: . . . generally women are treated as if they are not equal to male colleagues perhaps because students tend to see women in clerical administrative and research roles, not as lecturers . . .

A key consequence of being stereotyped in this way was having to consciously work to achieve academic credibility; an attribute students ascribed to men automatically:

- SP3: I feel less respect is accorded my teaching and I have to work hard to earn their respect. I feel male colleagues are given this respect automatically . . . women are perceived as less able . . . I have to overcome their scepticism about whether I know what I'm talking about. I firmly believe women are seen as less credible intellectually.
- SP5: . . . students undervalue female teachers therefore I feel I have to work harder at being seen to be credible for them (dress, credentials etc.) . . . males are assumed to be knowledgeable, females have to prove it. Any failings in female lecturers are picked up on and seen to be fatal . . .

Intractable student behaviour in teaching situations reflected these problems:

- S4: It's more difficult for female staff to command the respect that men do – have to persuade students to do things.
- N1: Some students try to 'manipulate' which they would probably not try on with male colleagues.
- S1: Perhaps (they are) more challenging of my authority in the years one and two . . . later they may be willing to put more into class.

Some women described evidence of sexual stereotyping and prejudice in the offensive comments they had received on evaluation forms or in staff-student council meetings, and

those who had female colleagues at work (6 had none) reported them as having had similar experiences. In some cases, the format of evaluation forms had been altered to preclude the possibility of making personal comments; others referred to the need for such change:

- S1: I have had insulting remarks . . . about the pitch of my voice, dress, legs, being attractive . . . we talked about how infuriating this is and that students can just be 'shites' (sic).
- S2: (Students) may be more prone to write personal comments such as on clothing and appearance in general.
- SP3: . . . this (bias) is evidenced in the way they respond to some questionnaires and in their attitudes in staff-student liaison committee and in their verbal comments about women which are sometimes offensive/sexist.

The perception of gender bias was sometimes cited by senior women as a particular problem for young female staff:

- S7: One female colleague said . . . students were so used to hearing male staff lecturing that it was more difficult for them to adjust to a female voice, they tended to react negatively and treat lectures with less seriousness . . .
- AP2: I'm probably too old and senior (to be affected) . . . female tutors are judged against a male standard and are often not found to measure up. Two younger colleagues say they are not thought to carry the weight and authority of male colleagues.
- AP3: At 44 it is more difficult for students to think of me in terms of gender. Younger female colleagues have certainly said they have been subjected to sexist comments on evaluations and that their authority has been questioned.

Those women who claimed that gender was not a factor in evaluations appeared to recognize the reality of student sexism, but presented it as something which should be overcome providing the appropriate time or effort was invested:

- AP8: Initially . . . students are less receptive to young, female lecturers than to older male ones.
- A9: . . . students expect men to be more authoritative on their subject but once they hear what their teacher has to say, they forget about gender.
- N3: If a teacher can establish respect at the academic level, the gender problems – whether sexual or prejudice against women is (sic) overcome.

But the gaining of student respect, not surprisingly, was seen as problematic by the women who presented students as fundamentally sexist. Aping the authoritative academic was a poor strategy as this inevitably compromised the woman's femininity in the eyes of her students, which itself had costs. There was the strong notion that respectability and acceptance for women as academics must be accomplished through the deliberate adoption of a positively feminine style of interaction with the students:

- NP2: . . . any tendency to be 'firm' or speak negatively to latecomers or chatterers is regarded as 'bossy' or 'schoolmarmish' and attracts some very rude comments from male students.

- N1: Some colleagues feel if they have to adopt an authoritative tone, i.e. over assessment deadlines etc. they are considered 'shrill' . . . I find I need to adopt a less authoritative more nurturing style to earn good evaluations.
- S4: I find I use a more co-operative, participative style.

This leads to consideration of the role and status of positive stereotypical female attributes such as nurturance, caring and empathy. The women staff often reported behaviour, and expectations of behaviour, consistent with what might be characterized as comprising a feminine or caring role in relation to the students. Not surprisingly, most women regarded these traits positively in themselves, however, it is important to make clear the limits of acceptability to them of the feminine role. In terms of its pastoral aspects – providing advice and support services to students often outside the classroom – there was considerable evidence of ambivalence or resentment. Some women staff described how pressured they felt by students' and male colleagues' expectations into playing a part whose negative consequences, in terms of the personal time and emotional costs involved in dealing with demanding and sometimes distressed students, were considerable:

- S1: There's much more pressure on them (female staff) for student attention . . . women often end up in caring duties like Dean of Students and personal tutors. Students expect women to be more caring and understanding . . . male colleagues often send students to the women for sorting out their problems so students are aided in their perceptions.
- AP2: . . . they are more likely to confide in me and expect me to be sympathetic.
- SP5: I am the focus of students' desires to be more looked after in a way that my male colleagues are not.
- AP3: Most female advisors in our department have far more contact with students than men do. It takes up more of our time.
- S9: Women students can be demanding on me as a woman since there are so few women staff – come to think of it, in pastoral terms, male students do too.
- N3: . . . students are more at ease with me than my male colleagues and so I bear the brunt of this role in the school.

In addition, by engaging in personal interactions of this kind a degree of familiarity or ambiguity as to status could be engendered with students, which could further detract from the teacher's (already tenuous) authority:

- A9: They're much more likely to ask personal questions than with a man. They are also less inclined to take no for an answer . . . e.g. for an extension to a deadline even when I've said my decision is final.
- S6: Students seem to approach me as if I am a friend – which I am not. They assume familiarity and informality . . . this is disconcerting.
- SP3: Students can sometimes be a bit pushy and I need to be clear and firm about their responsibilities and my boundaries. Students perceive female teachers as more approachable and seek much pastoral care from us. Both behaviours are due to stereotypical views of women's attributes.
- AP10: I think they feel less intimidated by me . . . this has positive and negative consequences.

Only two women appeared to derive personal satisfaction from being seen as sympathetic counsellors:

- AP6: Both women and men come to me with their problems. I have noted homosexual men share this with me in a way they don't with male colleagues.
- N7: Male colleagues find personal tutees will seek other staff to help with problems; they weren't approachable, students felt they wouldn't be sympathetic.

Teaching style and effort

While the pastoral demands of the 'feminine' role were usually reported ambivalently or even negatively, female staff almost invariably characterized their personal teaching style, or women's teaching style in general, as pedagogically superior to that of their male colleagues because of its informal and interactive qualities and their own conscientiousness. While some staff resented the students' assumption that women would be approachable, or felt a degree of coercion in adopting a feminine style which was 'acceptable' to sexist students, they nevertheless could represent it as having distinct educational benefits for students and resulting in good evaluations for teachers:

- S2: Students are not intimidated in tutorials.
- SP5: . . . interactions are more personal/informal (with women teachers) but age is also important.
- N5: In practical classes, students are very willing to talk freely.
- S6: I get positive feedback because of perceived approachability, I encourage student participation, co-operation etc.

Being regarded as less authoritative than male colleagues could therefore be presented as advantageous:

- S6: Students interrupt more, question more and talk more in class.
- A1: They are more likely to question (doubt?) what I tell them. This may not be a bad thing!

Women who denied that gender bias was an issue in their working lives explicitly identified their teaching style as educationally superior to the 'masculine' (formal) style:

- SP10: Perhaps I teach more informally than most of my male colleagues . . . so long as my lectures are structured tightly within this informal framework students appreciate the informality . . . they tend to be relaxed.
- A9: I have always had very positive teaching evaluations . . . I give them quite a bit of individual attention and create a comfortable atmosphere . . . they are less in awe of me than if I were a man.
- S11: Females are more approachable and this is reflected in the ratings.
- N7: In written comments students have referred to empathy, not being 'talked down to' by me.

Further, the majority of female respondents described female teachers as more conscientious and committed teachers than their male counterparts:

- SP5: . . . females put in more effort: (1) to overcome bias in the system; and (2) because they have a more caring ethos to their teaching therefore try harder.
- S7: . . . female staff generally put more effort into teaching . . . they tend to be less selfish with time, possibly because they regard teaching as a very important part of their job.
- A5: The few I know do put much more effort into their teaching . . . because sadly female teachers are still such a rare sight at (university x) so both female models and leaders are missing.
- AP2: I think female teachers are more conscientious and react more to criticism.
- S6: I believe strongly that women care more about teaching and so put more effort and energy into it and this goes unrewarded i.e. no promotion.
- N3: On the whole women are more approachable and therefore more popular. They may be seen to take more time with individual students.

In fact, male teachers were often represented as displaying a variety of inappropriate, even contemptible attitudes to their teaching responsibilities:

- AP3: Women are more conscientious, better communicators and more sensitive to the need for careful preparation. Male academics are primarily concerned with furthering their own careers exclusively whereas women enjoy working as a team.
- N5: Female teachers tend to be conscientious in preparing materials and are willing to provide back-up material if students have problems . . . senior male teachers are more inclined to a 'take it or leave it' approach.
- N7: . . . females seem to look to offer challenging assignments/exams, males not so . . . females always seem better prepared, males doing things last minute.

Male colleagues

Comments about male colleagues occurred in many contexts in the responses. As was the case in relation to teaching, without exception comments were negative and were independent of women teachers' views on student gender bias, their seniority or subject area. Specifically, none of the female respondents referred to male colleagues as being supportive or understanding about gender issues, and some made wry comments about their lack of awareness or even obstructive or undermining behaviour:

- S6: Ha! No. Never (have they mentioned gender issues).
- AP6: Men rarely reflect on gender issues.
- SP5: No, gender seems to never have been an issue for them.
- S1: . . . they aren't aware or in the least bothered by it. When students say they think a (female) colleague is 'cool' or 'cute' they don't seem bothered. I've never heard a male colleague talking about gender . . . as I have women . . . they have been opposed to doing anything much with evaluation procedures.

N4: (They have said) any good ratings I get are because I have more contact with students.

One motif, which emerged in around half the female questionnaires, was male colleagues' reported construal of the teacher-student relationship in sexual terms. Women staff might be said to benefit in evaluations by being sexually attractive, or female students to admire certain male members of staff or use sexual wiles on them:

- S9: (They have said) an attractive female teacher is sure to get good evaluations.
A9: I have heard a male colleague link successful evaluations to the attractiveness of the female colleague concerned.
S2: They report comments (on evaluation forms) showing that the students find them sexually attractive . . . female students are in the majority and they may inflate male evaluations.
A1: One has said female students react well to young male staff. I think it was a joke but it underlies an attitude I found offensive.
N3: Young male colleagues are usually flattered by the attentions of female students.
S7: One of my male colleagues tends to cultivate certain female students. It's not clear whether this is reflected in student evaluations of his teaching.
A12: I have heard occasionally an account of a female student using supposed charms to obtain sympathy and flexibility in class requirements!
AP2: One male colleague has said that girls weep and think they can get round him.
S6: (They) say that women tend to cry more and flirt more to gain sympathy or attention . . . sometimes they are sent to the women because we are less influenced . . . I think my male colleagues 'doth protest too much'!

This contrasts with women's representations of their own relationships with students. Apart from two references to male students 'trying to flirt' in informal situations and the reported comments on evaluation forms, which were perceived as offensive, there were no overtly sexual references in the women's data.

Male and female student behaviour

Most women lecturers said that student behaviour in general was influenced by teacher gender. As described above, female staff read from students' behaviour their stereotypical conceptions of women as less worthy and authoritative, yet more approachable and informal than men. However, women staff often distinguished between male and female student behaviour, not only in the context of the specific question on that issue. Comments about male students were made more frequently and the great majority of these were critical, mostly referring to offensive, bullying, sexist behaviour:

- S7: . . . male students may expect more leniency from women teachers and to get extensions.
A5: Some female colleagues say male students make their life difficult, have less authority . . .

- NP6: Two female colleagues said male students tend to be more 'assertive' with female staff because of the male view of female competence.
- SP5: Some male students are more aggressive than when with male lecturers – they try to score points by contradicting course materials.
- AP3: Male students are more confident than female and think they can browbeat you – older male students may try to flirt, younger may make you a mother figure . . . older male students may be patronising or bullying – I've experienced it with two students.
- AP2: I've heard female colleagues say male students are rude to them and show a lack of respect and think they'll get away with it.
- A9: (Female colleagues) say they get arrogant male students demanding special treatment and challenging grades, they've learned to be very cocky. Male students are noisy and attention seeking, female students are more apologetic for time – male students don't recognize time as an issue. Males challenge grades, females accept.
- N7: Male students are arrogant and don't attend because it's a female teacher. (In informal situations you get) arrogance from male students asking for extensions and questioning marks because they think you're a soft touch . . . males are arrogant.
- A12: Maybe male students try to flannel me more.

In contrast, only one negative comment about female students was made. They were represented overall as more tractable and human, yet less confident; therefore more able to benefit from the less formal atmosphere and fewer constraints operating in classes taught by women:

- N1: Female students are ok, males 'posture'.
- A1: Female students are more open and have respect, male students don't take me seriously as authority and can be disruptive in class.
- S8: Female students are less showmen and are quieter and competent, not extrovert . . . females are more 'let's co-operate'.
- NP6: Female students may feel more confident than with a male lecturer.
- A5: This is very important to me, the problem is underestimated; female students are too inhibited submissive and shy, and this is not helped by having all male teachers and a lack of female role models.
- N7: . . . female lecturers are admired by female students and criticized by male. Male teachers are seen the same by both.
- S11: Female students are more emotional with female lecturers . . . (they) respond better to female lecturers.
- NP2: Female students feel more comfortable with women staff and discuss problems readily.

The greater reported empathy between female students and staff was related to views about evaluations. The three women who thought women teachers were evaluated more positively than men said female students predominated in their classes and that they had a positive relationship with them. There was the suggestion that the shyness and emotionality of female students, and the responsibility female staff may feel as role models might be experienced as burdensome, however:

S9: I've discussed this with colleagues, maybe female students expect more from female teachers. Because there are so few female staff they inevitably become role models . . .

2. *Male teachers*

The responses of the male teachers were more homogenous than the women's, the great majority claiming either that teacher gender did not affect evaluations, or that it was not possible to determine whether it did. Responses tended to be curt, often consisting solely of yes and no answers, without the elaboration and experiential justifications of views typical of the women respondents. A thematic analysis of the questionnaire data nevertheless yielded information about male representations of gender and academia.

Gender stereotypes

Where reference was made to the stereotypical attributes of male and female teachers, they coincided with those identified by women respondents. However, the value and consequences of these traits in academia were usually presented differently. Only two male respondents articulated the idea that male academics might be advantaged by students' perceptions. The first thought that his personal evaluations might be benefiting as a function of his exhibiting a masculine academic style (a circumstance which he portrayed as evidence of a lack of discrimination in the students):

NP1: I have a positive authoritative style, which silly males may see as a threat and immature females like.

An understanding that women staff were likely to be systematically handicapped in evaluations by students because they were seen to have a lower standing as academics and because of their association with the caring role, was expressed by one male respondent, a social scientist. He attributed the heightened conscientiousness of women teachers to these social pressures and he was aware of his female colleagues' feelings about the issue:

S1: Women have less status and are more approachable – same thing . . . men may bullshit more (in teaching) but this could be because they're more confident because they are taken more seriously. You have to be very well organised to make sure you succeed – if you're a man you can 'trade on your status'. One (colleague) has said that she had to dress more formally to gain respect because women aren't taken as seriously . . . one said students were informal and used her first name and that they wouldn't do that to a male teacher.

However, masculine attributes were more likely to be represented as problematic for the teaching role. Some male respondents appeared to experience a disjunction between their masculine identity and that of being a good teacher, giving rise to a sense of self-doubt which had no equivalent in the female responses. For them, women staff were fortunate not to be perceived as forbidding and unapproachable:

- SP2: Some students mostly say they're afraid of me – others, always female, say they like my voice. Students may be inexplicably diffident and resistant to interaction – this may be a reaction to a rather hard male presentation of myself, especially in times of stress and overwork – i.e. most of the time these days. They find female staff more approachable for counselling and dealing with personal problems. This fear ameliorates over time in informal situations.
- N5: There's fear on the part of some (students) to treat me normally because of my age and perceived 'seniority'. (In informal situations) female students are more reluctant to approach me.
- S7: I think students expect more help from women – my ratings are above average but students don't see me as very approachable – I know women staff receive many more 'out of lecture' enquiries than me. I find (informal situations) very difficult, female colleagues achieve it easily . . . I have a much more formal relationship with students . . . subjectively students seem to find female teachers helpful and approachable.

Significantly, two of these respondents said that women teachers had a general advantage over men:

- N5: A lively outgoing female who is attractive to look at and well-dressed etc. will always be rated more highly.
- S7: 'I know the best ratings (in my department) were obtained by women.

Most men denied the reality of student gender bias, yet some of these were certainly aware that their female colleagues had concerns about this issue. They recalled complaints from colleagues relating to their poor treatment or undervaluing by students in ways that communicate an almost studied lack of empathy, or which minimize the episode:

- A1: Two female colleagues complained, but only with respect to one student who had been aggressive orally and in writing, they thought the student's personality was obnoxious.
- N4: One female colleague has noted that Asian male students tend to be more aggressive in manner, presumably this is a cultural phenomenon.
- S5: Yes (female colleagues have discussed gender bias) I can't recall.
- NP3: Yes one. She appeared to believe she was undervalued compared to men.

Even S7, the social scientist who represented women as benefiting from preconceptions of femininity, recalled complaints about students from female colleagues. He had also observed differences in student behaviour in his classes compared to those of a female colleague:

- S7: One (colleague) has said that students expect to be spoon-fed – I haven't found this. She thinks this is because students see women as motherly and men as less approachable. (Female colleagues) find students friendly and even casual in their behaviour towards them. (Students) are attentive with me – whereas one female colleague has difficulty keeping students quiet in lectures.

Teaching effort

The majority of men, consistent with the idea that gender bias did not occur in student evaluations, said that teaching effort by male and female staff was either identical or a function of individual priorities. A minority said that women teachers put more effort into teaching than men though only one of these (S1 above) explained this in terms of their greater conscientiousness:

- NP1: Women seem to put in more effort.
- A1: Yes, my experience suggests they are especially committed to teaching.
- S3: My observation is that women are more diligent and pay more attention to detail and to people. I cannot explain why this should be so.
- A3: Women teachers put more effort and consideration into their teaching – a compensation for real or perceived pressure from male colleagues.

Male and female student behaviour

Overall there were few references to gendered behaviour by students, but, in a direct reversal of the trend in the women's responses, the majority of negative comments related to female students; only one negative reference was made to male student behaviour:

- N2: Some female students become 'giggly' when they interact with me. There's no problem with the others.
- N4: Female students seem slightly more critical but I'd attribute this to their gender rather than mine.
- S7: . . . I find female students are much more conformist and deferential than males – but this might be general and unrelated to my gender.
- N1: Males try to be smart and show off; females seek approval for hard work and keenness.

Two respondents articulated a concern with eliminating sexual ambiguity in male relationships with female students:

- S1: I behave towards female students so that it's clear I have no sexual interest in them. So I tend to be more formal with females, it's silly but I often find myself talking about my partner so as to reassure them that I am 'not interested' in them.
- S7: One (male colleague) has expressed concern about flirtatious female students, he finds this uncomfortable and avoids social situations. I don't know why.

Gender defences?

A theme which had no exact representation in the women teachers' responses was the officious tone evident in those of some male staff. Some comments appeared pompous, defensive, even hostile, and to the analyst seemed designed to express disapproval of the survey. For example, whereas humour figured throughout the women's responses, it was invoked only on one

occasion by a male respondent (in the course of describing his 'ice-breaker' strategy of chatting about football to students in informal situations). The air of antagonism was apparent in some of the comments quoted above and occurred in many contexts in the questionnaire:

- A2: I have no means of knowing (whether gender bias in evaluations occurs). . . . I assume it (i.e. equality of teaching effort) I have nothing to indicate the contrary.
- A4: My evaluations are all above board, they are about courses not personality. Why should I think they (i.e. male and female staff) would not (devote equal effort)? . . . Presumably it's (i.e. student behaviour towards male and female teachers) different, but I don't make an issue of it and neither do they.
- N5: (In response to the question concerning teacher gender and evaluation) My teaching is rated anonymously.
- N4: I can't say (if student behaviour differs) I (personally) have only one gender.

The brevity of most male responses itself seemed to indicate a reluctance to engage with the topic. One respondent commented:

- S5: Sorry for the brief answers. No doubt you will find this interesting in itself!

DISCUSSION

The majority of women academics in this study considered or suspected student evaluations to be gender biased against female lecturers. Such views were not confined to women teaching in 'masculine' domains, such as natural science, as some quantitative evidence would imply, nor were they related to career location. Respondents offered accounts of student sexism and prejudice, describing themselves as undervalued first by virtue of being women, and second through lacking the appropriate attributes for fulfilling the traditional academic stereotype. Many had experienced, and/or had heard from colleagues about, episodes of sexism in face to face interactions with students. Like their counterparts in similar studies in the UK such as those by Bagilhole (1993 a, b; Bagilhole and Woodward, 1995), they described having to consciously work hard to 'prove' to students the academic authority they felt was taken for granted in male lecturers. Heckert *et al.* (1999) have presented evidence from the US that female faculty report experiencing behaviours from students indicative of a relative lack of respect, e.g. challenging grades and phoning staff at home. Similarly, Miller and Chamberlin (2000) showed that American sociology students systematically misattributed the academic qualifications of male and female faculty, to the detriment of female staff. In addition, women in the present study reported experiencing pressure from students and male colleagues to play a stereotypically feminine role e.g. by undertaking onerous and personally costly 'pastoral' activities for students, a finding which echoed those of Acker and Feuerverger (1996).

Nevertheless the overall image of gender and academia provided by the women in this study contrasts significantly with that generated in previous research. Bagilhole's accounts, for example, have documented women lecturers' experiences of victimisation, harassment and exclusion from ruling cliques in the academic workplace, by their male colleagues. Similarly, Acker and Feuerverger (1996, p. 404) recount the 'widespread sense of disappointment and disillusionment' among the narratives provided by their sample of Canadian academics. In short, previous work has presented a picture of women struggling and suffering within what Nicolson

(1996, p. 72) has so graphically described as the 'toxic context' of a patriarchal workplace. Far from presenting the picture of oppression, cultural and above all occupational alienation identified by other researchers, the female academics in this study appeared to display an unshaken self-confidence in their occupational ability and performance. While recognizing that sexism existed in academia, the prejudices of others appeared not to impact on their identities as academics or as women. Certainly some were angered, irritated, resentful of the yoke of others' expectations and assumptions, but their positive visions of themselves seemed unaffected.

Some understanding of this finding may possibly be gained by considering another notable feature of these data, namely the widespread derogation of their male colleagues in which female staff tended to engage. Male staff's comprehension of gender issues, commitment to teaching, behaviour in relation to students and so on, were presented as poor and implicitly or explicitly contrasted unfavourably with female lecturers. A sense of self-confidence and moral superiority over their male colleagues pervaded many of the female participants' responses. This discrepancy may partly relate to the fact that the present study focused upon students and teaching rather than the wider politics of academia, however, the assured attitude of the women towards their work, and their negativity about male colleagues, seemed so widespread and robust it is hard to imagine them as context-specific. More speculatively, it is tempting to see the women's strong, positive self-image as directly related to, even permitted by, their derogation of male colleagues. This is reminiscent of the strategy of accentuating differences with the out-group in order to enhance in-group identity well known in social identity theory (SIT) accounts. In this regard, it is tempting to see teaching as a dimension along which women, as a low status group, could choose to positively differentiate themselves from men (see below). However, the fact that derogation of male colleagues occurred both in the accounts of female academics whose social identity as women seemed salient (i.e. who represented gender bias among students as widespread) and in those for whom it appeared not to be (i.e. who denied that gender bias was an issue in student evaluations), draws attention once more to the problems social identity theory accounts have had in theorizing women as a homogenous, low status group, and with more general aspects of the theory (see Breakwell 1979; Skevington and Baker, 1989; Stangor and Jost, 1997). Further, there was no evidence that female staff rated themselves as poorer on any other dimensions of comparison with their male colleagues, for example, as researchers (see below).

Whatever its theoretical significance, of central importance to the women's image of themselves as good academics was an approach to teaching which could be characterized as feminine in terms of educational style and commitment. The interactive, informal character of women's teaching compared to the more didactic 'male' style has been noted elsewhere (Statham *et al.*, 1991; Park, 1996). Some authors have even suggested that separate evaluation instruments be utilized which recognize these different performances (Andersen and Miller, 1997). In this study it is important to note that the 'feminine' style was not presented as an alternative to, but as pedagogically superior to, the didactic (male) style. Similarly, women's meticulousness over teaching, as evidenced in their careful preparation of materials, encouragement of appropriate student learning techniques etc., was not presented as 'over conscientious' but as entirely appropriate to the job of university lecturer. What women do as teachers in this representation embodies the 'gold standard' to which all teachers should aspire. Male teachers were seen as failing to fulfil this requirement of their job, while benefiting from their ascribed authority as academics. Some respondents may have seen themselves or women in general as achieving good teaching evaluations because of their greater effort therefore, yet still have felt

disadvantaged by student prejudice in evaluations relative to men. Similarly, those who said evaluations were unaffected by student gender bias were identifying competence and application as the bases for good ratings, both of which are potentially general attributes (though currently mostly confined to women).

The representation of 'feminine' style being coincident with ideal occupational style, with being a good teacher rather than a good woman, is again somewhat at variance with the gist of other research which has implied the importance to women academics of adhering to the feminine role for its own sake. In this study, there was no indication that female staff were seeing their work 'as a hobby' as Nicolson has described (1996, p. 82) nor that they were experiencing major tension between their occupational and (private) gender identities such as Wager (1998) has portrayed. They appeared to be much less prepared to be exploited into performing a disproportionate share of (undervalued) teaching and pastoral duties than many women academics (see Gray, 1994; Acker and Feuerverger, 1996). In short, the findings were indicative of their primary and consistent self-representations as academics.

From a wider perspective, however, there are concerns at a number of levels with the 'feminine' teaching style. Not only did some female staff resent the coercion they felt was involved in its adoption, but there are aspects of the informal style which are inherently problematic. First, while a teacher's approachability can increase the likelihood of student learning and participation (Hull and Hull, 1988), it can also lead to a loss of academic credibility and the taking of liberties in class and outside it. Caplan (1993) and Burns-Glover and Veith (1995) have written about the need for women to establish and balance an academic identity without violating gender role norms of passivity and nurturance, and it was clear that even the women in this study on occasion experienced the line between being approachable and maintaining student respect as fine.

Similarly, other research has pointed to the importance for female academics' teaching evaluations of achieving 'androgyny' in self-presentation, i.e. of appearing both authoritative and caring (Freeman, 1994; Street *et al.*, 1996). Legitimacy, for women academics, apparently necessitates the gaining of a set of demanding and potentially conflicting attributes, which can easily slip out of equilibrium into disaster. Baker and Copp's (1997) discussion of the downward slide in Baker's class evaluations as a result of her increasingly obvious pregnancy illustrates the tenuous nature of women's acceptability as academics. This seemed to be a problem particularly for younger staff in the present study; more senior women obviously often having the gravitas of age/status to aid them. Interestingly this seems to differ from the experiences of staff at MIT (Committee on Women Faculty in the School of Science, 1999) who reported idealistic attitudes in early careers giving way to a resigned recognition of sexism, though that survey was more concerned with institutional processes rather than with students *per se*.

Systemic factors make the conscientious 'feminine' teaching style problematic. Teaching commitments directly impact upon the time available for research activity, success in which continues to be the main criterion by which academics' career advancement is determined in the UK (see FitzGerald, 1999). Respondents in this study were not asked directly about research, and it was only mentioned by three female respondents, in each case in relation to a male obsession with self-advancement and the moral primacy of women's commitment to others and their teaching responsibilities:

- NP2: Perhaps women put in more (to teaching) overall, on average – tend to be more balanced, less ambitious about the research/teaching split.

While these few women appeared to regard research as over-valued in relation to teaching, there was no evidence that the majority of female respondents did, indeed the only woman to convey an impression of insecurity or defensiveness in her responses was one whose identity seemed entirely invested in her teaching role. Her comments about research seem almost defiant. In response to a question concerning gender bias in course evaluations, she wrote:

AP6: I am an outstanding teacher. This comes up every time in the staff-student council. It is almost embarrassing. I devote hours to my teaching (I've devoted my life to it over the years). I realise I could have done nothing else, so I must not blame myself if it means I've done much less research and had little free time. Women are more attuned to interpersonal relationships so they put in more effort. Many men are very slap-dash . . . and don't seem to care. Women are less career-oriented and so don't allow research to take precedence to the detriment of their teaching.

Significantly, she appeared to derive more satisfaction from pastoral duties than any other woman:

AP6: I have particularly good relations with the young men I teach . . . the Chair commented it was one of the 'best things' about me.

The self-confidence the great majority of women displayed in their academic competence suggested a successful accommodation of all their various occupational demands including research. However, given the current prioritizing of research, the lack of rewards attaching to conscientious teaching and of sanctions to poor teaching, those who devote more time and effort to teaching are failing to behave strategically and possibly compromising their professional advancement. The role overload women academics may experience has been described graphically by Barnes-Powell and Letherby (1998). They detailed the demands female staff face both to compete as researchers and nurture as women, and note how they may even have to spend precious time on additional activities such as defending feminist epistemology. Moore and Trahan (1998) have shown that undergraduates were indeed more likely to rate a written excerpt on the topic of gender as politically motivated, when the author was female. In these circumstances, Park's (1996) argument that the taken for granted superiority of research output over teaching competence should be re-appraised, is of interest. Whether the profession should advance along the lines of introducing divergence and specialization in these two major aspects of the academic role is unclear, however. It might well be feared that the (further) separation of gender roles, which would be likely to follow, would lead to a devaluing of the (feminine) teaching role (see Quina *et al.*, 1998, for a discussion of the devaluing of women's work in academia).

Developments such as the establishment of the Institute of Learning and Teaching (see Hersh, 1999), and the undertaking of Teaching Quality Assessments by university funding bodies in the UK attest to the state's concern to raise the profile of the teaching role. It could be that this initiative, should it result in some appropriate recognition of good teaching practice, and in combination with ever increasing numbers of female academics, might lead to changes in perception. As Kremer (1998, p. 148) pointed out, the ability to cope with 'multiple demands' is increasingly seen as desirable in many occupations. It could be that ultimately the female academic pattern would emerge as normative. It is interesting that he identifies men as

potentially feeling defensive in these circumstances. In the meantime, students' judgements about women academics' capability seem persistently to be contaminated by judgements of their womanliness: Benz and Blatt (1996) have shown that even 'low inference' items on evaluation instruments e.g. 'spoke audibly' are subject to contextual (stereotypical) interpretation. Top (1991) pointed to the importance of attributions in understanding the meaning of evaluations – if high effectiveness ratings for women are seen to be the result of effort say, rather than expertise, sexism remains essentially unchallenged. In addition, Yoder and Schleicher (1996) found that (hypothetical) high achieving women working in gender-incongruent occupations were judged by students as competent, but were seen as less socially successful. If student evaluations continue to incorporate both measures of teaching effectiveness and empathy for students, perhaps women cannot win.

Finally, consideration must be given to the issue of relations between the genders in academia. The women in this study, as in others (Martin, 1984; Bagilhole, 1993a) identified student prejudice as a largely male phenomenon, with male students reportedly far more likely to openly challenge their authority than female students. Quantitative analyses of teaching evaluation data have shown that student gender interacts with teacher gender in determining ratings (Basow, 1995; Bachen *et al.*, 1999), and Burns-Glover and Veith (1995) demonstrated experimentally that male students were largely driving stereotypical judgements of faculty (see also Rojahn and Willemsen, 1994). In this study the clear negativity associated with the comments about male students by women staff, and, to a lesser extent, about female students by male staff, regardless of subject area, suggests a disturbing mutuality. The necessity of dealing effectively with male students can therefore be seen as contributing to the development of the conscientious 'feminine' style and its consequences for women's careers.

Women's representation of male students as prejudiced mirrored their negative views of their male colleagues; in short, their general tendency to articulate essentialist ideas of gender. While such views may in some way facilitate women's sense of identity as good academics, clearly they raise concern about the quality of relationships existing between men and women in higher education. There is no body of research relating specifically to male academics' perceptions of students and female staff and the strong evidence of disparity in perception and understanding between them and their female colleagues revealed in this study is particularly significant. Unlike the women, male staff tended to represent student evaluations as unbiased and teaching effort among male and female academics as equivalent. Their curt or sometimes hostile responses to the questionnaire items implied a dismissive or defensive attitude to gender concerns, including those of their female colleagues, of which some had been aware. Given that male questionnaires were distributed by the female respondents, who presumably did not select colleagues on the basis of their hostility, this attitudinal chasm may be even more disturbing. Not only did male and female outlooks differ but also misconceptions about each other occurred. For instance, male staff reportedly attributed good teaching evaluations to a woman's attractiveness rather than effort. There was also evidence however of women's failure to empathize: some complained of the inability of male colleagues to grasp the negative aspects of being seen as approachable, yet seemed unaware that for some men, being perceived as distant and unapproachable (and their behaviour being misconstrued as sexual if they tried to be less formal), was distressing. There is some evidence that male staff have grounds for feeling alienated, in that male and female college students both report feeling closer to their female teachers (Sears and Hennessey, 1997).

Overall, there was evidence of a major failure in communication between academics, which, together with the issue of male student behaviour, surely requires further investigation and

addressing, not least because male and female lecturers in the UK have been shown to experience substantial and equivalent amounts of stress in their jobs (Abouserie, 1996).

REFERENCES

- ABOUSERIE, R. (1996). 'Stress, Coping Strategies and Job Satisfaction in University Academic Staff', *Educational Psychology*, 16, 49–56.
- ABRAMSON, P.R., GOLDBERG, P.A., GREENBERG, J.H. and ABRAMSON, L.M. (1977). 'The talking Platypus phenomenon: competency ratings as a function of sex and professional status', *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 2, 114–124.
- ACKER, S. and FEUERVERGER, G. (1996). 'Doing good and feeling bad: the work of women university teachers', *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 26, 401–422.
- ANDERSEN, K and MILLER, E.D. (1997). 'Gender and student evaluations of teaching', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 30, 216–219.
- BACHEN, C.M. MCLOUGHLIN, M.M. and GARCIA, S.S. (1999). 'Assessing the role of gender in college students' Evaluations of Faculty', *Communication Education*, 48, 193–210.
- BAGILHOLE, B. (1993a). 'Survivors in a male preserve: a study of British women academics' experiences and perceptions of discrimination in a UK university', *Higher Education*, 26, 431–447.
- BAGILHOLE, B. (1993b). 'How to keep a good woman down: an investigation of the role of institutional factors in the process of discrimination against women academics', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 14, 261–274.
- BAGILHOLE, B. and WOODWARD, H. (1995). 'An occupational hazard warning: academic life can seriously damage your health. An investigation of sexual harassment of women academics in a UK University', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 16, 37–51.
- BAKER, P. and COPP, M. (1997). 'Gender matters most: the interaction of gendered expectations, feminist course content, and pregnancy in student course evaluations', *Teaching Sociology*, 25, 29–43.
- BARNES-POWELL, T. and LETHERBY, G. (1998). 'All in a day's work: Gendered care work in Higher Education'. In: MALINA D. and MASLIN-PROTHERO S. (Eds) *Surviving the Academy: Feminist Perspectives*. London: Falmer Press.
- BARNETT, L.D. (1996). 'Are teaching evaluation questionnaires valid? Assessing the evidence', *Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector*, 25, 335–349.
- BASOW, S. (1995). 'Student evaluations of college professors: when gender matters', *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87, 656–665.
- BASOW, S. (1998). 'Student evaluations: the role of gender bias and teaching styles'. In: COLLINS, L.H., CHRISLER, J.C. and QUINA, K. (Eds) *Career Strategies for Women in Academia: Arming Athena*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- BENZ, C.R. and BLATT, S.J. (1996). 'Meanings underlying students ratings of faculty', *The Review of Higher Education*, 19, 411–433.
- BRADLEY, C. (1984). 'Sex Bias in the Evaluation of Students', *British Journal of Social Psychology* 23: 147–153.
- BREAKWELL, G.M. (1979). 'Women: group and identity?' *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, 2, 9–17.
- BRONSTEIN, P. and FARNSWORTH, L. (1998). 'Gender differences in faculty experiences of interpersonal climate and processes for advancement', *Research in Higher Education*, 39, 557–585.
- BURNS-GLOVER, A.L. and VEITH, D.J. (1995). 'Revisiting gender and teaching evaluations: sex still makes a difference', *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, 10, 69–80.
- CAPLAN, P. (1993). *Lifting a Ton of Feathers: a Woman's Guide to Surviving in the Academic World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- CHRISTOPHER, M.M. and LESKOSKY, L. (1997). 'Effect of faculty gender on veterinary student teaching evaluations', *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education*, 24, 36–42.

- COMMITTEE ON WOMEN FACULTY IN THE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE (1999). 'A study on the status of women faculty in science at MIT', *The MIT Faculty Newsletter*, 11, 2–12.
- FERNANDEZ, J. and MATEO, M.A. (1997). 'Student and faculty gender in ratings of university teaching quality', *Sex Roles*, 37, 997–1003.
- FITZGERALD, J. (1999). 'What Price Teaching?' *AUT Woman* 46: 2.
- FREEMAN, H.R. (1994). 'Student evaluations of college instructors: effects of type of course taught, instructor gender and gender role, and student gender', *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86, 627–630.
- GALLANT, M.J. and CROSS, J.E. (1993). 'Wayward puritans in the ivory tower: collective aspects of gender discrimination in academia', *The Sociological Quarterly*, 34, 237–256.
- GOLDBERG, P. (1968). 'Are women prejudiced against women?' *Trans-Action*, 5, 28–30.
- GRAY, B. (1994). 'What are we doing to ourselves?' In: S. DAVIES, C. LUBELSKA and J. QUINN (Eds) *Changing the Subject: Women in Higher Education*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- HECKERT, T., WHITE, K., GULINSON, A., SCHNARRE, R., GANNON, L. and SCHNEIDER, S. (1999). 'Differential treatment in academia: do female faculty report being treated differently by students than male faculty?' *Psychological Reports*, 85, 263–268.
- HENWOOD, K.I. and PIDGEON, N. (1995). 'Grounded theory and psychological research', *The Psychologist*, 8, 115–118.
- HERSH, M. (1999). 'The Institute for Learning and Teaching: opportunity or threat?', *AUT Woman*, 46, 3.
- HOWIE, G. (1999) 'First steps toward gender audit', *AUT Woman*, 47, 1
- HULL, D.B. and HULL, J.H. (1988). 'Effects of lecture style on learning and preferences for a teacher', *Sex Roles*, 18, 489–496.
- KREMER, J. (1998). 'Work'. In: Trew, K. and Kremer, J. (Eds) *Gender and Psychology*. London: Arnold.
- LANGBEIN, L.I. (1994). 'The validity of student evaluations of teaching', *PS Political Science and Politics*, 27, 545–553
- LODER, N. and ELEY, S. (1998). 'Probe into what puts women off research', *The Times Higher*, 18 September, 7.
- MALINA, D. and MASLIN-PROTHERO, S. (1998). *Surviving the Academy: Feminist Perspectives*. London: Falmer Press.
- MARTIN, E. (1984). 'Power and authority in the classroom: sexist stereotypes in teaching evaluations', *Signs*, 9, 483–492.
- MCNABB, R. and WASS, V. (1997). 'Male-female salary differentials in British universities', *Oxford Economic Papers – New Series*, 49, 328–343.
- MILLER, J. and CHAMBERLIN, M. (2000). 'Women are teachers, men are professors: a study of student perceptions', *Teaching Sociology*, 28, 283–298.
- MOORE, M. and TRAHAN, R. (1998). 'Evaluating an excerpt about gender: does sex of an author matter?' *Psychological Reports*, 82, 247–253.
- NEATH, I. (1996). 'How to improve your teaching evaluations without improving your teaching', *Psychological Reports*, 78, 1363–1372.
- NICOLSON, P. (1996). *Gender, Power and Organization*. London: Routledge.
- PARK, S.M. (1996). 'Research, teaching, and service: why shouldn't women's work count?', *Journal of Higher Education*, 67, 46–84.
- POPE, C. and MAYS, N. (1996). 'Qualitative methods in health and health services research'. In: N. Mays and C. Pope (Eds) *Qualitative Research in Health Care*. London: BMJ Publishing Group.
- QUINA, K., COTTER, M. and ROMENESKO, K. (1998). 'Breaking the (plexi-) glass ceiling in higher education'. In: COLLINS, L.H., CHRISLER, J.C. and QUINA, K. (Eds) *Career Strategies for Women in Academia: Arming Athena*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- ROJAHN, K. and WILLEMSSEN, T.M. (1994). 'The evaluation of effectiveness and likeability of gender-role congruent and gender-role incongruent leaders', *Sex Roles*, 30, 109–119.

- ROWDEN, G.V. and CARLSON, R.E. (1996). 'Gender issues and students' perceptions of instructors' immediacy and evaluation of teaching and course', *Psychological Reports*, 78, 835–839.
- SEARS, S.R. and HENNESSEY, A.C. (1996). 'Students' perceived closeness to professors: the effect of school, professor gender, and student gender', *Sex Roles*, 35, 651–658.
- SKEVINGTON, S. and BAKER, D. (1989). *The Social Identity of Women*. London: Sage.
- STANGOR, C. and JOST, J.T. (1997). 'Commentary: individual, group and system levels of analysis and their relevance for stereotyping and intergroup relations'. In: SPEARS, R., OAKES, P.J., ELLEMERS, N. and HASLAM, S.A. (Eds) *The Social Psychology of Stereotyping and Group Life*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- STATHAM, A. RICHARDSON, L. and COOK, J. (1991). *Gender and University teaching: A Negotiated Difference*. Albany: Syracuse University New York Press.
- STRAUSS, A. and CORBIN, J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park CA: Sage.
- STREET, S., KIMMEL, E. and KROMREY, J. (1996). 'Gender role preferences and perceptions of university students, faculty and administrators', *Research in Higher Education*, 37, 615–632.
- SWAIN, H. (1999). 'Call to get tough on sex bias', *The Times Higher*, 5 March, 3.
- SWIM, J., BORGIDA, E., MARUYAMA, G. and MYERS, D.G. (1989). 'Joan McKay versus John McKay: do gender stereotypes bias evaluations?' *Psychological Bulletin*, 105, 409–429.
- TATRO, C.N. (1995). 'Gender effects on student evaluations of faculty', *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 28, 169–173.
- TOP, T.J. (1991). 'Sex bias in the evaluation of performance in the scientific, artistic, and literary professions: a review', *Sex Roles*, 24, 73–106.
- WAGER, M. (1998). 'Women or researchers? The identities of academic women', *Feminism and Psychology*, 8, 236–244.
- YODER, J.D. and SCHLEICHER, T.L. (1996). 'Undergraduates regard deviation from occupational gender stereotypes as costly for women', *Sex Roles*, 34, 171–188.