

WOMEN IN ACADEMIA: AN ANALYSIS OF THEIR EXPECTATIONS, PERFORMANCE AND PAY

by Sonia Dalmia*

Daniel C. Giedeman

Helen A. Klein

Nancy M. Levenburg

INTRODUCTION

The authors of this paper are faculty members in the business school of a medium-sized (22,000) university in the mid-western United States. Over the last few years, informal discussions at the school brought forward a growing sense of disconnect that the faculty perceived between themselves and their students. A major source of disconnect highlighted was the difference in faculty and student priorities. While the faculty saw learning as the student's principle objective in college, they felt earning a credential was the primary motivating factor for students. To align this divide in expectations a faculty-led task force was created to examine student and faculty perceptions of undergraduate student's performance. In pursuit of this effort, a 77-item survey was distributed to the business school faculty in the summer of 2003. The survey was designed to assess faculty member's views about the general characteristics of the business school and its students, their classroom policies and practices, their general feelings as faculty members and their opinion about what motivates students.

The survey was not intentionally designed to study the impact of gender on the perceptions of faculty members; however, the results when examined indicated some critical gaps along gender lines. For instance, female professors outnumbered their male counterparts in expressing that the business school culture fails to set and enforce high standards for students and that in spite of a sizeable number of students lacking in skills and study habits, grade inflation is a problem. The female faculty also felt that the emphasis given to student evaluations is inappropriate as they are not an accurate representation of their teaching performance. Therefore, more females favored the development of additional methods for evaluating teaching over men. Female professors also admitted to the fear of negative evaluations affecting their course load, grading policies, tendency to take disciplinary actions against students, standards and expectations more than men. Most importantly, female faculty indicated a higher level of agreement with the statement that they will not be supported by

*All authors are professors in The Seidman College of Business, Grand Valley State University, Michigan

the administration if they assigned low grades and if their students complained than did their male counterparts.

Although, some of these gender gaps were not huge, we believe they are significant enough to be a problem. As across college campuses, particularly on those campuses where the focus is on teaching, critical decisions regarding tenure, promotion and merit salary raises are often based on student evaluations of faculty performance in the classroom (Seldin, 1993 from Adams, 1997; Magner, 1997). This has led to a plethora of research on the validity of these evaluations. Much of this research has focused on the links between gender of the instructor and their ratings of teaching effectiveness. While the findings have been mixed, an important consistency that emerges from these studies is that student's expectations of the instructors based particularly on gender role beliefs play a significant role in how they evaluate teaching (Anderson and Miller, 1997). In other words, research finds that female faculty who violate gender expectations (e. g. those who are more aggressive as opposed to nurturing, etc), lose out in the ratings battle (Anderson and Miller, 1997) to men.

In spite of the little difference found by the existing literature in the overall evaluation of male and female faculty, anecdotal evidence continues to suggest that many female faculty feel that no matter how they perform in the classroom, it is "not quite right" (Anderson and Miller, 1997). These feelings are clearly in the spirit of the perceptions expressed by female faculty members at the author's business school. Thus, if women perceive being penalized by the dependence on student evaluations more than men, an important question to ask is what impact does this practice have on their instructional strategies and behavior in the classroom? Assuming that pay raises, tenure, promotion and awards are as important to female faculty as to male faculty members, do female instructors focus more on pleasing students in order to obtain favorable evaluations compared to men? Clearly, if instructors are rewarded when they receive high ratings and penalized when they receive low ratings, teaching evaluations may act as a deterrent to faculty rigor. The research question then arises is: Do female faculty "pander" to students more than men by diluting curricula and inflating grades to maximize their evaluations in a competitive environment because of their perceived notions about the inequities they face with respect to student's attitudes towards them in the classroom?

While a lot of research has been conducted on the subject of student evaluations of college professors, no one to our knowledge has actually examined the expectations of female faculty themselves to determine how these may influence their performance and thus have implications for inequities in salary over time. This exploratory study takes a step in that direction. To do so, it utilizes data from three different sources--faculty expectations survey, student evaluations and course grade point averages and salary information--to examine if the fear of teaching evaluations influences the performance and compensation of female faculty members at the author's business school more than men. That is, it examines if the concerns expressed by female faculty members via the

faculty expectations survey actually reflect the existing conditions in their school?

We begin the next section by detailing the research on student evaluations of teaching. The data used are presented and explained in the next section with the results. Finally, we conclude by highlighting the principle results of our study.

STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING

In recent years, criticisms of higher education accompanied by outcries for greater accountability have led to an environment in which decisions regarding tenure, promotion, and pay raises are increasingly influenced by students' evaluations of faculty members' performance in the classroom (Adams, 1997; Andersen and Miller, 1997; Anderson, 2003; Fich, 2003; Massoni, 2004). In fact, according to Wilson (1998, p.A12), student evaluations "are now the most important, and sometimes the sole, measure of an instructor's teaching ability." Current studies have shown that as many as 98% of universities use "systematic student evaluations of classroom teaching" (Magner, 1997, p. A18). This is up dramatically from 1973 when it was estimated that only 29% of institutions used student evaluations of teaching (SET).

This use of SET as a *summative* measure of teaching performance is in sharp contrast to its initial developmental intent – as a *formative* tool for teaching improvement purposes (Blunt, 1991).¹ Several factors have been offered to explain why this switch in use and importance of SET has occurred. One is found in the "student as customer" philosophy that prevails on many college campuses, particularly those that are teaching-focused (Holley, 2000; Simpson and Siquaw, 2000; Swenson, 1998). This trend toward student-oriented education is one in which universities compete for enrollment often based on student satisfaction. While researchers may disagree on many issues related to SET's, most would be quick to agree that these evaluations do measure student satisfaction (Abrami, 1990 from Adams). More satisfied students presumably lead to higher enrollments. Higher enrollments however are no indication that learning is taking place.

A second factor that may account for this increasing reliance on SET is the fact that more and more state governments are tying public university funding to learning outcomes. This has led to an increasing need to evaluate teaching effectiveness (Simpson and Siquaw, 2000). From an administrative perspective, SETs are an easy way to do this (Stone, 1995 from Adams). After collecting data from student's vis-à-vis questionnaires, summary statistics can

¹ Adams (1997), however, indicates that there is no evidence to suggest that the use of student evaluations actually improves instruction, since they fail to identify causes of weaknesses – only broad categories of concern. And in the absence of requisite knowledge of specifics, it is impossible to determine what kinds of corrective actions might be appropriate.

be calculated, easily and effortlessly allowing deans or other administrators to numerically examine faculty members' performance.

Aside from the ease of measurement, there is other evidence that helps justify the continued use of SETs. A cross-disciplinary, faculty-based study performed by Szeto and Wright (2003) found that of 13 methods used to evaluate teaching, SET's appeared to be the preferred method by faculty. On a similar note, March and Roche (1997) showed that faculty ratings of themselves were more consistent with SETs than with the evaluations of either administrators or peers. And according to other studies, SETs tend to be valid measurement instruments (March & Roche, 1997) that have shown some correlation with learning outcomes (d'Apollonia & Abrami, 1997).

While SETs are readily obtained and calculated and do seem to have some merit, particularly in terms of providing formative feedback to teachers and as a measure of student satisfaction, their use is certainly not without controversy. One question consistently raised is whether students are properly equipped and qualified to evaluate effective teaching (Adams, 1997). "Are students who are doing poorly in their courses able to objectively judge their instructors? And are students, who are almost universally considered as lacking in critical thinking skills, often by the administrators who rely on student evaluations of faculty, able to critically evaluate their instructors?" (Adams, 1997, p.11).

A second concern is that the reliance on the summative nature of student evaluations has produced a culture in which students are motivated to get good grades, and faculty are motivated to get good evaluations. In this environment, it is "only reasonable to expect teachers to do what they can to achieve the highest possible ratings" (Adams, 1997, p.11). Simpson and Siguaw (2000) found that faculty attempt to influence SETs by adopting new and different behaviors. Among these behaviors are lowered rigor and grading standards which tend to dilute the learning experience. Another study done at the University of Washington supported this notion when it found that professors who give easy grades get better evaluations (Greenswald and Gilmore, 1997). Birnbaum (1998) concludes similarly in his study at CSU Fullerton when faculty studied indicated that they did indeed water down their standards in order to raise SETs.

Other concerns with SET identified in the literature include: (a) the unreliability and lack of validity of SET (this is in sharp contrast to one benefit cited above) (Adams, 1997; Lang, 1997); (b) SETs are more a reflection of student satisfaction (with good grades, classroom interactivity, etc.) than effective teaching (Fich, 2004; Massoni, 2004); (c) the failure of college and university promotion and tenure committees to look at responses to specific questions rather than "umbrella" numbers and overall statistics (Basow, 1994); and (d) that SETs seem to be influenced by a number of factors unrelated to student learning. One meta-study published in *American Psychologist* indicated that only one sixth of the variance found in evaluations was attributable to educational performance (Birnbaum, 1998). In many studies, situational factors

like grading policies, class sizes, workload, field of study and instructors' ranks are found to be significantly correlated with SETs. In others, student variables like motivation and grade expectations come into play.

Another set of significant variables relate to personal characteristics of the individual instructor. Clayton (1999) showed that 50 to 80% of the variance in SET's is related to personality characteristics. Radmacher and Martin (2001) found that, among the variables studied, extroversion was a strongest predictor of SET. Similarly, in one dramatic but somewhat anecdotal study, a professor drastically increased his evaluations by delivering his usual lectures with more enthusiasm. Amazingly, students in the "enthusiastically-taught" sections said they learned more than those in the "non-enthusiastically-taught" sections. Outcome measures, however, indicated that there were no actual differences in learning outcomes between the two (Lang, 1997).

One personal variable that has been the subject of many SET-related studies is gender. In general, it has been found that SETs are not gender blind (Andersen and Miller, 1997; Basow, 1997; Kierstead et al., 1988; Massoni, 2004). This statement however simplifies what appears to be a very complex issue. The literature reveals the following about gender and SET:

- Male professors receive overall higher ratings than their female counterparts (Sidanius and Crane, 1989; Kierstead et al., 1988; Basow and Silberg, 1987).
- Female professors receive their highest ratings from female students and their lowest ratings from male students (Bennett, 1982; Basow, 1995).
- When students expect to receive lower grades in the course, female professors are rated more harshly via SET than male professors (Langbein, 1994; Messner, 2000; Sprague and Massoni, 2002). Similarly, when students receive negative feedback from an instructor, female professors are rated significantly lower than male professors (Sinclair and Kunda, 1999).
- Students expect faculty members to behave according to gender-specific stereotypes with women expected to be more "nurturing" and supportive, giving students more time and attention, than their male counterparts (Kierstead et al., 1988; Langbein, 1994). Faculty members who fail to live up to these gender-specific stereotypes are penalized via SET (Adams, 1997; Anderson, 2003; Langbein, 1994; Statham et al., 1991).
- Women teachers are more likely to receive angry, punitive written comments than male teachers (Massoni, 2004).
- Many college students perceive their male instructors as "professors" and their female instructors as "teachers" (Miller and Chamberlin, 2000).
- Because women are assumed to be supportive listeners, they are more frequently expected to serve in an advisory capacity to students, which are not necessarily rewarded via students' evaluations (Andersen and Miller, 1997).

- Female faculty tend to struggle in the classroom with the conflict between the male oriented role of professor and their own inclinations to be more nurturing and supportive (Statham et al, 1991)
- Older female faculty who are tenured tend to be less inclined to be supportive and nurturing and adopt more typical male role characteristics. (Statham, et al, 1991)

Thus, it appears from the literature that female professors, particularly those who are untenured, are often in a difficult situation in the classroom. Determinations of rank, salary and tenure decisions are increasingly based on students' perceptions, which the literature suggests are gender-biased. If female faculty members hold high standards or teach difficult courses, they are likely to be victims of gender bias (Sinclair and Kunda, 1999), which can lead to substantial economic inequalities over time (Fich, 2003). Given that women are greater in numbers at the untenured level and underrepresented at the assistant, associate, and full professor ranks (Anderson, 2003), they appear to be the most vulnerable. We therefore set out to explore if this is indeed the case at our business school? In doing so, we examine if the environment of increasing reliance on the use of SET has impacted women differently than men.

DATA AND RESULTS

To identify faculty expectations of themselves as well as their students, the faculty-led task force, described earlier, sent out a total of 90 surveys to the tenured, tenure-track, affiliate, adjunct and visiting faculty at the author's business school. Faculty was asked to rate the 77-items in the survey on a five point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). While the completion of the survey was voluntary, faculty members were assured of their anonymity in order to increase the response rate. 56 faculty members returned the survey, representing a response rate of 62%. After eliminating two missing observations and the 20 responses from affiliate, adjunct or visiting faculty, we were left with a sample of 34 observations of which nine were females and the remaining 25 were male respondents. Also 73.53% of the faculty, who responded to the survey, were tenured and 26.47% were tenure-track. Although the survey instrument contained 77-items, Table 1 reports how male and female faculty members responded to 17 questions from the survey that we consider are pertinent to our study. Note, because of zero responses to many questions on the five point scale, we reduced the scale to three points ranging from *disagree* (1), by combining the strongly disagree and disagree responses of the faculty members, to *agree* (3) by combining agree and strongly agree responses of faculty members.

Responses in Table 1 clearly reveal that female professors are more concerned about student evaluations of teaching than their male colleagues and allow the fear of adverse evaluations to prevent them from utilizing creative instructional approaches in the classroom. To examine if the gender differences in the responses to the 17 items were substantial, we performed a t-test and

found only six differences to be significant along gender lines. Regardless, we believe it is worthwhile to take a closer look at the patterns revealed in Table 1 as the findings are still suggestive of differences between males and females and the relatively low level of significance likely reflects the limited size of the dataset. Moreover, since the real effect of student evaluations depends not on their actual validity but rather on their perceived properties (Basow, 1995) and if women perceive them to be more harmful than men, it is important to examine if the reliance on overall teacher rating encourages them to dumb down the material and inflate grades in order to ensure reasonable equities in personnel decisions and merit pay raises over time.

Therefore, to assess if the perceptions of female faculty encourage them to “teach to SETs” and lower grading and course standards more than men, we utilize data on SET and grade point averages assigned² for all of the courses taught by the tenured and tenure-track faculty at our business school over the academic period Fall 2001 to Winter 2004. Evaluations for a total of 797 classes were available from 23,993 student respondents out of the 29,770 enrolled of which 203 classes were taught by female faculty who were more likely to be untenured (64.04% vs. 34.34%) and instructing core courses (32.51% vs. 26.60%) compared to their male counterparts. The average class size for both male and female instructors was similar: 37.19 compared to 31.81 students, respectively. Summary statistics on course ratings and grade point averages assigned are reported by gender and tenure status in Table 2. A definite pattern emerges. Regardless of tenure status, the differences where significant reveal that not only do female instructors receive significantly higher ratings, they are also more rigorous-- assign lower grade point averages-- compared to men. These results clearly do not lend credence to the fears expressed by female faculty members in the faculty expectations survey at our business school.

Just to be sure, we also estimated an ordinary least squares regression model of the following form to control for variables that could influence SET other than gender and tenure of an instructor.

$$E_i = \alpha + \beta_1 S_i + \beta_2 T_i + \beta_3 G_i + \beta_4 L_i + \beta_j F_i + \beta_9 G_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

where E_i is the overall student evaluation average for the class, S_i is the number of students enrolled in the class, T_i is a dummy variable indicating that the professor teaching the class has tenure, G_i is a dummy variable indicating that the professor teaching the class is female, L_i is a dummy variable indicating that the class is a 100 or 200 level course, F_i is a set of four dummy variables indicating the discipline of the course and G_i is the grade point average of the

² We would like to thank Dr. John Riefel, Associate Dean, Seidman College of Business for making this data available to us.

class. The regression results reported in Table 3 provide confirmation to the findings from Table 2 discussed above. They indicate that after controlling for other variables, female instructors actually received significantly higher overall student ratings than men.

Are these superior ratings a result of higher grades assigned by female instructors compared to their male colleagues? Even though the research findings on this topic are mixed, it is important to address this question as more female faculty members expressed being concerned about the impact on evaluations when setting expectations and standards for their students compared to men. To test if higher evaluation scores received by female instructors in the above regression were the result of their being more lenient than male professors, the following regression model was estimated (all variables are as they were defined in Equation 1):

$$G_i = \alpha + \beta_1 S_i + \beta_2 T_i + \beta_3 G_i + \beta_4 L_i + \beta_5 F_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (2)$$

The results from this regression (given in Table 4) show that after controlling for other factors female faculty members were more rigorous and assigned lower grade point averages to their students than their male counterparts. It therefore seems unlikely that the results from the estimation of Equation 1 are a consequence of female faculty members holding their students to an easier standard than male professors. In fact, the results indicate just the opposite. Even though female professors appear to hold their students to higher standards than their male colleagues, students give them higher evaluations.

Finally, student evaluations of teaching are frequently used, alone, across universities in US for personnel decisions and salary reviews. Their purpose is to fairly evaluate teaching effectiveness in terms of student learning and to help faculty improve their teaching. Yet, the perception of many faculty members, particularly female, is that the use of student evaluations achieves neither of these goals. 100% of the female respondents to the faculty expectations survey at our business school expressed the need to develop additional methods to evaluate teaching. A reason for this heightened concern could be the fear that even a slightly biased process can, over time, lead to substantial inequities in salary over time. To assess if this is indeed the case at the author's business school we used data on faculty compensation available publicly in the library. A summary of this data for two academic periods is presented in Table 5.

Currently, women make up 24.6% of the total faculty at our business school. Within broad fields at the assistant professor level, for the academic year 2004-05, women's pay is about equal to that of men. The median salary of an associate female faculty member is \$87,028 which is \$2,179 below that of an associate male faculty member or expressed as a ratio, it is 97% of men's salary. Likewise, the median salary of a female professor is 91.5% of a male professor's salary. These salary statistics indicate that women are paid almost

as much as men. Moreover, we find that the median salary of women has increased faster than that of men. Thus, reinforcing the results above on SET that women are performing better than men on all levels at our business school.

We also estimated the following regression model to assess the effect of gender on faculty pay to control for other explanatory variables:

$$P_i = \alpha + \beta_1 G_i + \beta_2 A_i + \beta_3 FP_i + \beta_j F_i + \beta_8 Y_i + \varepsilon_i$$

(3)

where P_i is the professor's base pay, G_i is a dummy variable indicating that the professor is a female, A_i is a dummy variable indicating that the professor is an associate professor, FP_i is a dummy variable indicating that the professor is a full professor, F_i is a set of four dummy variables indicating the discipline the professor specializes in and Y_i is the number of years the professor has taught at the college. The results of this regression, given in Table 6, indicate no significant effect of gender on professors' salaries.

CONCLUSION

A faculty expectations survey conducted at the author's business school in the summer of 2003 revealed distinct patterns along gender lines. For example, a larger proportion of female instructors compared to men were of the opinion that students do not take end-of-course evaluations seriously and that student evaluations are not an accurate representation of their teaching abilities. They also felt that the emphasis given to SETs was not appropriate and that alternative method should be developed to assess an instructor's performance in the classroom. A response of greatest concern was female faculty members perceiving a lack of support from the administration if they were to hold to their standards and limiting the use of innovative instructional strategies in the classroom for fear of adversely affecting their ratings.

Since, SETs are frequently being utilized to make personnel decisions across college campuses in the US, these responses are of concern as poor evaluations can have a detrimental effect on these decisions over time. Thus, if evaluations play a critical role in the decisions concerning raises, promotion and tenure and if faculty members, especially the women, do not perceive SETs as providing a valid measurement of their teaching abilities the question to ask is: Do female faculty members respond to SETs by adopting lower grading and course standards in their classroom compared to men to win the ratings game? This study examines this question and analyses the implications reliance on SETs can have for performance and pay over time.

Results of our study indicate that students on average rate female instructors higher than men, in spite of the fact that their class grade averages run lower than those assigned by their male colleagues. Thus, suggesting that faculty fear of adverse student evaluations does not in reality discourage female instructors at the author's business school from being sufficiently demanding of

their students. Moreover, a simple analysis of faculty compensation did not reveal any significant relationship between gender and pay among our business school faculty. The only effect of gender was observed on merit pay increases, which are partially based on SET in that female faculty members received a higher increment at each rank compared to their male counterparts.

Taken together, these results indicate a substantial difference between perception and actual performance of the business school female faculty members. As female professors are clearly performing better compared to male professors on all indicators of productivity. A word of caution however, since we studied only our business school and the size of our sample was small it is quite possible that the same patterns may not be universally found.

Table 1
Gender differences in faculty response to the expectations survey

Survey Item	Gender	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
I believe the business school, as a whole, is sufficiently Rigorous	Female	66.67%	11.11%	22.22%
	Male	44.00%	24.00%	32.00%
I think the business school culture encourages rigorous expectations and grading**	Female	88.89%	11.11%	0.00%
	Male	64.00%	12.00%	24.00%
I feel the emphasis given to student evaluations is Appropriate	Female	66.67%	22.22%	11.11%
	Male	44.00%	12.00%	44.00%
I think grade inflation is a problem in the business school*	Female	0.00%	11.11%	88.89%
	Male	16.00%	40.00%	44.00%
I believe the business school should develop additional methods for evaluating teaching*	Female	0.00%	0.00%	100%
	Male	24.00%	24.00%	52.00%
I consider the negative impact on student evaluations when I assign grades	Female	66.67%	11.11%	22.22%
	Male	52.00%	16.00%	32.00%
I allow the fear of negative student evaluations to influence the amount of work I assign	Female	55.56%	22.22%	22.22%
	Male	72.00%	12.00%	16.00%
My standards have fallen over the years	Female	66.67%	22.22%	11.11%
	Male	52.00%	28.00%	20.00%
I worry about the negative impact on student evaluations when I set standards and expectations	Female	44.44%	11.11%	44.45%
	Male	56.00%	20.00%	24.00%
I worry about negative impact on student evaluations when I take negative or disciplinary action against a student	Female	44.44%	0.00%	55.56%
	Male	52.00%	16.00%	32.00%
I allow the fear of negative student evaluations to influence	Female	66.67%	11.11%	22.22%

my grading	Male	56.00%	32.00%	12.00%
I believe I will be supported if I assign low grades and students complain*	Female	55.56%	33.33%	11.11%
	Male	16.00%	20.00%	64.00%
I limit trying new or creative approaches in the classroom because of potential harm on student evaluations**	Female	55.56%	22.22%	22.22%
	Male	80.00%	4.00%	16.00%
I believe students do a careful job of completing end-of-course evaluations	Female	44.44%	55.56%	0.00%
	Male	44.00%	24.00%	32.00%
I am conscious of the impact on student evaluations when I decide what and how much to give as assignments	Female	44.44%	11.11%	44.45%
	Male	52.00%	8.00%	40.00%
I believe students take end-of-course evaluations seriously as they complete them	Female	44.44%	55.56%	0.00%
	Male	40.00%	36.00%	24.00%
The student evaluations are an accurate representation of my teaching performance**	Female	55.56%	33.33%	11.11%
	Male	28.00%	24.00%	48.00%

* Significant at the 5% level

** Significant at the 10% level

Table 2
 Student Evaluations of Teaching and Grade Point Averages Assigned
 by Gender and Tenure Status of Faculty Members

	Course evaluation ^a	Course grade point average	Number of classes
Overall			
Male	4.16**	2.98*	594
Female	4.23	2.91	203
Tenured			
Male	4.10*	2.94	390
Female	4.26	2.92	73
Tenure-Track			
Male	4.26	3.05*	204
Female	4.21	2.90	130

^a Instructors are evaluated on a 5 point scale ranging from *poor* (1) to *excellent* (5)

* Significant at the 5% level

** Significant at the 10% level

Table 3
 OLS Estimates of Gender Effect on
 Student Evaluations of Teaching

Variable	Estimate
Intercept	3.05* [15.60]
Number of students enrolled	0.006* [2.92]
Instructor is tenured	-0.04 [1.10]
Instructor is female	0.10* [2.84]
100-200 level course	0.02 [0.43]
Accounting course	-0.11* [2.48]
Economics course	0.24* [5.05]
Finance course	0.22*

	[4.28]
Marketing course	0.11*
	[2.26]
Class grade point average	0.28*
	[5.47]
N	797
R ²	0.1302
F-statistics	13.09
<hr/>	
Absolute t-values in parenthesis	
* Significant at the 5 percent level	

Table 4
OLS Estimates of Gender Effect on
Grade Point Average Assigned

Variable	Estimate
Intercept	3.49*
	[68.14]
Number of students enrolled	-0.006*
	[5.18]
Instructor is tenured	-0.094*
	[4.22]
Instructor is female	-0.096*
	[3.84]
100-200 level course	-0.25
	[9.11]
Accounting course	-0.24*
	[8.04]
Economics course	-0.18*
	[5.53]
Finance course	-0.24*
	[6.94]
Marketing course	-0.19*
	[6.02]
N	797
R ²	0.2837
F-statistics	39.02
<hr/>	
Absolute t-values in parenthesis	

* Significant at the 5 percent level

Table 5
Trends in Faculty Salary

Designation	Gender	N	Salary(2004-05)		Salary(2003-04)		Average Experience
			Median	Median	Increment	Increment	
Assistant Professor	Female	8	78247	76500	2.28	4.75	
	Male	8	78341	77145	1.55	2.87	
Associate Professor	Female	6	87028	85620	1.65	12	
	Male	15	89207	87777	1.63	11.4	
Professor	Female	1	91018	88885	2.40	17	
	Male	23	99413	97680	1.77	18.43	

Table 6
OLS Estimates of Gender Effect on
Faculty Salary

Variable	Estimate
Intercept	78939.6* [37.13]
Instructor is female	1137.22 [0.58]
Instructor is a full professor	24546.33* [9.15]
Instructor is an associate professor	5424.86* [2.38]
Accounting professor	5818.24* [2.72]
Economics professor	-11700.89* [4.34]
Finance professor	12738.55* [4.95]
Marketing professor	5210.11* [2.20]

Years of teaching experience	-373.69*
	[3.68]
N	61
R ²	0.8136
F-statistics	29.46

Absolute t-values in parenthesis

* Significant at the 5 percent level

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. V. (1997) Student evaluations: The ratings game, *Inquiry*, 1, 10-16.
- Andersen, K. and Miller, E. D. (1997) Gender and student evaluations of teaching, *PS, Political Science & Politics*, 30, 216-219.
- Anderson, K. J. (2003) Students, professors, gender, and ethnicity; researchers share findings, *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education*, 14, 23.
- Basow, S. A. (1994) Student Ratings of Professors are not Gender Blind, *AWM NewsLetter*, 24.
- Basow, S. A. (1995) Student evaluation of college professors: When gender matters, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87, 656-665.
- Basow, S. A. and Silberg, N. T. (1987) Student evaluations of college professors: Are female and male professors rated differently?, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79, 308-314.
- Bennet, S. K. (1982) Student perceptions of and expectations for male and female instructors: Evidence relating to the question of gender bias in teaching evaluation, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, 170-179.
- Blunt, A. (1991) The effects of anonymity and manipulated grades on student ratings of instructors, *Community College Review*, 18, 48-53.
- Fich, F. E. (2003) Are student evaluations of teaching fair?, *Computing Research News*, 15, 2-11.
- Greenwald, A. and Gillmore, G. (1997) Grading leniency is a removable contaminant of student ratings, *American Psychologist*, 52, 1209-1217.
- Holley, D. (2000) Pedagogy and new power relationships, *The International Journal of Management Education*, 1
- Kierstead, D., D'Agostino, P. and Dill, H. (1988) Sex role stereotyping of college professors: Bias in students' ratings of instructors, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80, 342-44.
- Lang, S. S. (1997) Student ratings soar when professor uses enthusiasm, *Human Ecology Forum*, 25, 24.

- Langbein, L. I. (1994) The validity of student evaluations of teaching, *PS, Political Science & Politics*, 27, 545-553.
- Magner, D. K. (1997) Report says standards used to evaluate research should also be used for teaching and service, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 44, A18-A19.
- Massoni, K. (2004) The influence of gender on students' evaluations of teachers, *Sociologists for Women in Society*.
- Messner, M. (2000) White guy habitus in the classroom: Challenging the reproduction of privilege, *Men and Masculinities*, 2, 457-469.
- Miller, J. and Chamberlin, M. (2000) Women are teachers, men are professors: A study of student perceptions, *Teaching Sociology*, 28, 283-298.
- Radmacher, S.A. and Martin, D.J. (2001) Identifying significant predictors of student evaluations of faculty through hierarchical regression analysis, *The Journal of Psychology*, 135 (3), 259-268.
- Sidanius, J. and Crane, M. (1989) Job evaluation and gender: The case of university faculty, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 19, 176-197.
- Simpson, P. M. and Siguaw, J. A. (2000) Student evaluations of teaching: An exploratory study of the faculty response, *Journal of Marketing Education*, 22, 199-213.
- Sinclair, L. and Kunda, Z. (1999) Reactions to a black professional: Motivated inhibition and activation of conflicting stereotypes, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 885-904.
- Sprague, J. and Massoni, K. (2002) In *2002 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association*.
- Stone, J. E. (1995) Inflated grades, inflated enrollment, and inflated budgets: An analysis and call for review at the state level, *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 3, 1-33.
- Stratham, A., Richardson, L. and Cook, J. (1991) *Gender and University Teaching: A Negotiated Difference*, SUNY Press, Albany, NY.
- Swenson, C. (1998) Customers & markets: The cuss words of academe,

Change, 30, 34-39.

Wilson, R. (1998) New research casts doubt on value of student evaluations of professors, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 44, A12-A14.