



Western Michigan University  
ScholarWorks at WMU

---

Dissertations

Graduate College

---

8-1997

## Discrimination Against Female Graduate Teaching Assistants

Joanne Ardovini-Brooker  
*Western Michigan University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations>



Part of the Gender and Sexuality Commons, Inequality and Stratification Commons, and the Work, Economy and Organizations Commons

---

### Recommended Citation

Ardovini-Brooker, Joanne, "Discrimination Against Female Graduate Teaching Assistants" (1997).  
*Dissertations*. 1647.

<https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/1647>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact [wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu](mailto:wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu).



**DISCRIMINATION AGAINST FEMALE GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANTS**

**by**

**Joanne Ardovini-Brooker**

**A Dissertation  
Submitted to the  
Faculty of The Graduate College  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the  
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
Department of Sociology**

**Western Michigan University  
Kalamazoo, Michigan  
August 1997**

## DISCRIMINATION AGAINST FEMALE GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANTS

Joanne Ardovini-Brooker, Ph.D.

Western Michigan University, 1997

Many studies have been done concerning the classroom climate, particularly in the university setting. It has been found that the classroom climate for women is one that is cold, unreceptive, unwelcoming, and even hostile to women. This chilly reception is endured by female undergraduate students, graduate students, and professors. This researcher believes that the chilly classroom climate also extends to female graduate teaching assistants/instructors. I also believe that this chilly climate may be chillier and more hostile for them, since graduate teaching assistants/instructors do not have the status associated with a doctoral degree. This concept is the basis for what I have covered in my investigation of the college classroom.

I utilized a triangulation of methods to explore the discrimination against female graduate teaching assistants/instructors within the classroom setting. My methods include unobtrusive observations, surveys, and consciousness-raising debriefings. What was found was that graduate teachers/instructors, whether female or male, experience a chilly/hostile classroom climate. However, female graduate teachers/instructors are more often than male graduate teachers/instructors confronted with hostile student behavior. Additionally,

it was found that females in general are more often than males de-valued by their students. Further research is suggested concerning this topic.

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

**This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.**

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.**

**In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.**

**Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.**

**Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.**

# **UMI**

**A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA  
313/761-4700 800/521-0600**



**UMI Number: 9806452**

---

**UMI Microform 9806452**  
**Copyright 1997, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.**

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized  
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

---

**UMI**  
**300 North Zeeb Road**  
**Ann Arbor, MI 48103**

**Copyright by  
Joanne Ardovini-Brooker  
1997**



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

How does one begin to acknowledge the people who contribute to the attainment of a life long goal? The following are just a few who contributed in the completion of this dissertation. First, I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to the members of my committee, Dr. Susan Caringella-MacDonald, Dr. Ronald Kramer, Dr. Doug Davidson, and Dr. Gwen Raaberg. I also thank Dr. David Hartman for his willingness to share his computer and statistics expertise. To you all I offer my sincere appreciation for your guidance, support, and encouragement. More importantly, I thank you all for not allowing me to give up on myself and my dreams.

Second, to my best friend and spouse, Dale Ardovini-Brooker, who continued to support and love me no matter how unbearable I became. I would also like to thank you, Dale, for making me realize that men can be feminists too. To my mother, Maria Ardovini-Williams, and my sister, Theresa Stufano, I thank you both for demonstrating that women can do anything given the opportunity, which you have both provided for me. Last, I would like to extend a special thanks to my mentor and friend, Dr. Susan Caringella-MacDonald. Your passion for nothing short of brilliance has been my source of inspiration.

Finally, I dedicate this dissertation to the memory of my grandmother, Giovanna Palmieri. An immigrant unable to read, yet able to exemplify the meaning of intelligence, strength and inde-

**Acknowledgements--Continued**

**independence.**

**Joanne Ardovini-Brooker**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Purpose of and Need for the Study.....	4
Research Questions.....	7
Overview of Methodology.....	8
Outline of Dissertation.....	8
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	10
Background of the Problem.....	10
Discrimination Against Women in General.....	12
Feminist Theory.....	12
Liberal Feminism.....	13
Marxist Feminism.....	18
Socialist Feminism.....	21
Radical Feminism.....	24
Postmodern Feminism.....	27
Summary of Theory and Discrimination Against Women.....	29
Discrimination Against Women in the Work World, Academe.....	30
Discrimination Against Women in the Social Sciences.....	32

## Table of Contents--continued

<b>CHAPTER</b>		
	The Issue of Race.....	33
	The Issue of Tenure.....	35
	Discrimination Against Women as Leaders.....	37
	Attribution About Women's Success.....	38
	Bias Against Women's Titles.....	40
	The Issue of Student Evaluation, Devaluation, and Behavior.....	42
	The Issue of the Chilly Climate and the Discrimination Against Women.....	46
	Chilly Attitudes Towards Women in Academe.....	46
	Bias Against Women's Issues and Experiences in Academe.....	49
	Chilly Behaviors Towards Women in Academe.....	50
	The Impact of the Chilly Climate and Discrimination Against Women.....	51
	The Impact of the Chilly Climate and Discrimination on the Female Graduate Student.....	53
<b>III. DESIGN.....</b>		<b>57</b>
	Introduction.....	57
	Research Questions.....	58
	Population and Sample.....	59
	Stage I: Unobtrusive Observations.....	61
	Stage II: Survey Data.....	65
	Part 1: Abstract Evaluations.....	65
	Stage II: Survey Data Continued.....	68

## Table of Contents--continued

CHAPTER		
	Part 2: FEM Scale.....	68
	Stage III: Consciousness-Raising Debriefing.....	70
	Triangulation of Methods.....	73
	Limitations of the Study.....	74
	Limitations of Stage I, Unobtrusive Observations...	74
	Limitations of Stage II, Survey Data.....	77
	Limitations of Stage III, Consciousness- Raising Debriefing.....	78
IV.	FINDINGS.....	80
	Introduction.....	80
	Characteristics of Overall Sample.....	80
	Stage I: Unobtrusive Observations Data.....	83
	T-Test Analysis.....	86
	Comparison of the Means of the Grand Total, Total Female, and Total Male Observed Behaviors.....	86
	Comparison of the Means of the Recoded Grand Total of Observed Behaviors, Recoded Total Female Observed Behaviors, and Recoded Total Male Observed Behaviors.....	87
	T-Test Analysis of Average Total, Average Total Female, and Average Total Male Behaviors.....	89
	Comparison of the Means of the Recoded Average Total, the Recoded Average Female, and the Recoded Average Total Male Observed Behaviors.....	91
	Comparison of the Means of Each Individual Dimension of Behavior.....	92

## Table of Contents--continued

### CHAPTER

Student Hostile Behavior Findings in Female Graduate Instructors' Classes That Were Not Significant.....	93
Student Hostile Behavior Findings in Male Graduate Instructors' Classes That Were Not Significant.....	95
Chi-Square Analysis.....	97
Chi-Square Analysis of Observed Hostile Behaviors.....	97
Characteristics of Survey Sample: Stage II and III...	98
Stage II: Survey Data.....	103
Part 1: Article Abstract Evaluations.....	103
Chi-Square Analysis.....	105
Article Abstract #1 (Female Author).....	105
Article Abstract #3 (Male Author).....	106
Article Abstract #4 (Female Author).....	107
Combined Female Authors' Evaluation Scores.....	112
Stage II: FEM Scale Scores.....	113
Part II: FEM Scale Scores (Recoded).....	113
Average FEM Scale Score Per Class and According to Sex of the Student.....	114
Chi-Square Analysis.....	116
Stage III: Consciousness-Raising Debriefing.....	119
Journal Entry: Male Graduate Instructor #2 (1/23/97).....	120
Journal Entry: Male Graduate Instructor #1 (1/30/97).....	121

## Table of Contents--continued

### CHAPTER

Journal Entry: Female Graduate Instructor #1 (2/3/97).....	124
Journal Entry: Female Graduate Instructor #2 (2/7/97).....	125
V. INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	128
Introduction.....	128
Stage I: Unobtrusive Observations Interpretations....	129
Significant T-Score Values.....	129
Significant Chi-Square Value.....	131
Stage II: Part 1, Article Abstract Evaluation Interpretations.....	133
Research Question #1.....	133
Significant Chi-Square Values.....	133
Research Question #4.....	138
Stage II: Part 2, FEM Scores Interpretations.....	139
Research Question #2.....	139
Significant Chi-Square Values.....	139
Research Question #5.....	140
Stage III, Consciousness-Raising Debriefing Interpretations.....	141
Research Questions #3 and #5.....	141
Summary and Conclusions.....	146
APPENDICES	
A. Research Instrument: Stage I, Unobtrusive Observation Tally Form.....	149

**Table of Contents--continued**

<b>B. Research Instrument: Stage II, Survey Instrument.....</b>	<b>152</b>
<b>C. Protocol Clearance From the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board.....</b>	<b>162</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>164</b>



## LIST OF TABLES

1. Sample Population Breakdown According to Sex of the Instructor, Sex of Student and Year in School.....	81
2. Sample Population Breakdown According to Sex and Year in School of Students Registered in Female Graduate Instructors Classes.....	82
3. Sample Population Breakdown According to Sex and Year in School of Students Registered in Male Graduate Instructors Classes.....	83
4. Female and Male Student's Hostile Behaviors Within Female Graduate Instructors' Classes.....	85
5. Female and Male Student's Hostile Behaviors Within Male Graduate Instructors' Classes.....	85
6. T-Test of the Total Observed Behaviors and the Total Female and the Total Male Observed Behaviors.....	87
7. T-Test of the Recoded Total Observed Behaviors and the Recoded Total Female and the Recoded Total Male Observed Behaviors.....	89
8. T-Test of the Average Total Observed Behaviors and the Average Total Female and the Average Total Male Observed Behaviors.....	90
9. Student Behaviors that Were Found to Occur More in Female Graduate Instructors' Classes Than in Male Graduate Instructors' Classes (Not Statistically Significant).....	94
10. Student Behaviors that Were Found to Occur More in Male Graduate Instructors' Classes Than in Female Graduate Instructors' Classes (Not Statistically Significant).....	96
11. Survey Sample Population Breakdown According to Sex and Year in School.....	99
12. The Differences Between Stage I Student Sample Population and Stage II and Stage III Student Sample Population Breakdown According to Sex and Year in School.....	100

# List of Tables--continued

13.	Recoded Article Abstract #1 Evaluation Scores by Recoded Years in School.....	106
14.	Recoded Article Abstract #3 Evaluation Scores by Recoded Years in School.....	107
15.	Recoded Article Abstract #4 Evaluation Scores by Recoded Years in School.....	108
16.	Recoded Article Abstract #4 Evaluation Scores by Recoded Age.....	109
17.	Recoded Article Abstract #4 Evaluation Scores by Recoded Race.....	110
18.	Recoded Article Abstract #4 Evaluation Scores by Recoded Father's Education.....	111
19.	Recoded Article Abstract #4 Evaluation Scores According to Sex.....	112
20.	Recoded Female Authors Total Evaluation Scores by Sex of the Respondent.....	113
21.	The Student Average FEM Scores for Female and Male Graduate Instructors' Classes.....	116
22.	Recoded FEM Scores by Sex of the Student.....	117
23.	Recoded FEM Scores by Recoded Mother's Education.....	118
24.	Recoded FEM Scores by Recoded Father's Education.....	119

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Statement of the Problem

Many studies have been done concerning the classroom climate, particularly in the university setting. For example, Roberta M. Hall and Bernice Sandler in their study entitled, "The Classroom Climate: A Chilly One for Women," describe the discrimination that many women experience in higher education. They found that despite women's gains in access to higher education, especially since the passage of Title IX, a chilly climate persists for women. This climate is one that is cold, unreceptive, unwelcoming, and even hostile to women. For example, within the intellectual and academic spheres there is a tendency for women to think of themselves as not quite on a par with men as a result of the chilly climate.

The college classroom is not immune to the sexist ideologies that exist in our society. Women have in the past and continue in the present, to face discrimination in the classroom. This discrimination emanates from administration, faculty, and students and is directed towards women and their work (MacLean & Milovanovic, 1991).

Colleges are still a Boys club where women are making-up a larger and larger number of the membership. Yet, the climate and rules are not reflecting this change. It has been found (Hall &

Sandler, 1992) that "academic work done by men may be valued more highly than that done by women" and that "a woman student may have to outperform her male peers to be taken seriously by her professors" (p. 4). This has been found to hold true for female faculty as well. The intent of this study is to see if this holds true, as well as if it is even more pronounced, for female graduate teaching assistants/instructors.

At times it seems as if women must jump through hoops of fire to be taken seriously in academe. Yet, their work may still be devalued, questioned, challenged, and even belittled. This, I believe, is a form of hostility, if not harassment, initiated by the very students women are trying to educate. Many female faculty, including female graduate teaching assistants/instructors, face this type of hostility/harassment everyday. This hostility is a form of discrimination that is waged in the classroom by certain types of neo-conservative male and female student, as well as other types of students, e.g., traditional, liberal, but still sexist (Hart, 1994, p. 4). This type of behavior includes subtle, nonverbal put-downs, disrupting the class, sighs, students talking among themselves, and overt acts of hostility (Hart, 1994). This study questions whether this occurs more in female graduate teaching assistants/instructors' classrooms than in male graduate teaching assistants/instructors' classrooms.

From this point on, I will refer to graduate teaching assistants as graduate instructors because of the nature of the appoint-

ment. The term instructor better describes a teaching assistant's sole responsibility for a college course in the Sociology Department at Western Michigan University than graduate teacher which implies less than total responsibility for a course.

The discrimination against women in higher education "is real and mounting, and it must be taken seriously" (MacLean & Milovanovic, 1991, pp. 65-66). We must also seek to understand the discrimination against women that occurs at all levels of academe in order to put an end to anti-women, "anti-feminist classroom swarming" (MacLean & Milovanovic, 1991, pp. 65-66).

By using the terms anti-women and anti-feminist swarming, I am referring to the anger that is expressed within the classroom by many students towards the female academicians. This anger maybe expressed through hostile behaviors, devaluation of scholarship produced by women, and/or negative attitudes towards women.

Student's chilly or hostile classroom behavior, devaluation of women's abilities, and/or sexist attitudes are some examples of a wider "misogynist new wave in the university which is couched in an inarticulate reference to quality of education" and "men's rights" (MacLean & Milovanovic, 1991, p. 66). This assault is fuelled by an appalling ignorance about women academicians, particularly female graduate instructors, who do not have the status associated with a doctoral degree.

The chilly or hostile student behaviors, devaluation, and sexism are what I explore in this study. In particular, I examine the

chilly classroom climate for female graduate instructors in the Sociology Department at Western Michigan University.

#### Purpose of and Need for the Study

I believe that this examination is essential because within academe there is an overwhelming tendency to equate female scholars "with subjectivity, political partisanship, and muddled thinking" (MacLean & Milovanovic, 1991, p. 64). This misconception is used to "ghettoize female academics," particularly, "in anodyne enclaves;" as well as in questioning women's intellect (MacLean & Milovanovic, 1991, p. 64). It seems as if in higher education, like many other institutions within society, there exists a "sexist rebellion against any woman who commands authority" (MacLean & Milovanovic, 1991, p. 64). This is a part of the current backlash against feminist women. This is particularly true within an institution where male world views have been historically, and currently continue to be, privileged.

Studies, such as a second study conducted by Sandler and Hall, have shown that many female academicians who hold doctorate degrees experience hostility from their students within their classrooms. Sandler and Hall found that a chilly climate existed for female professors to the extent that many of the women had changed their careers. Other authors, such as Mary J. Hart, discuss the hostility that is generated from students and is directed towards female professors. Hart compared student hostility in a female's classroom to

being in a wolfpack. Just imagine what female graduate instructors, who do not hold doctoral degrees, experience in the classroom. If the female professor's experience of the classroom is chilly, then the female graduate instructor's experience must be a frozen tundra.

Many female graduate instructors, including myself, have faced and will continue to face this type of discrimination, hostility, and/or harassment. The existence of such hostile behavior by both male and female students towards female graduate instructors is due to numerous factors. Some factors would include such things as scapegoating, rebelling against mom, and a renewed conservative ideology reflective of our nation's economic turmoil. Female graduate instructors may be seen by their students as an object of their resentment regarding equality in opportunities and issues of diversity. I have two personal anecdotes that I would like to share at this point, as examples of this and as an illustration of the personal being political.

The first anecdote concerns a male student that I had in one of my classes, Sociology 210: The Study of Modern Social Problems. I was addressing theoretical issues concerning social problems and deviance, when a male student stated that he believed that I was misinformed and needed to speak to another faculty member for the correct interpretation of the theory. The faculty member to whom this male student directed me happened to be a male. I expressed to the student that I believed that I was correct in my interpretation; however, I would go to the faculty member that he had suggested and

ask for his input. When I confirmed to the male student that I was correct and that the male faculty member also believed the fact to be so, he stated that I was still incorrect and could not have spoken to the male faculty member. This form of antagonism continued the entire semester.

The second anecdote concerns two female students in the same class, yet over different semesters. Over the duration of the semester I had tried to incorporate a feminist, woman's perspective with every social problem that we, as a class, had chosen to examine. Approaching the class with a feminist pedagogy, I was aware that I must get the class to think critically about the society in which we exist. This was not an easy task. Nonetheless, I was able to get most of my students to understand the impact that one's race, class, and gender has upon their social experiences. However, I was unable to reach two women in the class. One woman, a young traditional student, asked me when I was going to stop harping on the gender thing because she believed that women are no longer oppressed. She continued to say that maybe her mother and grandmother had been oppressed in the past, but things are different now and she is not oppressed; gender is no big deal. Thereafter, every time I included gender in our analysis of a social problem, this student would frown and mumble under her breath that I was a bitch and needed to get over myself.

The second female student, a nontraditional student approximately in her late 30's or early 40's, raised the same issue. How-



ever, she did not approach me with as much regard as the first female student. This woman came into my office one morning after class and for 15 minutes bombarded me with insults and abusive language. She felt that it was her right and her obligation, to berate me for saying that she was oppressed and ignored by our society. "I am not oppressed, now leave me alone!," she yelled as she turned and left my office.

The above incidents are perfect examples of the forms of harassment and hostility that female academicians must endure. One could say, and logically so, that female graduate instructors may seem to be a threat to some students, both male and female. They are a symbolic barrier to their students' future employment, and ultimately, their students' success.

### Research Questions

A chilly climate exists for female faculty, students, and graduate instructors in academe. This study questioned whether the devaluation by students is expressed through hostile, dominant, and/or disrespectful behavior within female graduate instructors' classrooms. The research questions are as follows:

1. Is women's scholarship devalued by students?
2. Are students' attitudes towards women and/or feminism sexist?
3. Is there a chilly, hostile classroom climate for female graduate instructors?

4. Does devaluation lead to chilly behaviors?

5. Are attitudes towards women and/or feminism factors that lead to the chilly, hostile classroom climate for female graduate instructors?

### Overview of Methodology

I utilize feminist theories in "attempt to describe women's oppression, to explain its causes and consequences, and to prescribe strategies for women's liberation" (Tong, 1989, p. 1). I have also utilized a triangulation of methods. I used unobtrusive observations, surveys, and consciousness-raising debriefing, in order to examine the issue of sexism in the female graduate instructors' classrooms.

### Outline of Dissertation

Chapter II of this dissertation provides a review of related literature. This review includes sections on the background of the problem, discrimination against women in general, feminist theories, discrimination against women at work, particularly in academe, the issue of race, and many other sections. Chapter III describes the design of the study. Sections are dedicated to describing the student sample population, all three stages of research, and the limitations of the study. Chapter IV consists of the findings of the three stages of research. Chapter V includes a discussion and interpretations of the findings, along with my concluding remarks about

**this research.**

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### Background of the Problem

Women have historically been, and continue to be, discriminated against. Inequality in the workplace, such as within the university setting, is an example. Barbara Reskin and Irene Padavic in their book, Women and Men at Work, state that sex inequality in the workplace is manifested in several ways. "The sexes are concentrated in different occupations; women are often confined to lower-ranking positions than men and are less likely than men to exercise authority; women earn less than men" (Reskin & Padavic, 1994, p. 43).

These manifestations of sexism still exist, even after the all the advances made during Second Wave of Feminism of the 1960's. For example, the Equal Pay Act, passed in 1963, outlawed "separate pay scales for men and women for work requiring similar skill and performed under similar working conditions" (Barrett, 1979, p. 55). Nonetheless, today women make up nearly half of the nation's workforce, yet, 75% of these working women still earn \$25,000 a year less than men (The National Council for Research on Women, 1996, pp. 4-6). Relatedly, for every dollar earned by white men, white women earned 72 cents, African American women earned 63 cents, and Hispanic women earned only 56 cents (The National Council for Research on Women, 1996, p. 4). In 1964, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act was

passed. This legislation was written to bar any "discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origins in hiring, firing, promoting, compensating, and other terms, privileges, and conditions of employment" (The National Council for Research on Women, 1996, p. 7). This, however, did not apply to higher education until 1972 when the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was established (The National Council for Research on Women, 1996, p. 7). Today even though white males make up only 33% of the total population; they continue to make up 85% of the tenured professors, 85% of partners in law firms, 80% of the US House of Representatives, 90% of the US Senate, 95% of Fortune 500 CEOs, 97% of school superintendents, 99.9% of athletic team owners, and 100% of all US presidents (The National Council for Research on Women, 1996, p. 7).

Discrimination is alive and well within the ivory towers. G.P. Green and E.H. Becker, in a report written in 1997, found that women represent 43.5% of all college and university faculty and only 38% of all full-time faculty. The median weekly salary of the full-time female faculty was found to be 81% of the median weekly salary received by male colleagues. However, this figure has been disputed by R.B. Reich and K. Nussbaum. They suggest that this figure is an overestimation of the true earnings of full-time female faculty because "the gap between the earnings of women and men is smaller for weekly wages than for annual earnings" (Reich & Nussbaum, 1994, p. 29).

Social scientists have advanced several explanations for these discrepancies. Reskin and Padavic discuss some of these explanations

to include cultural factors, sex stereotypes, the preservation of male advantage, and discrimination (Reskin & Padavic 1994, p. 43).

Angela Simeone (1987) also discusses some of the explanations for these discrepancies. She states that

because the vast majority of those in decision-making positions are male, systems are formed which conform more closely to the needs and experiences of academic man than women. . . . One cannot absolve academia of sexist discrimination when it is manifested in the acts of individuals, for those acts are reinforced by the assumptions, policies, and practices of the institutions themselves. (p. 143)

Whatever the explanation, the end results are unequal outcomes in experiences, opportunities, and rewards. Women seem to be trapped between a glass ceiling and a sticky floor. The glass ceiling phenomenon prevents women from advancing into the decision making positions. The sticky floor phenomenon fuses women to "low-paying, low-mobility jobs" that ultimately curtail the advancement of many women (The National Council for Research on Women, 1996, p. 4). All of this results in the continuation of discrimination against women. There are numerous theories that attempt to explain the discrimination that occurs against women. Feminist theories are among the medley of theories that can be used to understand this discrimination.

#### Discrimination Against Women in General

##### Feminist Theory

Feminist theory describes the causes and effects of the oppression of women. There are many different perspectives that distinguish the variety of feminist theories that exist today. Due to the

subject matter of this dissertation, I will only discuss a few theoretical perspectives because I feel that they are the most relevant to the phenomenon at hand. The theoretical perspectives I discuss include liberal feminism, marxist feminism, socialist feminist, radical feminism, and post-modern feminism. Each theory offers distinct epistemological assumptions (ways of understanding society) and means to achieving social change for women's liberation. All the feminist theories included (Andersen, 1994), regardless of the perspective from which they came, have a common purpose:

The purpose of feminist theory is to help us understand the conditions in society and to envision the possibilities for liberating social changes. Feminist theory is not written and thought just for its own sake but rather for what it suggests about political changes as well. (p. 318)

### Liberal Feminism

Liberal feminism's main goal is equality in opportunity for all. This goal of a just and compassionate society in which freedom flourishes is the foundation upon which our country is supposedly built. Yet, discrimination and oppression continue; particularly within the ivory towers of academe.

An epistemological assumption of liberal feminism is that our socialization forces people to grow up with distorted and harmful ideas about males and females, resulting in gender inequality. Cultural ideas, such as gender roles, are also seen as restricting people's freedom to choose how to live their lives (Johnson, 1995, p. 110). Because of these basic assumptions, liberal feminism would

develop a solution that focuses on changing ideas, cultural practices, and creating anti-discrimination laws based on one's sex. Examples of these types of solutions are Title 9, anti-sexist pedagogy, and anti-sexist curriculum development. The epistemological assumptions and the solutions offered within the liberal feminist perspective developed originally from the work of Mary Wollstonecraft, Harriet Martineau, John Stuart Mill, Harriet Taylor Mill, Betty Friedan, and many others.

The roots of liberal feminism are first traced back to the work of Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-1797) (Schneir, 1992, p. 5). Wollstonecraft provides part of the philosophical foundation for contemporary liberal feminism in her major work, A Vindication of the Rights of Women, which appeared in the United States in 1792 (Ander- sen, 1994, p. 325). In it she "concentrated on describing the state of ignorance and servility to which women were condemned by social customs and training" (Schneir, 1992, p. 6). Wollstonecraft argued (Schneir, 1992) that it is the nature of ignorance that oppresses women.

The mind will ever be unstable that has only prejudices to rest on, and the current will run with destructive fury when there are no barriers to break its force. Women are told from their infancy, and taught by the example of their mothers, that a little knowledge of human weakness, justly termed cunning, softness of temper, outward obedience, and a scrupulous attention to a puerile kind of propriety, will obtain for them the protection of man; and should they be beautiful, everything else is needless, for, at least, twenty years of their lives. . . . (p. 6)

According to this passage, Wollstonecraft argued that gender roles are the result of social learning. She also argued that what



appears to be the natural weakness of women, and ultimately the impediment of the development of mental reasoning, is the result of a lack of liberty, a dependence on men, and a blind submission to authority and socialization (Andersen, 1994, p. 326). We are taught that women's work, or work performed by women, is less valuable than men's. Therefore, women's contributions to society, e.g., house work or scholarly work, tend to be devalued and/or delegitimated. A particular example of this discrimination against women is the lack of regard granted to Harriet Martineau for her contributions to the field of Sociology. Like so many women, Martineau has all but been ignored by her field. In 1837, two or three decades before Durkheim and Weber were born, Martineau published Society in America, in which she reported on "this new nation's family customs, race and gender relations, politics, and religion" (Henslin, 1997, p. 17). Yet, her significant work has been neglected; she is primarily known for translating Auguste Comte's ideas into English.

According to Margaret L. Andersen's book, Thinking About Women: Sociological Perspectives on Sex and Gender, no thinkers have been more influential in the development of liberal feminism than John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor Mill (Andersen, 1994, p. 329). The analysis that the Mills developed in their work entitled, The Subjection of Women (1869), "is the philosophical backbone of liberal feminist politics" (Andersen, 1994, p. 329). The main thrust of their work is still felt in contemporary groups such as the National Organization for Women (NOW), which has been instrumental in changes

made within the realm of higher education.

According to their work, "female subordination is rooted in a set of customary and legal constraints that blocks women's entrance and/or success in the so-called public world" (Tong, 1989, p. 2). They argue that our society holds false beliefs of women. For example, we believe that women are by nature less intellectually and physically capable than men. These misconceptions of women keep them out of the academy, the forum, and the marketplace, and result in the hinderance of women achieving their true and full potential (Tong, 1989, p. 2). These misconceptions continue to impede the progress of women in general and women in academe in particular.

The Mills take their analysis one step further than Wollstonecraft and Martineau. They relate the oppression of women to a systematic critique of liberty and the relations between the sexes (Andersen, 1994, p. 329). The Mills regarded women as a subject class and recognized the state of female bondage as not forced but willing (Schneir, 1992, p. 162). They also emphasized "that subtle and pervasive social conditioning is the means by which women are prepared to accede to roles as the savants of men" (Schneir, 1992, p. 162).

The Mills look at gender differences and social learning to explain discrimination against women. According to the Millss' work, social conditions create gender specific attitudes and gender inequality based on what is believed to be natural differences. However, the Mills argue that what is considered natural is only what is taken for granted (Andersen, 1994, p. 331). They continue by say-

ing that what appears to be natural is the result of social learning. Therefore, they believe that if we change the social conditions, social learning we will achieve gender equality, which will ultimately benefit males and females alike. They argue that "there is no reasonable defense for the current state of affairs and that the creation of liberty for women would benefit not just women but society as a whole" (Andersen, 1994, p. 331).

These ideologies espoused by the Mills are also seen in the writings of many twentieth century liberal feminists. Betty Friedan's The Feminine Mystique is an example of such a book. Although less radical than the above writers of the Enlightenment, Friedan had an implicit understanding of women as a powerless sex class (Tong, 1989, p. 22). According to Friedan, the "feminine mystique" is the cherished and self-perpetuating core of contemporary American (U.S.) culture (Friedan, 1984, p. 18). This mystique of feminine fulfillment encompasses, being a perfect wife and mother, having the highest ambition of giving birth to five children, a beautiful house, and getting, and more importantly keeping, your husband (Friedan, 1984, p. 18). Friedan argues that this notion that women can find contentment exclusively in this traditional role of wife and mother has left women empty.

Friedan offered a solution, an escape away from this misery: work outside the home. "She warned that unless women in the United States get college educations and then use them productively in the full-time, public work force, they will be driven to strange manias

and deep depressions" (Tong, 1989, p. 23). Friedan also warned stay-at-home mothers that they were doing their children no good by staying at home. She thought that these stay-at-home mothers will only create passive and immature children by smothering them. Therefore, Friedan believed that even if women wanted to stay at home, "they should not be allowed to do so" (Tong, 1989, p. 23).

Friedan (1984) did not believe that women were confronted with an all or nothing situation (love or career). She argued that "the assumption of your own identity, equality, and even political power does not mean you stop needing to love, and be loved by, a man, or that you stop caring for your own kids" (p. 380). This love and caring of and by her family, Friedan suggests, is only part of a women's life and need not make excessive claims on her time. It is "a part of her life, but not all of it" (Tong, 1989, p. 24). However, Friedan reconsiders her conception of combining marriage, family and career in her later work, The Second Stage. Although marriage and family are not all of a woman's life, she now states that they are the most important part of her life. Today, these aspects of a woman's life are still considered to be the defining factors of her life. Women's careers come in second.

### Marxist Feminism

Marxist feminism differs from liberal feminism in that it assumes that class accounts for women's status and functions, instead of social learning and gender discrimination. Under the economic sy-

stem of capitalism, bourgeois women experience different forms of oppression than that experienced by proletarian women. Marxist feminism urges all women to understand the oppression that women, bourgeois and proletariat alike, face due to capitalism and the political and social structures that are built upon this infrastructure.

Marxist feminism rejects the liberal feminist notion of human nature as rational being. Instead, (Tong, 1989), Marxist feminism emphasizes

that what makes us human is that we produce our means of subsistence. . . . We are what we are because of what we do--specifically, what we do to meet our basic needs in productive activities such as fishing, farming, and building. Unlike bees, beavers, and ants, whose activities are governed by instinct, we create ourselves in the process of intentionally, or consciously, transforming and manipulating nature. (pp. 39-40)

This is the basis of marxist feminism which developed from the work of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. The quotation is a illustration of what Marx termed as historical materialism, social existence determines consciousness (Tong, 1989, p. 40).

Marxist feminists agree with the assumption that social existence determines consciousness. They argue that to understand why women are oppressed in ways that men are not, we must analyze the relationship between women's work status and women's self-image (Tong, 1989, p. 40). They also argue that capitalism is a system of power relations as well as exchange relations, a commodity or market society where everything has a price and is exploitable. For example, when a women "chooses" to sell her body for sex or for reproductive services because she has no other means, chances are that

her "choice" is coerced and not freely selected (Tong, 1989, p. 42).

Marxist feminism addresses the issues of class, class consciousness and false consciousness. Although women may not constitute a class per se, many have struggled to have their domestic work recognized as real work. This results in many women developing a consciousness of themselves as a class of workers, whose office just happens to be their homes. However, the dominant consciousness is resistant to recognize women's newly found consciousness. This new consciousness is labeled by those in power as false and inappropriate in order to maintain the status quo (Tong, 1989, pp. 43-44). In turn, these women experience alienation, a feeling meaninglessness or worthlessness. These women become alienated from the product of their labor, themselves, other human beings, and from nature (Tong, 1989, p. 44). They are not whole. Ann Foreman argued that this state of alienation is worse for women than it is for men in our capitalist society. According to Tong (1989), Foreman believed that "women's alienation is profoundly disturbing because women experience themselves only as the fulfillment of other people's needs. . . in the absence of their families' and friends' needs of them, women have no sense of self" (p. 45).

Based on this assumption, the primary task of marxist feminism is to create the kind of environment that allows, if not encourages, women to experience themselves as integrated whole persons and not as fragmented half human beings. Women must no longer be denied self.

Other marxist feminists suggest that to achieve this goal women

must fight for their comparable worth. According to marxist feminism, comparable worth is "an opportunity to challenge the market basis of wages--that is, to force us to reconsider why we pay some people so much and others so little" (Tong, 1989, p. 59). Comparable worth is important to many marxist feminists because of the feminization of poverty and the value of work, or should I say the devaluation of women's work. This focus is a way to redress women's poverty and equalize wages. "Many marxist feminists derive satisfaction from the thought that as a result of the comparable worth movement, capitalist assumptions about what kind of work counts as valuable could be seriously, even permanently, undermined" (Tong, 1989, p. 61). To summarize, Marxist feminism urges women to enter the public sphere, place their economic independence at the forefront of the movement and focus "on the intersection between women's experience as workers and their position in the family" (Tong, 1989, p. 61).

### Socialist Feminism

Socialist feminism and marxist feminism share many epistemological assumptions, however, there is one major point that separates them. Socialist feminism argues that "gender and class play an approximately equal role in any explanation of women's oppression" (Tong, 1989, p. 39). This differs from marxist feminists argument that class ultimately accounts for the oppression of women.

Socialist feminism also shares epistemological assumptions with

radical and psychoanalytic feminism. Socialist feminism borrows from radical feminism their analysis of the gender hierarchy that exists under patriarchy. Both socialist and radical feminists suggest that as long as men hold the power in society and control social institutions, "women will either be confined to the home or relegated to the least prestigious and most poorly paid lines of work" (Tong, 1989, p. 174). This will only support the status quo and hinder women's liberation.

Socialist, radical, and psychoanalytic feminism all describe why men exist within the public world, while women are banished into the private world. What socialist feminism takes from psychoanalytic feminism is the way it attributes this situation to the "ways in which men's and women's gender identities and behavioral repertoires are constructed deep in the unconscious, which is little affected by revolutionary activity in the economic and political sphere" (Tong, 1989, p. 174). From this assumption, as well as those taken from radical feminism, socialist feminism developed two main approaches: dual-system theory and unified-systems theory.

The basic epistemological assumption made by socialist feminism is that women's oppression is primarily based in capitalism and its interrelationship with patriarchal gender relations (Andersen, 1994, p. 341). This coupling of a nonmaterialist account of patriarchy with a materialist account of capitalism is the foundation of dual-system theory. Juliet Mitchell is an example of a socialist feminist using dual-system theory to analyze women's oppression. Mitchell



discusses the family as well as women's relation to capital. Mitchell believes that some aspects of women's family life is economic, "the result of change made in the mode of production across space and through time" (Tong, 1989, p. 176). The other aspects, she believes, are biosocial, "the results of the interplay between female biology and the social environment" (Tong, 1989, p. 176). She continues and argues that other aspects are ideological, "Resulting of the ideas society has about the way in which women should relate to men" (Tong, 1989, p. 176). Therefore, according to Mitchell and many other socialist feminists, women will only be liberated if the defeat of capitalism is accompanied by the defeat of patriarchy.

Mitchell's book, Women's Estate, is the basis of her dual-system theory. In this book she explores women's relation to capital. Mitchell suggests that "Women's status and function are jointly determined by her role in production and in reproduction, the socialization of children, and sexuality" (Tong, 1989, p. 176).

An example of unified-system theory is seen in the work of Iris Young. Young believes that only socialist feminism can explain gender-biased capitalism. She argues that through socialist feminism, we are granted a view of what capitalism really is, was, and always will be. This is, she suggests, "essentially and fundamentally a patriarchy" (Tong, 1989, p. 184). Young wrote of her thesis, "My thesis is that marginalization of women and thereby our functioning as a secondary labor force is an essential and fundamental characteristic of capitalism" (p. 184). According to her thesis, Young

suggests that we live in a patriarchal capitalism/capitalist patriarchy. She insists that capitalism and patriarchy are "Siamese twins" (Tong, 1989, p. 185).

Like Young, Alison Jaggar works towards a unified-system theory. Jaggar, as well as other socialist feminists, Adrienne Rich and Dorothy Dinnerstein, suggest that alienation identifies women's oppression. However, Jaggar believes that this alienation is a phenomenon peculiar to capitalist patriarchy (Tong, 1989). "Under capitalism, women's oppression takes the form of her alienation from everything and everyone, especially herself, that could be a source of integration for her" (p. 189). According to Jaggar, we must fully understand this aspect of women's oppression before liberation can occur.

### Radical Feminism

Radical feminism views gender inequality as due to neither ignorance, a lack of freedom, nor to capitalism; but rather, it is the result of the collective efforts of men to dominate, control, and exploit women (Johnson, 1995, p. 111). Thus, unlike the liberal, marxist, socialist feminism, radical feminism does not see the capitalist social structure as the starting point for feminist analysis. Radical feminism sees "capitalism, militarism, hierarchy, and competition as manifestations of core patriarchal values and beliefs and vehicles through which men maintain dominance" (Johnson, 1995, p. 111). Accordingly, for women's liberation to occur, we must see how

men dominate major institutions that enable them to shape the world in ways that reinforce their collective dominance. We must eliminate patriarchy.

Radical feminism defines patriarchy as a "sexual system of power in which the male possesses superior power and economic privilege" (Andersen, 1995, p. 356, citing Eisenstein, 1979). They view this privilege of power, patriarchy, as the basis of social relations and as more fundamental than class relations in determining women's experiences (Andersen, 1994, p. 356). Other radical feminists are more explicitly tied to marxism. However, the current work within radical feminism is "totally apart from the materialist thesis in marxist work, locating the causes of oppression solely within patriarchal culture and its control of women" (Andersen, 1994, p. 356).

An example of this form of radical feminism can be found in the writings of Mary Daly. Daly sees patriarchal institutions as "creating myths and forms of social organization that constrain women to exist in male-centered worlds" (Andersen, 1995, p. 358). In her book, Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism, Daly (1990) describes why she is compelled to write about the ills of patriarchy and what it is doing to women. She discusses her writing as follows: "I wrote to expose the atrocities perpetrated against women under patriarchy on a planetary scale and to show the profound connection among these Goddess-murdering atrocities" (p. xxiv).

Daly believes that women under patriarchy live under phallographic rule and are confined to very few roles. The role most often

assigned to women is the one of vessel/carrier, directed and controlled by men (Daly, 1990, p. xxvi). Men control women by establishing their reality for them. Daly argues that men create this false reality for women by posing and hiding certain questions, questions with androcentric answers (Daly, 1990, p. xxxv). She believes that it is the task of feminists to ask and answer questions that place women in the center. These questions and answers will reveal women's reality. Daly states, "it is the task of feminists to con-questioning, con-questing for the deep sources of the questions" (p. xxxv).

Daly has been criticized for her search for reality by Audre Lorde. Lorde's objection of Daly's search was that Daly failed to discuss the reality of women of color. Daly's failure to name "Black Goddesses" in her study excluded their reality (Daly, 1990, p. xxx). Therefore, Lorde argued that only half of women's reality was being told.

As Mary Daly's work illustrates, many radical feminists argue that men's control of women cannot be simply explained on the basis of class oppression. As Gayle Rubin (Andersen, 1994) states,

no analysis of the reproduction of labor can explain foot-binding, chastity belts, or any of the incredible array of Byzantine, fetishized indignities, let alone the more ordinary ones, which have been inflicted upon women in various times and places. (p. 357).

Another radical feminist theorists is Catherine Mackinnon. A major theme in MacKinnon's work is the notion that gender is not a basic difference, but a hierarchy. Treating gender as a difference

results in a bipolar distinction. This opposition legitimatizes the way gender is enforced through strict gender role expectations. Yet, gender is not recognized as being forced upon persons because of "static descriptions of gender as a biological or social or mythic or semantic partition, engraved or inscribed or inculcated by god, nature, society (agents unspecified), the unconscious, or the cosmos" (MacKinnon, 1987, p. 3). This only results in the perpetuation of the status quo, male domination.

### Postmodern Feminism

The fundamentally skeptical attitudes about existing knowledge makes postmodernism appealing to feminists (Andersen, 1995, p. 375). Many feminists are attracted to postmodernism because of the assumption that nothing is essentially male or female; but rather socially constructed categories developed through culture and history, not biology. With the unity of postmodernism and feminism comes an emphasis on diversity in experiences and a focus on the unique (Andersen, 1995, p. 376).

One of the most attractive aspects of postmodernism to many feminists is its focus on difference, or the status of other. By this I am referring to the postmodern assumption that women have historically and continue to be created and defined as other by men whom control discourse. Most notably is Simone de Beauvoir, a postmodern feminist/existentialist feminist. In her book, The Second Sex written in 1949, de Beauvoir challenges the male definitions of

women and urges women to define themselves. She also urges women to develop this definition of themselves outside of the male/female dyad (de Beauvoir, 1989, pp. x-xlii). A woman must think of herself as more than ovaries, a uterus, and glands; because, according to de Beauvoir, "these peculiarities imprison her in her subjectivity, circumscribe her within the limits of her own nature" (de Beauvoir, 1989, p. xxi).

Simone de Beauvoir also urged women to place themselves at the center of analysis instead of being the object, other, of analysis. Many feminists echoed this suggestion and theory upon the assumption that women must recover their own voices and develop their own knowledge.

According Rosemarie Tong, there are three postmodern feminist perspectives. These perspectives are derived from the works of Helene Cixous, Luce Irigaray, and Julia Kristeva. Helene Cixous believes that masculine writing has reigned over feminine writing. This has placed feminine writing in the realm of "other" (Tong, 1989, pp. 223-226). As a result, women exist in men's terms, or not at all (Tong, 1989, pp. 223-226). This status of other marginalizes women and devalues any contribution women make to society, e.g., academe.

Luce Irigaray seeks to liberate the feminine from the type of male philosophical thought that Cixous describes. Irigaray believes that the only women we know is the phallic feminine (Tong, 1989, pp. 226-229). The phallic feminine are women as men see them, not as women define themselves. When women define themselves in ways that do

not reflect man, they do not exist (Tong, 1989, pp. 226-229). Although Irigaray was exploring issues of women's sexuality, her logic is applicable to the realm of higher education.

Julia Kristeva believes that there is one dominant group that establishes the definitions for the society. This group consists of wealthy, white males. This group scapegoats others for the ills of the society. The scapegoating of certain excluded groups from the dominant is grounded in the abject, or an irrational sense of disgust traceable to the infant's pre-Oedipal experiences with its own body and that of its mother. Society has a fundamental problem with the abject, the feminine (Tong, 1989, pp. 229-231). Therefore, as the abject women are once again discriminated against.

In general, postmodern feminist theory is "pragmatic and fallibilistic" (Nicholson, 1990, p. 35). Postmodern feminist theory, as well as this research, tailors its methods and categories to the specific task at hand. This is done by using multiple categories, feminist methods, and feminist epistemologies. "In short, this theory would look more like a tapestry composed of threads of many different hues than one woven in a single color" (Nicholson, 1990, p. 35). I believe that this aspect of postmodern feminist theory is essential to this current study because it recognizes the diversity of women's needs and experiences.

#### Summary of Theory and Discrimination Against Women

Whatever the theoretical perspective, the conclusion is the

same, women are oppressed. Whether the causal factors are gender roles, gender stereotypes, economics, patriarchy, and/or the marginalization of voices, discrimination continues to occur against women. This discrimination befalls women of all roles, particularly those in male dominated areas. Higher education is just one example of a male dominated area where women are discriminated against. Any combination of these causal factors, or all of them taken together, assist in the creation of a chilly climate for women in academe. The chilly climate for women in academe is an environment where women are treated differently than men. Within this environment there are subtle communications "to women that they are not quite first-class citizens in the academic community" (Sandler, 1986, p. 1). This environment can be quite hostile towards women.

#### Discrimination Against Women in the Work World, Academe

Research is available to document the patriarchal power structure and phallogentric cultural climate that dominate the modern university. . . . Sexual, physical and psychological harassment are commonplace. (MacLean & Milovanivic, 1991, p. 63).

Such hostility is directed towards the female faculty member and establishes an atmosphere of tension within the classroom. Magda Gere Lewis found in her book, Without a Word: Teaching Beyond Women's Silence, that anger can be used in "Taking Our Place In The Academy" as a source of teaching and learning in response to this tension. However, anger also builds a wall of oppression that some woman academicians find impossible to climb (Gere Lewis, 1993, pp. 50-54).



Regardless, the tension and/or hostility itself persists.

What has been proven is the fact that individual women, all too often, fall victim to anti-female attitudes and behaviors in academe. The research, as summarized by Simeone, indicates that today women are more likely to be seen by academic men as less serious and less dedicated than academic men. Women also have less time devoted to their development by senior faculty and are often excluded from informal relationships with male colleagues and superiors. Women are less likely to be encouraged to enter certain fields and more likely to be discouraged from entering others. Women more often have their work evaluated less positively than it deserves and are seen and treated according to stereotypical roles (Simeone, 1987, p. 143).

Studies concerning gender stereotypes have consistently shown that in our culture, masculine traits, e.g., objectivity, independence, and self-confidence, are valued more than feminine traits, e.g., emotional, submissive, subjective, dependent, tactful, and gentle (Paludi & Strayer, 1985, p. 353). Women, as measured by the Beliefs About Women Scale (BAWS), are often depicted as less career interested, less intelligent, less decisive, less sexual, sillier, manipulative, and debilitated by menstruation (Belk & Snell, p. 410). Women are also regarded by men as less dominating, more vulnerable, more interpersonal, and more emotionally insightful than men (Belk & Snell, p. 410).

Traditionally masculine occupations such as lawyers, medical doctors, and office managers are perceived as being more prestigious,

are more socially valued, and consequently, receive higher pay rates. However, traditionally feminine occupations, such as elementary-school teacher, typist, librarian, and nurse, are perceived as being less prestigious, are socially devalued, and consequently, receive low pay rates. Studies have also found that men are rated superior to women on a variety of different tasks (Paludi & Strayer, 1985, pp. 359-360). We may have come a long way, however, as these studies demonstrate, sex stereotypes continue to prejudicially influence our attitudes and behavior toward women as individuals and as a group.

#### Discrimination Against Women in the Social Sciences

Mariam K. Chamberlain, editor of Women In Academe: Progress and Prospects, found that "the social sciences in general have been in a period of transition, moving rapidly toward sex-neutral status" (Chamberlain, 1988, p. 225). The proportion of women in Sociology, for example, over the past decade has reached the same level as that for Psychology, the largest field for women. However, the numbers are much smaller than we have been led to believe. Only 45.0% of those in the field of Sociology are women (approximately 227 women) (Chamberlain, 1988, p. 226). The number of women receiving doctorates exceeded that of men in 1985 but fell below 50% in 1986 (Chamberlain, 1988, p. 226). The increase in number and proportion of Social Science doctorates awarded to women over a ten-year period has translated into considerable improvement at the entry level, but not in upper reaches of the faculty (Chamberlain, 1988, pp. 228-229). Women

are also under represented in departmental administrative positions in Sociology, as well as many other disciplines (Chamberlain, 1988, p. 229).

A 1987 study, conducted by Joyce Bennet Justus, Sandoria B. Freitag, and Leann L. Parker, comparing the University of California with research institutions nationwide concluded that female faculty were more likely to be grouped in the lower ranks and temporary positions than their male cohorts. The study also found that women faculty were working at less prestigious community colleges, women's colleges, and small liberal arts colleges rather than at the big ten or research institutions. Women were found to be paid less, received tenure less, and granted academic promotions at a much slower rate than male faculty. Women were also found to be concentrated in certain disciplines such as English, Education, Foreign Languages, Nursing, Home Economics, Fine Arts, and Library Sciences. They were also under represented in disciplines such as Engineering, Business, and the Hard Sciences (Welch, 1990, p. 246).

### The Issue of Race

Frances A. Maher and Mary Kay Thompson Tetreault in their book, The Feminist Classroom, include issues of race. I, on the other hand, was unable to explore the racial issues experienced by minority instructors in this study due to the limited population from which I had to sample. What Maher and Tetreault found was that women of color, not surprisingly, face many obstacles in higher ed-

ucation that others do not. These obstacles include problems with non-traditional students, disproportionate teaching loads, marginalization within departmental power structures, ignorance about and trivialization of their research, extra difficulties in gaining tenure, and the absence of voice and input (Maher & Tetreault, 1994, pp. 5-6). James and Farmer have declared "African American women in white institutions should get combat pay" because of the discrimination they endure (James & Farmer, 1993, p. 212).

Minority women are even more isolated from their colleagues than Caucasian women and face hostility from men as well as women of all colors (Sandler, 1992, p. 2). They are more likely to be seen as the token faculty member, regardless of their qualifications. As Elizabeth Hadley Freydborg cogently argues (James & Farmer, 1993),

the paradigm of exclusion is consistently played out in academia. . . . There are numerous and increasing stories related by and about my sisters experiencing mental breakdowns, attempting suicides, paranoia, neurological infirmities and hypertension caused by stress in the extreme. (p. 52).

We must remain sensitive to the Eurocentric and patriarchal nature of our society and acknowledge the oppression and discrimination that minority women face that is even more pronounced than that of white women. This is due to the double jeopardy of being a women and a minority in our society. According to Maher and Tetreault (1994), citing Moses, (1989),

black women are expected to work very hard, be very quiet, and be very grateful that they have a job. White women are expected to be just as quiet, but they do not have to work as hard or be as grateful. White males can do whatever they want. . . . As a result of this kind of discrimination. . . minority men and all women spend a higher proportion of their time

teaching and advising rather than engaging in original research. (p. 6)

I believe that this holds true for women of other cultures as well as women of color. Women of ethnic origins, other than that of the dominant group, face oppression and discrimination.

### The Issue of Tenure

Women in academe are very often under represented in tenure-track and tenured positions. The following quotations taken from 1996 university reports (University of Michigan and Yale University) depict the tenure and overall crisis for women in academe. As it has been established, women are under represented at all levels of higher education. According to Hoover (1996),

women are significantly under represented in executive ranks and professorships at the University of Michigan. . . . Women hold about 12 percent of the university's full professorships, up from about 6 percent 15 years ago. Women also hold 22 percent of the tenured and tenure-track positions at U-M, compared with an average of 35 percent at all institutions nationwide. (p. 1)

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, although women have come along way, progress is very slow and to some extent, things may be regressing instead of progressing for women in academe. Ligh (1996) states that "women constitute less than ten percent of tenured faculty members in the Faculty of Arts and sciences, and professors said progress in tenuring women professors has slowed in the past years" (p. 1).

At elite universities, the proportion of the female tenured faculty members are much smaller than at other campuses. For in-

stance, at Stanford only 13.3% of the tenured faculty are women and at Yale the proportion is 13.8% (Wilson, 1997, p. A10). This seems to be quite a dismal situation for women on elite campuses. Nationwide, the picture isn't any better, since only 25% of the tenured faculty are women (Wilson, 1997, pA10). There seems to be a serious problem here; one that reflects the patriarchal nature of our society. Wilson (1997) states that

reaching the top tier of any segment of American society has always been difficult for those who have historically been left out. . . . Even though a department may vote in favor of a candidate, there may be people in the minority who have access to folks higher up in the process. (p. A10)

Other forms of data confirm these findings, such as the data presented by Frank A. Buckless, Susan P. Ravenscroft, and Amelia A. Baldwin-Morgan, in their study entitled, "The Academic Underclass: Accounting For Women As Adjuncts." In their study, the authors found that the barriers to tenure-track are higher for women than they are for men. Women tend to hold lower ranks than men on average and are less often granted tenure (Buckless, Ravenscroft & Baldwin-Morgan, 1996). Tenure rules are established and "designed by white males for white males" (Hoover, 1996).

Stephen Kulis's study also shows an overall crisis for women in academe. In the study, "Gender Segregation among College and University Employees," Kulis found that research oriented institutions hire proportionally fewer women for nearly all jobs categories, especially tenure-track jobs. However, public institutions appeared more likely to hire women faculty, but only for non-tenure-track positions. Ku-

lis found that an inverse relationship existed for tenure-track and tenured hires (Kulis, 1997, p. 165).

### Discrimination Against Women as Leaders

Sadly, many other studies have supported these findings. Women remain under represented in tenured and other full-time faculty positions, as well as in executive and administrative positions. In many instances, women are not seen as leaders. Natalie Porter, Florence Lindauer Geis, and Joyce Jennings found in their study, "Are Women Invisible as Leaders?" that "sex stereotypes still control social judgments, and that discrimination operates nonconsciously and in spite of good intentions" (Porter, Geis, & Jennings, 1983, p. 1035).

A.M. Morrison and M.A. Von Glinow support this conclusion and cite several studies indicating that "gender stereotypes suggesting that women are inappropriate for leadership positions are so strong that contrary data are often ignored" (Burn, 1996, p. 75). The report by the U.S Department of Labor (1991) on the glass ceiling also cited research that showed that "a majority of women in both line and staff positions had leader-style management skills and a greater proportion of women in staff positions displayed a greater leadership orientation than men" (Burns, 1996, p. 74). This is rarely recognized. S.A. Darley suggested that we have a tendency to make inferences about individuals based on our dominant images of traditional male and female roles. "We may forget that the nurturing, emotional,

people-oriented wife-mother can be assertive, rational high-achiever in her work role" (Burn, 1996, p. 75). These are all crucial findings, especially since teachers are the leaders of the classroom. Their contributions to academe continue to be overlooked, and devalued, if not ignored altogether. At this rate, it seems as if we may never be able to establish a climate in higher education that is truly supportive, encouraging, and most importantly, representative of women and the contributions we have made, make, and will continue to make.

#### Attribution About Women's Success

Even when women faculty are acknowledged and are represented in male dominated fields of study or granted tenure, their success is attributed to luck. Their male colleagues' success, however, is attributed to skill. Janet K. Swim and Lawrence J. Sanna in their study, "He's Skilled, She's Lucky: A Meta-Analysis of Observers' Attributions for Women's and Men's Successes and Failures," reported the following findings. They showed that on average, people have different expectations for women and men in their traits, role behaviors, occupations, physical appearances and abilities (Swim & Sanna, 1996, p. 507).

There are two primary interpretations of these findings. The first interpretation is brought forth by K. Deaux. Deaux argued that performances that are consistent with gender expectations are attributed to internal causes, like the individual's ability. Whereas,



performances inconsistent with gendered expectations are attributed to external causes, like individual lucky (Swim & Sanna, 1996, p. 508).

The second interpretation, proposed by R.D. Hansen and V.E. O'Leary, stands in contrast to the first interpretation. Hansen and O'Leary argued that ability and luck do not clearly represent internal and external causes. Instead, they concentrate on the compensatory relationship between attributions in terms of augmenting and discounting, with attributions to effort and luck indicating a discounting of ability as a cause of performance (Swim & Sanna, 1996, p. 508). The researchers found that a woman's ability was more likely to be discounted than a man's when making attributions for her performance. For example, if a woman succeeds in a task, the task is seen as being easy or she is seen as being lucky. This was also more likely to occur for a woman performing a masculine task, e.g., succeeding in a masculine field of study or research.

Nonetheless, no matter what the interpretation, the findings are the same. Women's successes are often attributed to external causes and not to an internal cause such as a woman's ability. Women are seen as working on easier tasks, in easier disciplines, and as having better luck than their male colleagues. Women and their work continue to be devalued by gendered expectations that perpetuate the notion that women have low ability and low performance levels as compared with men (Swim & Sanna, 1996, p. 508). The bottom line is that a person's gender "affects the ways in which they are perceived

particularly in terms of competence and ability" and women's behavior is perceived as different, and consequently it is devalued (Sandler, 1992, p. 10). These sexist attitudes are reflected in every way.

### Bias Against Women's Titles

Similar to Swim and Sanna, Bernice Resnick Sandler found that female and male students viewed their male professors' success as due to talent, while female professors' success was attributed to luck or affirmative action (Sandler, 1991, p. 8). With this in mind, it seems only logical that Sandler in her study, "Women Faculty at Work in the Classroom, or Why, it Still Hurts to be a Women in Labor," reported that students would address female professors as "Miss," "Mrs.," "Ms.," instead of "Professor" or "Dr." (Sandler, 1991, p. 8). This is a blatant disregard for the female professor's authority and expertise. Here the students dismiss the status associated with obtaining a doctorate for women.

This present dissertation study looks at female graduate instructors. In doing so we must remember that these women do not have the status associated with the title of doctor. Nor do they have the status associated with the male gender. When no specific status cue is present, people rely on gender to determine status. In accordance with traditional sexist gender stereotypes, men hold a higher status than women. My expectation for this study is that female graduate instructors' knowledge and ability will be devalued by their stu-

dents, similarly to what has been reported to occur for female professors. I further expect that the devaluation might be even stronger, because female graduates do not have the tittle "Dr."

A study conducted by Kenneth L. Dion entitled, "What's in a Title? The Ms. Stereotype and Images of Women's Titles of Address," explores the issue of titles used by women and the images they evoke. Dion found that the title "Ms." elicits expectations and images that are both positive and negative. On the positive side, women who are addressed as Ms. are seen by both sexes as motivated towards achievement and as more socially assertive and dynamic. On the negative side, the title "Ms." also evokes in both sexes images of a person with less interpersonal warmth and less likelihood of fulfilling interpersonal goals (Dion, 1987, p. 29).

The images Dion found to be positives are really negatives images for women in academe. If a female professor is seen as an assertive person, she is acting too masculine. If she is seen as a person with less interpersonal warmth, she is not fulfilling her gender role. The end result is often the devaluation and discrimination of the female professors by her students. This discrimination may be even worse for female graduate instructors. In addition to not having the status or title of doctor, and the problem of often being designated with the problematic "Ms." title, female graduate instructors may be seen as even more masculine or cold (not fulfilling their gender roles) because they are in a male dominated occupation, where associations, expectations, and standards are deter-

mined by men.

### The Issue of Student Evaluation, Devaluation, and Behavior

Susan A. Basow and Nancy T. Silberg studied student evaluations of professors. They found that both male and female students discriminated against women academicians. In their study, Basow and Silberg surveyed over 1,080 college students (553 men, 527 women). The students were to evaluate their professors (16 male and female professors) in terms of: teaching effectiveness, scholarship, organization/clarity, instructor-group interaction, instructor-individual student interaction, dynamism/enthusiasm, and sex-typed characteristics. The sex-type characteristics included a look at student perception of professor instrumental/active traits (masculine traits, such as assertive, dominant) and nurturant/expressive traits (feminine traits, such as warm, understanding) (Basow & Silberg, 1987 p. 308). A two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANVOA; Teacher Sex X Student Sex) was performed by using individual student ratings of Question # 1 (overall teaching ability) and all five factors of the teaching rating form (Basow & Silberg, 1987 p. 310).

Basow and Silberg found that male students gave female professors significantly poorer ratings than they gave male professors on teaching evaluation measures. Male students' ratings of female professors were poorer than those of female students (Basow & Silberg, 1987, p. 308). Female students also evaluated female professors less favorably than male professors (Basow & Silberg, 1987, p. 308). Stu-

dent perceptions of a professor's instructional/active and expressive/nurturant traits, which were positively related to student rating of teaching, accounted for only a few of these gender-related effects (Basow & Silberg, 1987, p. 308).

Sheila Kishler Bennett also examined student evaluations. In her study she had 253 students (enrolled in nonscience introduction courses at a liberal arts college) complete a course evaluation questionnaire which included: formal teaching performance, perceptual orientation scale, and indicators of degree and context of student-instructor contact (Bennett, 1982, p. 170). The sample included 11 female instructors and 28 male instructors (Bennett, 1982, p. 170). A principle factor analysis of perceptual orientation scales was used to "identify dimensions of cognitive orientation underlying student judgments of instructor's personal attributes and instructional style" (Bennett, 1982, p. 172).

What Bennett discovered was that "female and male instructors were found to be placed within a unitary perceptual frame of reference" (Bennett, 1982, p. 170). Female instructors were perceived as warmer and more appealing individuals and were required by students to offer greater interpersonal support (Bennett, 1982, p. 170). If this did not occur, the female instructors were judged more closely and critically than male instructors. Overall, Bennett's findings suggest that female faculty were required by students to behave in a manner that was congruent with their gender roles. Therefore, the findings suggest (Bennett, 1982) that "although direct gender bias

may not be observed in formal student evaluations of their instructors, female faculty members are nonetheless subject to culturally conditioned gender stereotypes" (p. 170).

The fact that female faculty receive lower student evaluation scores more often than male faculty may be explained by the students' devaluation of female expertise, scholarship, or contribution. This devaluation by students may take many forms. The behaviors include negative body language, skepticism of ability, disbelief, challenging authority, granting less credence, disrespect, and contradicting statements made by female faculty. Negative body language behaviors include, for example, turning away, lack of eye contact, and general inattentiveness (Sandler, 1992, p. 10). Lack of attendance, tardiness, leaving class earlier, talking during class, and doing other work during class are all examples of other behaviors that devalue female faculty members. All of these behaviors have been found to occur at a higher rate in female professors' classrooms than in male professors' classrooms (Sandler, 1992, p. 10). Compounded upon this gender discrimination is the additional devaluation that a female graduate instructor experiences because she is lacking the status associated with having a doctorate degree.

Sandler in her report entitled, "Success and Survival Strategies for Women Faculty Members," takes into account psychological explanations, as well as structural and social barriers for women in academe. Both studies found that student attitudes towards teachers recreate previous relations with authority figures, such as parents.

Both male and female students have gender-related expectations of their professors. They may expect the female faculty to be more caring and motherly than the male faculty. They may put more pressure on female faculty members for special treatment such as extending deadlines and increased individual attention (Sandler, 1992, p. 10). The gender role expectations of a stern, assertive, disciplinarian that are placed on the male teacher (father figure) by the students may be more easily confronted overtly. These roles may be negotiated by the male faculty member. However, the expectations placed on the female teacher (mother figure) for care and nurturance are less often open to negotiation. "A strong woman faculty member may be seen as rigid and controlling rather than intellectually rigorous and challenging" (Sandler, 1992, p 10). Students may become angrier at female faculty members who refuse to play the role of mother than at male faculty members acting the same way (Sandler, 1992, p. 10).

Sandler states that

at the same time that students may expect supportive behavior from female faculty members, they may nevertheless interpret such behavior as weakness, perhaps seeing it as too feminine. . . . But if a woman professors acts more assertive--like her male colleagues--she may be viewed as too masculine. (p. 10).

There are other studies exploring the issues involved in student evaluations of college professors that have focused on student expectations of faculty based on gender roles. For example, studies conducted by Susan A. Basow, and Nancy T. Silberg, as well as Sheila Kisher Bennett, have found that female professors were required by students to offer greater interpersonal support than male professors

(Bennett, 1982, p. 170). If this did not occur, the female professors were judged more harshly than their male colleagues. Males students were more likely to give female professors significantly poorer ratings than they gave male professors (Basow & Silberg, 1987, p. 308). These are some additional attempts to explain the existence of a chilly climate, an atmosphere that devalues women and freezes them out of the learning experience in higher education. The chilly climate also "communicates to women that they are not quite first-class citizens in the academic community" (Sandler, 1986, p. 1).

Sandler in her analysis entitled, "Women Faculty at Work in the Classroom, or, Why it Still Hurts to be a Women in Labor," studied the "chilly climate" for female faculty members. Her findings are similar to those of Frances A. Maher and Mary Kay Thompson Tetreault and other earlier noted studies. Students also rated their female professors more harshly than their male professors. All the studies report that male and female students have gender-related expectations for their professors. The studies also report that female faculty members are seen as mother figures by their students (Sandler, 1991, p. 7). When female professors are seen as being less available, their students respond to them with scowls and frowns as if their mother betrayed them (Sandler, 1991, p. 7).

The Issue of the Chilly Climate and the Discrimination Against Women

#### Chilly Attitudes Towards Women in Academe

Maher and Tetreault support what the previously mentioned studies



have found. They argue that students often respect male professors more than they do female professors. I believe that this fact alone establishes a discouraging environment for women. This environment can be hostile and disrespectful towards women in academe. Once this "chilly climate" is established, the foundation is laid for oppression and discrimination to continue. This discrimination against women's work in higher education and women as leaders in the classroom. In part, this discrimination is created by the perception that successful female academicians are either lucky, or bitchy because they seem to be too masculine. This perception supports the attitudes that devalue women's contributions and abilities. What ensues are disrespectful behaviors by students in female faculty's classrooms. This disrespectful behavior ranges from students not attending a female faculty member's class to direct verbal confrontation. Scholars in Sociologists for Women in Society articulated that this "chilly climate" presents many problems for women in higher education. To relieve some of the pressure and to help women cope, these scholars established workshops on how to survive in academe for women.

Maher and Tetreault look at the psychoanalytical concept of transference of gender roles from students to teachers as one explanation of the discrimination that occurs in women's classrooms. Their findings are similar to those already discussed here. These authors, however, go further. They pay particular attention to the newly strengthened banishment of feminist women that is occurring in

academe today.

In Judith Stacey, Susan Bereaud, and Joan Daniels' book, (1974) And Jill Came Tumbling After: Sexism in American Education, they found that it was not only men who were partaking in the discriminatory views against woman in academe, some women were also in on it. In the chapter entitled, "Are Women Prejudiced Against Women," Philip Goldberg reported that "women consider their own sex inferior and even when the facts give no support to this belief, they will persist in downgrading the competence, in particular, the intellectual and professional competence of their fellow females" (p. 37).

In our society both sexes consistently value men more than women, therefore, it was not hard for the researchers to confirm that "women automatically view their differences from men as deficiencies, this causes anti-female prejudice" (Stacey, Bereaud, & Daniels, 1974, p. 38). The authors also found that women continued to be more biased against other women than men in traditional male fields. The women in the study assessed males to be more competent than women in all of the fields tested (Stacey, Bereaud, & Daniels, 1974, pp. 40-41). They found a tendency for young female college students to downgrade the work of professional women and refuse to recognize them as equals to their male colleagues (Stacey, Bereaud, & Daniels, 1974, pp. 41-42). I believe that the study reveals discrimination against women as "not so much believing that women are inferior, as allowing that belief to distort one's perceptions of women" and their experiences (Stacey, Bereaud, & Daniels, 1974, p. 38).

### Bias Against Women's Issues and Experiences in Academe

Sandler, in her examination of academe, found that the distorted perceptions of women influences the way women's contributions are seen. For example, the "statements made by female faculty members are given less credence by students, male and female" (Sandler, 1991, pp. 8-9). Women in academe are scrutinized more by their students than males. As studies have demonstrated, women are not only seen as less competent, but things as insignificant as clothing, hair, and make-up become factors in evaluation of teaching abilities (Sandler, 1991, p. 9). If women even dare to include female experiences and perspectives in their classes, as Sandler found, they are "viewed by male students as radical feminists, in the pejorative sense of the term," and their "teaching role is beyond redemption" (Sandler, 1991, p. 10). This last quotation may seem a bit extreme, however, it exemplifies the climate in which female faculty must teach. This is also the climate in which female graduate instructors must teach.

Academic work done by women may also be delegitimated because it may introduce into the classroom issues that are seen as women's issues. These issues are devalued because they are perceived as being less important and unworthy of class time and discussion. Again, I believe that this is reflective of the negative association with anything female in our society. Sandler (1991) also reported that

male students seem to be uncomfortable with females in this role of authority; therefore to neutralize the situation the female professors becomes sexualized by the male student. . . .

A women faculty member is often viewed as an anomaly; she is not acting the way a typical woman is expected to act. Her very presence makes some of her students uncomfortable even before she speaks. (p. 11)

### Chilly Behaviors Towards Women in Academe

Virginia R. Brooks set out to investigate "whether dominance behavior in university classrooms would vary according to sex of student and/or sex of professor. If so, to identify which interactional effects would contribute most importantly to differences in dominance behavior" (Brooks, 1982, p. 685). Brooks reports her findings in her article entitled, "Sex Differences in Student Dominance Behavior in Female and Male Professors' Classrooms." Congruent with male gender characteristics, male students were found to exhibit significantly more aggressive behaviors than female students in their classes, no matter what the sex of their professor (Brooks, 1982, p. 683). However, significantly more male aggressiveness was expressed in female professors' classes than in male professors' classes (Brooks, 1982, p. 683). This aggressiveness in female professors' classes is part of the discrimination against women in academe.

Brooks' study discusses the power that men have in academe due to their privileged position in society. She identifies that this power resides in the ability to discriminate against others, namely, women. As Sue Davies, Cathy Lubelska, and Jocey Quinn, in their book, Changing The Subject: Women in Higher Education, (1994) quotes Millsom Henry as stating "the racist, sexist and elitist ideologies in society continue to be reflected and reinforced in the higher

education system" (p. 6). In other words, the power that men utilize to dominate women in society is also utilized to dominate women in the ivory towers of academe. Higher education, like society, is dominated by masculine values, masculine discourse, and masculine power (Davies, Lubelska, & Quinn, 1994, p. 5). It has been suggested that this pro-male, anti-female bias is manifest because gender is often used as a status cue (Paludi & Strayer, 1985, pp. 359-360). Gender grants a level of status that is a factor in the evaluation of scholarship, ability, and ultimately in the exclusion of women.

#### The Impact of the Chilly Climate and Discrimination Against Women

Although Barbara Bagilhole has argued that "women working in higher education are in privileged positions relative to many other women," women are still "in weak positions relative to most men within the academy" (Davies, Lubelska, & Quinn, 1994, pp. 5-6). Women are in a minority and experience all the problems of discrimination and isolation characteristic of groups in similar positions (Davies, Lubelska, & Quinn, 1994, pp. 17-18). "Women are outsiders in academia" (Davies, Lubelska, & Quinn, 1994, p. 5). Women are made to feel, due to this use/misuse of power, less confident, less willing to take risks, less able to negotiate for our needs. Many women experience marginality (Davies, Lubelska, & Quinn, 1994, pp. 17-18). Many may believe that we can just add women in academe and stir and there will be a harmonious assimilation, however not all the women will mix, some will fall out of the pot and others will get burned.

Davies, Lubelska, and Quinn found that women academics report "greater social isolation than men," and that women are "less integrated into university departments" (Davies, Lubelska, & Quinn, 1994, p. 18). This impacts behavior. For example, about two-thirds of women report that

they treat male and female students differently, and they in turn are treated differently by the students. They spend more time with female students and give them more support. In contrast, they sometimes get problems with male students who do not accept their status or authority as academics. . . . Male students are more difficult to deal with, they have the power of their maleness. Although it may not be in my mind it's in theirs and it makes it difficult to be assertive. Boys are skilled at manipulating women, they've done it all their lives. (p. 18)

Another form of the use/misuse of power and discrimination against women, that should be mentioned is sexual harassment. Davies reports the experiences of sexual harassment on college campuses for female professors. They discuss the problems of sexism and sexual harassment from male students. This was particularly so in the male-dominated disciplines in Engineering and Science (Davies, Lubelska, & Quinn, 1994, pp. 18-19). One woman was quoted as saying,

I stopped wearing mini-skirts following comments about my legs. I have to give as good as I get, sexual innuendo. I can handle it but some female staff find it more difficult. I treat the female students differently because they treat me differently. (p. 19)

Sexual harassment should be noted as a form of discrimination and an aspect of the chilly climate for women in academe. It was, however, an aspect that was beyond the purview of this research to study.

The Impact of the Chilly Climate and Discrimination  
on the Female Graduate Student

The "chilly climate" for faculty that Sandler and Hall describe in their work had developed from their earlier study of the climate for female students, The Classroom Climate: A Chilly One For Women?. What they explored was the experiences of females as undergraduate students on college campuses. This was also explored by Myra Sadker and David Sadker in their article, "Sexism in the Classroom: From Grade School to Graduate School." Both studies found that the classroom climate for women is not one of warm welcome. As it has been described throughout this chapter, the "chilly climate" is one that devalues, neglects, demeans, and marginalizes women. The Sadkers (1986) discuss four conclusions of their research. The four conclusions are summarized as follows:

1. Male students receive more attention from teachers and are given more time to talk in classrooms;
2. Educators are generally unaware of the presence or the impact of this bias;
3. Brief but focused training can reduce or eliminate sex bias from classroom instruction; and
4. Increasing equity in classroom interaction increases the effectiveness of the teachers as well. Equity and effectiveness are not competing concerns; they are complementary. (p. 512)

All the noted studies confirm what Sandler and Hall found in an study entitled, The Campus Climate Revisited: Chilly for Women Faculty, Administrators, and Graduate Students. In this study, Sandler and Hall reported that women in academe are bombarded with "a host of subtle personal and social barriers. . . that limit female faculty and administrators productivity and advancement" (Sandler &

Hall, 1986, p. 2). A summary of what the authors also found to be denigrating experiences for women in academe, particularly female graduate students, are as follows:

1. Female accomplishments are downgraded;
2. Female abilities are more likely to be questioned, subjected to greater scrutiny and/or ignored than those of males;
3. Female conversations with other women are viewed as unimportant;
4. Activities concerning females are seen as less valuable;
5. Field identification with females are downgraded. (pp. 6-7)

They also found that females were judged on different dimensions than males. For example, males and females are treated differently on their appearance. Females were assessed as follows:

1. Females are more likely to be judged by attractiveness;
2. Female faculty that are inattentive to their dress may be seen as sloppy;
3. Females are downgraded if they do not dress in a feminine style. (p. 9)

Sue Vartuli, editor of The Ph.D. Experience: A Woman's Point of View, discusses the many perils faced by female graduate students rather than undergraduates. The book brings into the readers reality the intense experiences, the common anxieties, doubts, and concerns that many women in academe experience. These experiences are very similar to those of the female undergraduates, but intensified. Vartuli puts into words the baptism by fire that graduate students, particularly female students, endure.

One aspect of jumping through the hoops of fire is relentless questioning. Women who chose academics as a career are continuously questioned, and hence, grow to question their own abilities. They



are also constantly weighing their education against their other roles and commitments in ways that men could never fathom (Vartuli, 1982, p. x). For example, a female graduate student with a family may feel the pressures of graduate work exacerbated because they detract from the time she spends with her family. She may feel as if she must choose between her work and her family. When she is spending time with her family, she may feel as if she should be doing work, and vice versa. She may question whether she spending enough time with her spouse and/or children. Is she a bad spouse, mother, person? The stress associated with this process may seem at times to be unbearable. I am constantly questioning, what I am doing this for? How much more can I take?

Catherine G. Krupnick also discusses the perils for female graduate students. For example, female graduate students experience low self-esteem in comparison with male graduate students. This is especially pronounced in fields where women are under represented. Female graduate students have less trust than most male graduate students in their own judgments, and a greater fear of making a mistake (Krupnick, p. 23). This maybe due to the fact that women are judged more harshly than men in academe, as illustrated by the earlier noted studies.

Yet, the questioning does not end there. Female graduate students are "forced into this proving ground" called the old boys network. They must play the complex games of the male world throughout their career. This network and games/politics can make a women feel

very alone and very vulnerable (Vartuli, 1982, p. x).

All this may seem to be quite a sizable barrier for women in academe to overcome. As the studies seem to suggest, women are challenged and their abilities questioned from all sides. This literature explores the challenging, questioning of ability, and ultimately the devaluation of the female graduate instructor by her students. The methods I use to research this phenomenon may be found in the next chapter.

## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN

#### Introduction

The goal of this study is to contribute to the literature and research regarding women's experiences in academe, particularly female graduate instructors. I believe that this may be done by studying students' behaviors within the classroom, student evaluations of scholarship, and attitudes towards women and feminism. This examination was divided into three methodological stages. Stage I included unobtrusive observations and the tallying of verbal and nonverbal hostile behaviors of the students. Stage II included a survey which was made-up of two parts. The first part of the student survey consisted of four article abstracts and evaluation statements for responses. The second part of the survey consisted of the FEM Scale, which measures attitudes towards women and feminism. Stage III included a consciousness-raising debriefing of the survey population.

The present study examined a population of undergraduate students enrolled in introductory Sociology courses (Principles of Sociology) taught by graduate instructors. This was done to determine the impact of the graduate instructor's sex and the students' attitudes towards women on the students' behavior in class, as well as their assessments of scholarship based on the sex of the scholar. Introductory courses were chosen because I believed that it would

give me greater access to the population of first and second year undergraduate students. I chose an introductory course because I wanted to access the attitudes of the students before they became sensitized to the issues of sex discrimination. Sexism is an issue which very often arises in Sociology courses, so older students might have more exposure and sensitivity than younger students. I wanted to minimize this potential confounding factor.

### Research Questions

As seen in Chapter II, the literature has abundantly supported the notion that women in higher education are devaluated by their colleagues, superiors, and students. Yes, there really is a chilly climate for females, both faculty and students, in academe. This study questioned whether this devaluation by students is expressed through hostile, dominant, and/or disrespectful behavior within the female graduate instructors' classrooms. The research questions are as follows:

1. Is women's scholarship devalued by students?
2. Are students' attitudes towards women and/or feminism sexist?
3. Is there a chilly, hostile classroom climate for female graduate instructors?
4. Does devaluation lead to chilly behaviors?
5. Are attitudes towards women and/or feminism factors that lead to the chilly, hostile classroom climate for female graduate

instructors?

From this point on in this study I will use the terms chilly climate and hostile climate interchangeably. I believe that the terms both incorporate many behaviors, such as devaluation, dominance, and disrespect. All these forms behaviors are explored in this present study.

### Population and Sample

The population sampled was students in an institution of higher education. Specifically, a convenience sample was taken from the population of undergraduate students in the Sociology Department at Western Michigan University. This sample included students enrolled in Principles of Sociology, an introductory course taught by two male and two female graduate instructors, during the Winter semester of 1997.

The four graduate instructors' classes were chosen to participate in the study because of access, as well as the similar nature of the instructors. All were white, similar looking in age, dress and teaching style. This was done to control for as many variables as possible, other than gender, which may effect student behavior in the classroom. Approaching the four graduate instructors was not a simple task. I was met with some resistance. One male and one female were very excited and willing to grant access to their classes; however, the other two instructors were suspicious of the study. Both were concerned that the study was going to criticize their

teaching abilities. The male was concerned with the ethics of the study and wanted to see the research instrument before he would agree to have his class participate. I set their minds at ease when I sent all four of the graduate instructors a letter explaining the focus and nature of the study. In the letter I reassured the instructors that I was not there to observe or critique their teaching styles.

Trust between myself and the four instructors was important to establish. This was so because it had not already been established based upon our similar status as graduate students and instructors alone. Although the graduate student/instructor culture at our institution is supportive, competition still exists. I mention this because I believe it describes the nature of the relationship between the researcher and the graduate instructor participants. I also mention this because, during the observation stage of the study, trust was imperative. I needed the graduate instructors to carry-out their class lectures as if I was not present, i.e., to not alter their behavior.

Within all four graduate instructors' classes, a total of 238 students were registered. Therefore, a possible 238 students could be observed during the unobtrusive observation stage (Stage I) of the study.

During the survey stage (Stage II) of the study, 187 students participated. A total of 51 students that were registered for the classes did not fill out the survey. Fifty students were absent across the four classes the day the survey was passed out, whether

not attending for just that day or unofficially withdrawing from the class. One student signed the consent form, however, she did not properly complete the questionnaire. This data was coded as missing. Therefore, there were 186 completed surveys out of 187 collected. The sample population for Stage II was the same sample population for Stage III of the study, the consciousness-raising debriefing of survey respondents.

#### Stage I: Unobtrusive Observations

Let me digress by re-introducing the two studies that I used to create the method for my research. The first study entitled, "Sex Differences in Student Dominance Behavior in Female and Male Professors' Classrooms," was done in 1982 by Virginia R. Brooks. Brooks sought to provide a comparison of male and female dominance behavior in the classroom and a measure of the contextual effect of sex of professor on the interrelatedness of sex, status, and dominance (Brooks, 1982, p. 683). The main difference between this and the present study was that I used graduate instructors. Brooks' method of research assumed that

quantification of spontaneous verbal behavior in a natural competitive setting would be a more accurate index of male and female dominance behavior and of interactional effects of sex and status than either self-report, role-playing, or videotape methods, which might allow misrepresentation of actual behavior. (p. 686)

The subjects Brooks included were first-year graduate students in social work. Verbal behavior of these students were tape recorded and hand noted by the researcher in 16 class periods with both male

and female professors. In this current study, however, I hand noted visual and verbal behaviors on paper only. I did not utilize audio tape recording because I believe that audio tapes would lack the ability to detect many of the visual hostile behaviors of the subjects. This may be seen as a limitation of this study. A video recording of the class lectures may have increased the accuracy of the tallied observations. This method is however more obtrusive, and therefore, may have influenced student and instructor behavior more than just my presence in the classroom.

The verbal behaviors that were recorded by Brooks (1982) as well as myself, included the following:

1. Number of times students speak,
  2. Length of time students speak,
  3. Number of times female students interrupt other male and/or female students,
  4. Number of times male students interrupt other male and/or female students,
  5. Number of times male/female students interrupt professors.
- (p. 687)

I have added to this list a number of other verbal behaviors. I developed this list through my experiences over three years as a graduate instructor, as well as through extensive discussions with other graduate instructors and professors. The variety of conversations consisted of our ideas of what hostile behaviors encompassed. The end result is a list of common experiences and behaviors that have been perceived by graduate instructors and professors as hostile, disrespectful behaviors. The added verbal behaviors are as follows:

6. Talking to other students during lectures.



7. Laughing at statements made by the instructor (when not applicable).

8. Sighing at statement made by the instructor.

9. Direct verbal confrontation with the instructor.

10. Speaking without raising their hand (if applicable).

The nonverbal behaviors that I had chosen to add to the list were developed similarly to those added to the verbal behaviors list.

The nonverbal behaviors that were recorded included:

1. Tardiness (without prior faculty knowledge).

2. Leaving class early (without prior faculty knowledge).

3. Rolling of eyes in disapproval or disagreement.

4. Crossing of arms in disapproval or disagreement.

5. Sleeping in lectures.

6. Passing notes during lectures.

7. Doing other work during class (e.g., other class work, adjusting one's schedule, doing their nails, etc. . .).

8. Leaving class to get a snack or other.

9. Reading newspaper or other materials.

10. Packing-up before class is dismissed.

11. Checking the clock.

12. Restlessness.

13. Sleepy posture.

14. Drawing, doodling.

Other items recorded included the sex of instructor, number of female/male students present, lecture topic, and time of lecture.

The twist that I have added to Brook's study, other than the additional verbal and nonverbal behaviors, is an analysis of undergraduate student behavior within the classroom (Sociology 200: Principles of Sociology) rather than graduate students. I recorded similar student behaviors as did Brooks, however, I broadened the scope of the study by examining hostile student behavior within the classroom directed towards the female graduate instructors, as noted earlier. I observed three classes of each of the four graduate teacher participants, two male and two female. I observed a total of 12 classes. This was done so that a comparison of the findings between the female and male classes would be possible.

Brooks (1982) used chi-square analyses based on grouped data from all the monitored classes to find statistical significance. This also allowed for the sex ratios in male and female professors' classes to be determined. I too used chi-square analyses for significance testing, as well as Cramer's V to assess the level(s) of association between frequencies and percentages. I used T-tests because of the relatively small data set. I had to collapse the data on many of the dimensions of hostile/chilly behaviors because of small "n's." For example, the number of observed behaviors that fell within the categories of leaving class early and leaving class for a snack (or other reasons) were so small that I combined the observations. I combined the category of sleeping in class with the category of sleepy posture. I also combined the category of doing other work during class with the category of reading newspapers (or other

materials). The category of drawing, doodling, was combined with the category of checking the clock/restlessness. The category of packing up before the end of class was excluded from the statistical analysis because there were no observed behaviors that occurred without the instructors' cue that class had ended.

The unobtrusive observations were done prior to the surveying of the sample because I did not wish to effect the students' behavior in the classroom, or sensitize the students to the issue of gender and/or discrimination. The students' exposure to the survey may heighten their awareness of what is to be observed. This is also the reason that I had chosen to include introductory courses instead of upper level courses. To reiterate, first year students may be less educated about gender discrimination.

## Stage II: Survey Data

### Part 1: Abstract Evaluations

The second study I draw upon was conducted by Philip Goldgerg. Goldgerg investigated whether there was prejudice by women against women and how women perceived their own sex (Stacey, Bereaud, & Daniels, 1974, p. 39). The study explored women's attitudes and prejudice towards other women. In my study, I included male students as well as female students to see if there is any difference between the prejudice, perceptions, and ultimately the devaluation of female scholars by male students versus female students. Although the literature clearly suggests that women are devalued within the realm

of higher education, I wish to re-establish these findings and build upon them by exploring the hostile, chilly climate for female graduate instructors. The hypothesis of Goldgerg's study was "even when the work is identical, women value the professional work of men more highly than that of women" (Stacey, Bereaud, & Daniels, 1974, p. 39).

In testing this hypothesis, Goldberg compiled six articles from varying fields and combined them into two sets of booklets. The participants were asked to evaluate the scholarship of the authors. For this study, I compiled four short article abstracts related to the fields of Sociology. I used article abstracts instead of full length article due to time constraints. The article abstracts were taken from the American Sociological Review. The article abstracts displayed authorship by two females and two males. To eliminate any other effects on the student evaluations, the authors did not bear any status ques, like, "Dr.", nor did a school affiliation appear on the article abstract. The authors names were fictitious to preclude any possibility of recognition, and therefore, student bias.

Although the sex of the author in this dissertation study is a variable, this should not be interpreted as the sex of the author effecting their scholarly contribution. I do not support the notion that value of scholarship is dependant upon the sex of the author, so I randomly attributed sex of the author to the article abstracts.

The criteria used to select the article abstracts reflected the findings in Elaine Martin's article entitled, "Power and Author-

ity in the Classroom: Sexist Stereotypes in Teaching Evaluations."

In the article, Martin discusses the findings of many studies. One study in particular found that reviewers of articles tended to evaluate journal articles more favorably when the sex of the author was consistent with the stereotypes of the discipline (Martin, 1984, p. 485). This study conducted by Harriet Mischel found evidence that women may be considered superior workers only when they stay within their traditional roles (Martin, 1984, p. 485). Therefore, I did not choose article abstracts within Sociology fields or areas that are male or female dominated. This was done so as to not impact the evaluations, and to isolate sex of the author as a variable. For example, a female writing on a topic such as nursing maybe seen as more credible than a male author. Therefore, the abstracts chosen would avoid nursing. The final abstracts selected covered the gamut of Sociological theory, statistical data, and references to previous studies, but avoided gender associated topics.

The subjects in my study, as well as in Goldberg's study, were to read the booklet that they were given and critically evaluate the scholarship of the articles by rating the articles value, persuasiveness, writing style, intellectual depth of article, professional competence, professional status, and ability to sway the reader (Stacey, Bereaud, & Daniels, 1974, p. 40). No mention of the authors sex was made. This was up to students to notice or ignore.

The participants in my study were given the four article abstracts and asked to evaluate the scholarship of each author. Six

evaluation statements were posed to the subjects. They are as follows:

1. The author is persuasive.
2. The author has a scholarly writing style.
3. This author demonstrates professional expertise within the field of Sociology.
4. The author was able to hold the reader's interest.
5. The author probably holds a high professional status position within the field.
6. I believe that the article has value within the field of Sociology.

The evaluation statements were set-up in a Likert scale (1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = neutral, 4 = disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree). The article abstracts and evaluation questions asked of the subjects of this study may be seen in Appendix B.

#### Stage II: Survey Data Continued

##### Part 2: FEM Scale

If it has not been made obvious, I wish to repeat Goldberg's method with a slight twist. My independent variables will include, as did Goldberg's, the gender of the scholar (X1) and the gender of the student (X2). However, I did not take into account the field of study (of the scholar) as a variable because I am solely using Sociology, for direct comparison purposes. I again differ from Goldberg's analysis because of my introduction of another independent

variable to the study. The independent variable is Attitudes Towards Feminism, or FEM Scale scores (X3).

I collected data utilizing the FEM scale, which has been validated in previous research. The FEM scale, developed by Eliot Smith, Myra Marx Ferree, and Frederick D. Miller in 1975, deals primarily with traditional sex role norms and anti-feminist stereotypes. The scale is a measure of sexist and authoritarian attitudes towards women and towards feminism (Smith, Ferree & Miller, 1975, p. 55).

The form is a compilation of twenty statements. A Likert scale is utilized to measure sexist attitudes. At the end of each statement the students are to rate from 1 to 5 their perceptions/attitudes. The response set was, 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = neutral, 4 = disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree (see Appendix B). Scores are summed across the twenty questions. A high score indicates low sexist attitudes. A low score indicate high sexist attitudes. As seen in the research hypotheses of this study, I included the student's FEM scale score because I question whether a low score (high sexist attitudes) or high score (low sexist attitudes) may lead to the students devaluing females in academe and ultimately to the creation of a chilly climate for female graduate instructors.

The survey portion of the study was placed in the packet after the abstract article evaluations, so as not to raise the subjects' awareness of the research question. Therefore, I administered the FEM Scale to the sample after the subjects had evaluated the article abstracts.

In measuring attitudes, the FEM Scale explores beliefs and values that are grounded in assumptions about reality and involve value judgments (Johnson, 1995, p. 15). The FEM Scale measures the respondents' tendencies to evaluate an entity (feminism, women) with some degree of favor or disfavor (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989, p. 543). In this study I wanted to identify the distinct cultural attitudes that we have towards women that predispose us not only to think about women and feminism in particular ways, but to have positive or negative feelings about them as well (Johnson, 1995, p. 15). I believe that the FEM Scale allows me to do just that because it measures attitudes that are important to women's experiences. The attitudes that are measured are important because they incorporate aspects of social life, "the role of emotion and the power of social systems" that "shape, regulate, and evoke" them, "producing both social cohesion and conflict" which affect classroom behavior (Johnson, 1995, p. 15).

### Stage III: Consciousness-Raising Debriefing

Stage III of this study, which was comprised of the debriefing, occurred after all of the observations and all of the respondents had turned in the surveys (article abstract evaluations and Fem Scale). A consciousness-raising approach was taken in this stage. This was done because my dissertation is concerned with the experiences of women. It is research by a woman, about women, and for women. Therefore, this is feminist research that uses feminist methods. As Cat-



harine MacKinnon argues, "consciousness-raising is the unique feminist method because it embodies principles such as enabling women to discuss and understand their experiences from their own viewpoints" (Reinharz, 1992, p. 220, citing MacKinnon, 1983, pp. 227-256). Although consciousness-raising as a feminist method usually refers to "meetings by small groups of women over an extended period of time for the purpose of discussing personal experiences without professional leadership," for this study, I defined it simply as an "educational activity" (Reinharz, 1992, p. 221). Many feminists view consciousness-raising as an educational activity because its product is "a new way of thinking, relating, naming, or acting" (Reinharz, 1992, p. 221).

In viewing the consciousness-raising method as an educational activity, I was able to be more inclusive than the usual definition of this method allows. As a part of my extension of consciousness raising, I incorporated males into the study and exposed them to the experiences of women in academe, hopefully to heighten their consciousness to the discrimination faced by women. Consciousness-raising also allowed me to be completely honest with the respondents concerning the study. I told the respondents what this dissertation was trying to investigate and the studies upon which the methods were built. Students were exposed to the information supplied in this chapter and in Chapter II, the literature review. The respondents were able to ask questions about my own views and experiences, as well as about the study. No knowledge concerning the unobtrusive

observations, elements of the survey, and previous research concerning the discrimination of women in academe was denied to the respondents. I replied to their questions and comments to the best of my ability, and cited the studies that would affirm my replies. Since the literature indicates that women are devalued in higher education, I felt that it was essential to establish credibility by demonstrating knowledge of the subject matter. Any statements that I made were supported by studies, as seen in Chapter II. My hopes were to inform and expose students to women's experiences in higher education, particularly to female graduate instructors' experiences.

During the debriefing stage of this study, an anti-sexist approach was utilized. An anti-sexist approach is usually associated with feminist pedagogy. It is a teaching "strategy which takes gender (race and class) firmly into account" (Briskin, 1991, p. 19). An anti-sexist approach to debriefing respondents of a study makes gender a central issue in social experiences, and validates these experiences in order to bring them into consciousness. An anti-sexist debriefing "shifts the focus from the realm of morality (I am not sexist) to the realm of political practice (what can I do about sexism?)" (Briskin, 1991, p. 20). I did not want students to think that I was calling them sexist. This would only block the students willingness to expose themselves to the silenced experiences of women. Since the topic of my dissertation is quite political, and because the personal is political, and even has the potential of being explosive, I felt it best to conduct the debriefing with the approach

of anti-sexist, consciousness-raising.

### Triangulation of Methods

As mentioned earlier, I have combined aspects of Brooks' and Goldberg's studies and built upon their research for this study. Because the studies are dated 23 years and 13 years respectively, I questioned whether the findings would still be supported. Are things the same for female graduate instructors in higher education as Goldberg and Brooks found them to be for female professors? I believe that the triangulation of research methods within my study grants a more holistic explanation of the chilly climate for female graduate instructors. By triangulation of method, I am referring to "multiple operationalism or convergent validation, the uses of three (usually) data-gathering techniques to investigate a phenomenon" (Berg, 1995, p. 5). I concur with Charlene Depner's argument (Reinharz, 1992) in support of triangulation when she states that

feminist psychology must move outside the limitations of the androcentric research tradition--to recognize what is of value in it and to move beyond this evaluation to the development of new constructs, new methods and new frameworks. . . (We must) revise existing research methods in accord with the feminist critique (and consider) the new and daring concept of a distinctively feminine insight and way of knowing. . . (We must) examine our assumptions, our methods of systematizing observations and making inferences as well as deficiencies in language and inquiry which make insight difficult. . . there is no perfect design, no perfect method. . . the richness of our subject matter demands a full array of methodological tools. . . feminist psychology must implement every tool at its disposal and create new ones--rather than reject any out of hand. (p. 93)

I believe this to be true for all disciplines and not just

psychology, to which Depner is referring. The use of multiple methods in any discipline expresses a "commitment to thoroughness, the desire to be open-ended, and to take risks" (Reinharz, 1992, p. 197). In putting forth an argument for the use of multiple methods, I am not suggesting that "combining approaches will ensure the increased validity" of my data (Maynard & Purvis, 1995, pp. 3-4). Nor, am I suggesting "that the information constructed through different methods can simply be aggregated to produce a single unitary picture of the truth" (Maynard & Purvis, 1995, p. 4). Rather, I am suggesting, along with many other feminist researchers, that "the differences generated from different research techniques are likely to be as illuminating as the similarities" (Maynard & Purvis, 1995, p. 4).

I used a triangulation of methods because I believe that it enabled me, a feminist researcher, to "link past and present, data gathering and action, and individual behavior with social frameworks" (Reinharz, 1992, p. 197). I also believe that through a triangulation of methods, this study may be able to "illuminate previously unexamined or misunderstood experiences" and offer some suggestion on how to overcome some of the problems women face in academe (Reinharz, 1992, p. 197). However, this research is not without its limitations.

### Limitations of the Study

#### Limitations of Stage I. Unobtrusive Observations

A major limitation of this study is the paucity of data con-

cerning race, and the effects of racism on minority female graduate instructors. No minority graduate instructors' classes were able to participate in the study because there is only one Black female graduate instructor and no Black male instructors within the department. I do not want to ghettoize the issue of race as it pertains to this topic by excluding it from the study. Nor do I feel comfortable as a White woman interpreting the experiences of minority women without proper representation of minority women within the study. However, a sample was not available.

Many traditional, feminist theories and research have rendered people of color invisible. It has been argued by black feminists, such as bell hooks, that "the word woman is synonymous with White women, for women of other races are always perceived as Others, as dehumanized beings who do not fall under the heading woman" (hooks, 1981, pp. 138-139). I do not wish to produce any generalizations based upon the experiences of the white middle-class women that participated in the study. Nor do I wish to trivialize the experiences of work-class, lower-class, and minority women.

Women of color in higher education experience discrimination based on race as well as gender. For example, black women are more often placed in the spotlight, given more responsibilities than white colleagues, have their competence questioned more often, experience external and internal conflict, and are expected to make all problems racial (Pigford, 1988, p. 76). Studies have clearly demonstrated that "Black female faculty represent a very small part of

the instructional personnel in higher education" and "have not succeeded as well as Black men, in terms of absolute numbers" (Graves, 1990, p. 4). This is indicative of the impact of both sexism and racism. As Yoland T. Moses (1989) stated in her study entitled, Black Women in Academe,

at the intersection of race and gender stand women of color, torn by the lines of bias that currently divide white from nonwhite in our society, and male from female. The worlds these women negotiate demands different and often wrenching allegiances. As a result, women of color face significant obstacles to their full participation in and contribution to higher education. (p. 1)

It is for this reason that this study does not assume that the experiences found to be true for white women are also true for women of color. Although this study is a feminist study, done by a women, about women, and for women, it is limited. Clearly, the study refers solely to white female and male graduate instructors, since their experiences are included. I do not want to deflect attention away from the fact that black women are "extremely victimized by both racism and sexism" (hooks, 1981, p. 141). Therefore, I want to emphasize that this study does not pretend to represent the experiences of all female graduate instructors.

I also agree with Alcoff and Potter in their perception of a strong consensus among Feminists today. No matter what the theory or methodology, the consensus is the commitment of Feminism to assist in the liberation of women. If Feminism is to take on this task, "it must address virtually all forms of domination because women fill the ranks of every category of oppressed people" (Alcoff & Potter, 1993,

p. 4). This will be the project of my future research of female graduate instructor experiences in the classroom. Since the personal is political, I have no choice but to assist my sisters in seeking "to unmake the web of oppressions and reweave the web of life" (Alcoff & Potter, 1993, p. 4).

#### Limitations of Stage II. Survey Data

A limitation of the second stage of the study is that the respondents to the survey may have determined that the survey was designed to evaluate their prejudice against women and, therefore, may have responded in a less genuine and less valid manner. I attempted to control for this by placing the FEM Scale at the end of the survey, requesting that the respondents complete the survey in the order that it was placed, and requesting that once the survey was completed that they hand it in and not go back to adjust any of their responses. Nonetheless, I found some respondents reading the FEM Scale statements prior to the evaluation of the article abstract section of the survey. I also found a few respondents changing their responses to the evaluations after they had completed the FEM Scale.

Another limitation of this stage of the study concerns the article abstracts. In retrospect, the article abstracts that I chose may not have been as gender neutral as I may have hoped. The subject matter covered in the abstracts was also an issue. For an introductory Sociology course, the topics may have been too complex and undigestible for first year college students. If the students were

unable to understand the subject at hand, how could I expect them to be able to critique the abstracts? I also made the false assumption that first year students have the ability to critique a writing sample. Anyone who has taught an introductory course is aware of students' inability to do so. Students all too often believe that the term critique is equivalent to the term criticize and or to pointing out the negative aspects of something. The respondents to my survey may not have been able to understand the subject matter of the article abstracts, and were afraid of pointing out the negative when they were not sure what the negative was. This may have resulted in a large segment of my sample population responding in a fairly neutral fashion.

#### Limitations of Stage III. Consciousness-Raising Debriefing

A major limitation of a consciousness-raising debriefing is its potential of becoming an explosive situation. When discussing subject matter such as sexism, it is easy for individuals to become indignant and defensive. This will only preclude informative discussions. A possible solution may be an unstructured outline of possible topics and studies to discuss during the debriefing. This may assist the researcher in directing the discussion in order to best enable consciousness-raising to occur. This outline may be referred to if the researcher finds it problematic to initiate discussion, or if the discussion becomes too heated. However, avoiding issues may not be conducive to consciousness-raising. If the par-



ticipants are willing to discuss an issue then it becomes open for exploration even if it gets heated. I believe that an unstructured outline could be useful, since consciousness-raising may be quite difficult. For three of the four debriefings, I did utilize notes taken from the literature review and not an unstructured outline. Many times, while using the notes, I felt as if I had lost control of the discussions. This contradicts my method, however, hind sight is 20/20. The limitations of this stage of research may become more clear during my discussion of the findings of this stage of research. The next chapter discusses the findings of each of these stages of research.

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS

#### Introduction

This chapter begins with the general demographic characteristics of the sample of students observed during the first stage of the research (unobtrusive observation). Additionally, the chapter presents the demographic characteristics of the sample of students used in stage 2 (survey). I also present the findings on stage 3 (consciousness-raising). By stages, I am referring to the three types of methods used in the study. To reiterate, the first stage includes unobtrusive observations. The second stage includes a survey which is divided into two parts, article abstract evaluations and the FEM Scale. The third stage of research includes the consciousness-raising debriefing.

#### Characteristics of Overall Sample

As seen below, a total of 238 students were registered for all four of the graduate instructors' classes. Of the possible 238 students, 136 were female and 102 were male. Of all four classes observed, 57% of the students were female and 43% of the students were male. The sample included a total 175 first year, 38 second year, 19 third year, and 6 fourth year students. As assumed of an introductory course, 74% of the students were in their first year, while

only 26% of the student sample population were in years other than their first year (16% second year, 8% third year, 2% fourth year students). (See Table 1.)

Table 1

**Sample Population Breakdown According to Sex of the  
Instructor, Sex of Students and Year in School**

Graduate Instructor	Total # of Students	Females	Males	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year
Female #1	(55) 23%	(25) 45%	(30) 55%	(34) 62%	(14) 25%	(6) 11%	(1) 2%
Female #2	(60) 25%	(30) 50%	(30) 50%	(46) 77%	(11) 18%	(3) 5%	(0) 0%
Male #1	(66) 28%	(37) 56%	(29) 44%	(49) 74%	(5) 7.5%	(7) 11%	(5) 7.5%
Male #2	(57) 24%	(44) 77%	(13) 23%	(46) 81%	(8) 14%	(3) 5%	(0) 0%
Totals of all Classes	(238) 100%	(136) 57%	(102) 43%	(175) 74%	(38) 16%	(19) 8%	(6) 2%

Table 1 also demonstrates that graduate instructor Female #1 had an enrollment of 55 students, 25 females and 30 males. Of her student population, 34 were first year, 14 were second year, 6 were third students, and 1 was a fourth year student. Female #2 had an enrollment of 60 students, 30 females and 30 male. Of her student population, 46 were first year, 11 were second, 3 were third year students. There were no fourth year students registered for her class. Graduate instructor, Male #1 had an enrollment of 66 stu-

ents, 37 female and 29 males. Of his student population, 49 were first year, 5 were second year, 7 were third year, and 5 were fourth year students. Male #2 had an enrollment of 57 students, 44 females and 13 males. Of his enrollment, 46 were first year, 8 were second year, 3 were third year students. There were no fourth year students registered for his class.

As seen in Table 2, the total for both female graduate instructors were as follows: 115 total students, 55 females, 60 males, 80 first year, 25 second year, 9 third year students, and 1 fourth year student. Of the student population registered for the female graduate instructors' classes, 48% were females and 52% were male. First year students made-up 70% of the sample population, while 30.9% were students in years other than their first year of college (22% second year, 8% third year, and .9% fourth year students).

Table 2  
Sample Population Breakdown According to Sex and Year in  
School of Students Registered in Female Graduate  
Instructors Classes

Female TA	Total # of Students	Females	Males	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year
Female #1	(55) 48%	(25) 45%	(30) 50%	(34) 42%	(14) 56%	(6) 67%	(1)
Female #2	(60) 52%	(30) 55%	(30) 50%	(46) 58%	(11) 44%	(3) 33%	(0)
Total	(115) 100%	(55) 48%	(60) 52%	(80) 70%	(25) 22%	(9) 8%	(1) .9%

As seen in Table 3, the totals for both male graduate instructors are as follows: 123 total students, 81 females, 42 males, 95 first year, 13 second year, 10 third year, and 5 fourth year students. Of the student population registered for the male graduate instructors' classes, 66% were females and 34% were male. First year students made-up 77% of the sample population, while 23% of the student sample population were in years other than their first year of college (11% second year, 8% third year, and 4% fourth year students).

Table 3

Sample Population Breakdown According to Sex and Year in  
School of Students Registered in Male Graduate  
Instructors Classes

Male TA	Total # of Students	Females	Males	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year
Male #1	(66) 54%	(37) 46%	(29) 69%	(49) 52%	(5) 38%	(7) 70%	(5) 100%
Male #2	(57) 46%	(44) 54%	(13) 31%	(46) 48%	(8) 62%	(3) 30%	(0) 0%
Total	(123) 100%	(81) 66%	(42) 34%	(95) 77%	(13) 11%	(10) 8%	(5) 4%

#### Stage I: Unobtrusive Observations Data

As it has been noted, I observed four graduate instructors' classes, three classes each for a total of twelve observations. Both female graduate instructors' classes were taught at 12:00 to 12:50,

three times a week. One male graduate instructor's class was taught at 8:00 to 9:30, twice a week. The other male graduate instructor's class was taught at 9:30 to 10:15, twice a week. The topics of the observed class lectures included social location, culture, socialization, research methods, and theory.

The behaviors that I designated as being hostile, or as behaviors contributing to a chilly climate, may be seen in Chapter III and on the observation tally sheets in Appendix B. I observed a total of 2,294 behaviors that fell within this realm. Of these observations, 1,132 behaviors occurred within the female graduate instructors classes and 1,162 behaviors occurred within the male graduate instructors classes.

As seen on Table 4, within the female graduate instructors classes, I observed women performing 471 hostile behaviors that I conceived as contributing to a chilly classroom climate. The female students were responsible for 42% of the observed hostile behaviors and averaged 3.3 behaviors per class period. I observed 661 hostile behaviors performed by the male students in the female graduate instructor's classes. These males were responsible for 58% of the observed behaviors and averaged 4.7 behaviors per class period. A total average of 8 hostile behaviors per class period occurred within the female graduate instructor's classes.

As seen on Table 5, within the male graduate instructors classes, I observed women performing 777 hostile behaviors that I had seen as contributing to a chilly classroom climate. The female students

were responsible for 67% of the observed behaviors and averaged 3.7 behaviors per class period. I observed 385 hostile behaviors performed by the male students in the male graduate instructor's classes. These males were responsible for 33% of the observed behaviors and averaged 4.1 behaviors per class period. A total average of 7.8 hostile behaviors per class period occurred within the male graduate instructors' classes.

Table 4

**Female and Male Student's Hostile Behaviors  
Within Female Graduate Instructors' Classes**

Sex of Student	Total Number Of Behaviors	Percent Of Behaviors	Average # of Behaviors Per Class Period
Female	471	42%	3.3
Male	661	58%	4.7
Total	1,132	100%	8

Table 5

**Female and Male Student's Hostile Behaviors  
Within Male Graduate Instructor's Classes**

Sex of student	Total Number Of Behaviors	Percent Of Behaviors	Average # of Behaviors Per Class Period
Female	777	67%	3.7
Male	385	33%	4.1
Total	1,162	100%	7.8

### T-Test Analysis

#### Comparison of the Means of the Grand Total, Total Female, and Total Male Observed Behaviors

At this point in the analysis, I decided to run t-testes of the observed hostile behaviors. I wanted to see if the behaviors occurred not by chance, but because of the sex of the student and/or the sex of the graduate instructor. T-tests would best compare the significance of the differences between the means of the samples. I ran two-tailed tests because I wanted to know if males and females significantly differed, regardless of which group acted or experienced hostility to greater or lesser degrees. In other words, female and/or male students could behave in a more or less hostile fashion in female and/or male graduate instructors classes.

I ran t-tests with the uncollapsed data. I first compared the means of the grand total observed behaviors within the female and male graduate instructors' classes. I then examined the total female and male students' hostile behaviors within the female and male graduate instructors' classes. I did not find statistical significance in comparing the means of the total observed behaviors, nor the total observed behaviors of males. As seen in Table 6, their t-scores were  $-.17$  and  $2.15$  (two-tailed significance score  $.868$  and  $.058$ ). Significance was found in comparing the means of total female observed behaviors in female and male graduate instructors classes. The t-score was  $-3.46$  (two-tailed significance score of  $.006$ ).



Table 6

T-Test of the Total Observed Behaviors and the Total Female  
and the Total Male Observed Behaviors

Observations	T-Value	2-Tail Sig.
Total Observations	-.17	.868
Total Female Observations	-3.46	.006
Total Male Observations	2.15	.058

Comparison of the Means of the Recoded Grand Total of Observed Behaviors, Recoded Total Female Observed Behaviors, and Recoded Total Male Observed Behaviors

I decided to collapse the data, recode it into two groups according to the medians, and rerun the t-tests. This was done to see if significance would be found between the low and high totals of hostility, as opposed to the actual raw or uncollapsed scores. I divided the data into two groups, 1 = low (total observations less than the median) and 2 = high (total observations greater than the median). The finding of t-test runs on the recoded data may be seen in Table 7.

The grand total observed behaviors had a range from 121 to 299 total hostile behaviors. The median was 180. Therefore, I recoded total observed behaviors into the following two categories, 1= low (less than 180) and 2 = high (greater than 183). No class had an total observed behavior number that fell between 180 and 183. The t-

value obtained was .00 (2-tailed significance value of 1.00). Statistical significance at an alpha level of .05 was obviously not found.

The total female observations ranged from 60 to 168. The median was 105. Therefore, I recoded the total female students' observed behaviors data into two categories, 1 = low (less than 105) and 2 = high category (greater than 125). No class had a female students' observed number that fell between 105 and 125. A t-test was run comparing the means of the recoded total female students' observed behaviors in the male and female graduate instructors' classes. The t-value was -2.83 (2-tailed significance value of .018). Similar to the total female observations, the recoded total female observations was also found to be statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 in male graduate instructors' classes. In other words, more women than men performed hostile behaviors in male graduate instructors classes than in the female graduate instructors' classes. However, we must keep in mind that the male graduate instructors had more female students (81) in their classes than the female graduate instructors (55). In other words, 66% of the male graduate instructors' classes were female, in comparison to 48% of the female graduate instructors' classes being female. This is a difference of 18%, 26 female students. That might explain the difference found.

The total male observations had a range from 31 to 170 hostile behaviors. The median was 78. Therefore, I recoded the total male

students' observed behaviors data into two categories, 1 = low (less than 78 observations) and 2 = high category (greater than 81 observations). No class had a male students' observed number that fell between 78 and 81. A t-test was run comparing the means of the recoded total male students' observed behaviors in the male and female graduate instructors' classes. The t-value was 1.12 (2-tailed significance value of .290). This was not found to be statistically significant at an alpha level of .05.

Table 7

T-Test of the Recoded Total Observed Behaviors and the  
Recoded Total Female and the Recoded  
Total Male Observed Behaviors

Recoded Observations	T-Value	2-Tail Sig.
Recoded Total Observation	.00	1.00
Recoded Total Female Observations	-2.83	.018
Recoded Total Male Observations	1.12	.290

T-Test Analysis of Average Total, Average Total Female, and Average Total Male Behaviors

To better compare the observed behaviors in the graduate in-

instructors' classes, I standardized the data. This was done by finding the average number of behaviors of the female and male students in the female and male graduate instructors' classes. I did this so that one student's behaviors would not be able to distort, or skew the findings. I computed the averages by dividing the number of observed hostile behaviors by the student attendance per class. For instance, I computed the average total observed behaviors by dividing the total observed behaviors by the total student attendance. I computed the average female total observed behaviors by dividing the total female observed behaviors by the total female attendance. I computed the average male total observed behaviors by dividing the total male observed behaviors by the total male attendance. I then ran the t-tests; the findings may be seen in Table 8.

Table 8

T-Test of the Average Total Observed Behaviors and the  
Average Total Female and the Average  
Total Male Observed Behaviors

Average Observations	T-Value	2-Tailed Sig.
Average Total Observations	.30	.769
Average Total Female Observations	-.80	.444
Average Total Male Observations	.67	.517

The average total observed behavior had a t-value of .30 (2-tailed significance value of .769). The average female observed behavior had a t-value of -.80 (2-tailed significance value of .444). The average male observed behaviors had a t-value of .67 (2-tailed value of .517). None of these were statistically significant. Therefore, the earlier finding of significance for total female observed behaviors in male graduate instructors' classes is contradicted if we consider average instead of total number of observations. I will discuss this in the next chapter on interpretations of the findings.

Comparison of the Means of the Recoded Average Total,  
the Recoded Average Female, and the Recoded Average  
Total Male Observed Behaviors

I then investigated the data by similarly collapsing by recoding each of the individual dimensions of hostile behaviors separately. I divided the groups according to their medians, similar to the procedure described earlier. The total average observed behaviors had a range from 2.47 to 6.36 average behaviors. The median was 3.6. The recoded total average observed behaviors was divided into 1 - low (less than 3.6) and 2 - high (greater than 3.7). The average female observed behavior had a range from 2.40 to 4.96 average behaviors. The median was 3.4. The recoded average female students' observed behaviors was divided into a low category (less than 3.4) and a high category (greater than 3.42). The average male observed behavior had a range from 2.52 to 8.10 average behaviors. The median was 4.05. The recoded average male students' observed beha-

viors was divided into a low category (less than 4.05) and a high category (greater than 4.32). The t-scores were not found to be statistically significant at an alpha level of .05. The lack of significance means that there were no systematic patterns between female and male graduate instructors and female and male students' hostile behaviors, as broken down into each individual dimension of behavior.

#### Comparisons of the Means of Each Individual Dimension of Behavior

I repeated the above processes for all of the mean number of behaviors on a dimension by dimension basis by total female and total male observations. All the dimensions are listed in the previous chapter. These dimensions ranged, for example, from sleeping to laughing. I did not find many t-values of difference to be of statistical significance. There were only three significant findings.

First, in comparing the means of the average times males and females sleep in class, the t-scores were found to be significant. The average times males and female students slept in the observed classes was significantly higher in male graduate instructors' classes. Second, I also found the average number of times female students were tardy for class to be significantly higher in male graduate instructors' classes. However, the male graduate instructors taught at 8:00 a.m. and 9:30 a.m.. This may have contributed to this finding.

The third statistically significant finding was the average

time male students talk to other students during lectures to be significant. The male students in my sample population were found to talk to other students more during female graduate instructors' lectures than during male graduate instructors' lectures.

Student Hostile Behavior Findings in Female Graduate Instructors' Classes That Were Not Significant

Although the following t-tests were not found to be statistically significant, I believe that a comparison of the means is nonetheless instructive as a potential indicator of the classroom climate that existed in the graduate instructors' classrooms. The female students in the female graduate instructors' classes participated in certain behaviors more than in the male graduate instructors' classes. For example, females were found to have a higher average of being absent, speaking to the female instructor after class, and doing other work during class. The female students also had a higher average in female instructors classes than in male instructors' classes of the following behaviors: crossing their arms, laughing at instructor's statements, passing notes, and talking to other students during class lectures.

I also found (see Table 9), that the male students had higher means of the following averaged behaviors in the female graduate instructors' classes than in the male graduate instructors' classes: crossing their arms, direct verbal confrontation, rolling their eyes at statements made by the instructor, interrupting the instructor, laughing at instructor's statements, passing notes, attendance,

speaking without raising their hands, and speaking in class.

Table 9

Student Behaviors That Were Found to Occur More in Female Graduate Instructors' Class Than in Male Graduate Instructors' Class (Not Statistically Significant)

Behaviors	Female Students	Male Students
Absent	X	
Speaking to Instructor After Class	X	
Doing Other Work	X	
Crossing Their Arms	X	X
Laughing	X	X
Passing Notes	X	X
Talking to Others	X	X
Direct Verbal Confrontation		X
Rolling Their Eyes		X
Interrupting		X
Attending Class		X
Speaking Without Raising Their Hand		X
Speaking		X

By speaking in class, I am referring to making statements, answering, and/or asking questions, and not to talking to other students dur-



ing class lectures. As it has already been mentioned, male students were also found to talk to other students more in female graduate instructors' classes more than in male graduate instructors' classes. This was noted earlier as being statistically significant.

Student Hostile Behavior Findings in Male Graduate Instructors' Classes That Were Not Significant

Although not statically significant, the t-testes also indicated what the climate was like in the male graduate students' classrooms. I found a higher total number of students absent in the male graduate instructors' classes than in the female graduate instructors' classes. The female students in the male graduate instructors' classes participated in certain behaviors more in the male graduate instructor's classes than in the female graduate instructors' classes. For example, females students were found to have a higher average of direct verbal confrontation, rolling their eyes, interrupting male instructor, speaking in class, speaking without raising their hands, and attending class. The female students in the male graduate instructors' classes also had a higher average of the following behaviors than in female graduate instructors' classes: leaving class early, tardiness, and checking the clock. Again, we must remember the early time in which the male graduate instructors taught as well as the fact that more females were registered for male instructors' classes when considering the findings. This is pursued further in the next chapter. The male graduate instructors had 81 females registered for their classes, while the female graduate

instructors had only 55 females registered for their classes. This is a difference of 26 female students.

Table 10 refers to the male students' behaviors.

Table 10

Student Behaviors That Were Found to Occur More in Male Graduate Instructors' Class Than in Female Graduate Instructors' Class (Not Statistically Significant)

Behaviors	Female Students	Male Students
Direct Verbal Confrontation	X	
Rolling Their Eyes	X	
Interrupting	X	
Speaking	X	
Speaking Without Raising Their Hand	X	
Attending Class	X	
Leaving Class Early	X	X
Tardiness	X	X
Checking The Clock	X	X
Absent		X
Speaking To Instructor After Class		X
Doing Other Work		X

The male students in the male graduate instructors' classes were also found to have a higher average of the following behaviors in the male

graduate instructors classes than in the female graduate instructors' classes: absent, speaking to male instructor after class, checking the clock, leaving class early, tardiness, and doing other work. Nonetheless, we must remember that the male graduate instructors taught earlier in the morning and for a longer period of time than the female graduate instructors.

In comparing the data found on Tables 9 and 10, it is made clear that male students participated in more dimensions of hostile behaviors in female graduate instructors' classes than in male graduate instructors' classes. The behaviors that the male students were responsible for in the female graduate instructors' classes are very similar to the behaviors that Sandler and Hall concluded as contributing to the chilly classroom climate for women. Although not significant, I believe that these behaviors demonstrate a devaluation of the female graduate instructors' ability, by the male students, i.e., rolling their eyes at statements made by the instructor, laughing, and interrupting the instructor. Direct verbal confrontation of the female graduate instructors by the male students is an example of the hostility that existed in the female graduate instructors' classrooms.

### Chi-Square Analysis

#### Chi-Square Analysis of Observed Hostile Behaviors

At this point in the research, chi-square was tested on the observed hostile behaviors to see if statistical significance existed

between each dimension of hostile behaviors and sex of instructor at an alpha level of .05. I ran the crosstabulations to compare the expected frequencies in relationship between the variables with the observed frequencies. This was done to see if the discrepancies between the two were great and statistically significant, or, more likely to be due to chance.

I ran chi-square tests on the following variables: recoded average female observed behaviors, recoded average male observed behaviors, recoded total female behaviors, recoded total male observed behaviors, and recoded total observations. All variables were crosstabulated by the sex of the graduate instructor. For example, I ran a crosstabulation on the female graduate instructors by student attendance, rolling their eyes, leaving class early, laughing at statements made by the instructor, etc. Only one chi-square value indicated statistical significance at an alpha level of .05. The recoded total female observed behaviors when crosstabulated against the graduate instructors' sex indicated that women behaved statistically more hostile in male graduate instructors' classes than in female graduate instructors classes. The Pearson's Chi-Square value was 5.333. The significance values was .02092. In addition to significance, the Cramer's V value (.66667) indicated the strength of the association to be fairly high.

#### Characteristics of Survey Sample: Stage II and III

As seen in Chapter III and in Table 11, a total of 187 surveys

were collected from all four of the graduate instructors' classes. There was one survey that contained all missing data and could not be used. Therefore, the total number of completed surveys was 186. Of the 186 valid surveys, 121 were completed by females and 65 were completed by males. The survey sample population was 65% female and 35% male. The survey sample included a total 128 first year, 31 second year, 23 third year, and 4 fourth year students. As assumed of an introductory course, 68.4% of the students were in their first year, while only 31% of the student sample population were in years other than their first year, and .5% was missing (17% second year, 12% third year, 2% fourth year students).

Table 11  
Survey Sample Population Breakdown According to  
Sex and Year in School

Graduate Instructor	Total # of Students	Females	Males	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year
Female #1	47	25	21	28	11	6	1
Female #2	41	24	17	28	9	4	0
Male #1	52	35	17	35	5	9	3
Male #2	47	37	10	37	6	4	0
Totals	186	121 65%	65 35%	128 68.4%	31 17%	23 12%	3 2%

The differences between the student sample population in Stage I and the student sample population in Stages II and III are seen in

Table 12.

Table 12

**The Differences Between Stage I Student Sample Population  
and Stage II and Stage III Student Sample Population  
Breakdown According to Sex and Year in School**

Graduate Instructor	Total # of Students	Females	Males	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year
Female #1	- 8	0	- 9	- 6	- 3	0	0
Female #2	- 19	- 6	- 13	- 18	- 2	- 3	0
Male #1	- 14	- 2	- 12	- 14	0	+ 2	- 2
Male #2	- 10	- 7	- 3	- 9	- 2	+ 1	0
Totals	138 78%	- 15 89%	- 37 64%	- 47 73%	- 7 82%	+ 4 121%	0 100%

Table 12 describes the number of students that were registered for the graduate instructors' classes but did not participate in Stages II and III because they were either absent or withdrew from class. The table also indicates a discrepancy between the number of third year students registered for the classes and the number of third year students that completed a survey. For instance, the total number of third year students initially registered for all four classes was 19 (Stage I). However, 23 third year students completed surveys (Stage II and III). The increase of third years students was within male graduate instructor #1 class. Initially, 7 third year students were registered, however 9 third year students completed

surveys. This is an addition of 2 third year students. Also, within male graduate instructor #2's class 3 third year students were initially registered, and 4 completed surveys. This is an addition of 1 third year student. Since the study occurred prior to the completion of the drop/add period for registration, this could be understood.

The majority of the students surveyed were white, non-Hispanic at 79.1% (148 respondents). Of the 187 collected surveys, only 24 were Black (12.8%), 8 were Hispanic (4%), 1 was Asian (.5%), 2 were Native American (1.1%), 2 were other (1.1%), and 2 cases had missing data (1.1%). In total, the survey sample population, only 19.8% (35 cases) were minority students.

Since the sample was drawn from introductory courses, it was expected that the students would fall within the ages of 18 to 21. The mean age of the respondents was found to be 19.98. The mode was 18 years old, with 74.3% of the sample population falling within this category (139 cases). Of all the respondents, 76.5% were between 16 to 19 years of age, 22.5% were between 20-32 years of age, and 1.1% was missing.

In collecting the demographic information concerning students' families, I found the mode for the total family income to be \$60,000 or over, with 80 cases falling in this category (42.8%). The majority of the respondents, 133 cases, fell within the categories ranging from \$40,000 to \$60,000 and above (71.2%). This may be reflective of the respondents' parents' education and occupation.

In total, of the survey sample population, 54.6% (102 cases) of the respondents' mothers had gone to high school and/or some college, 44.4% (83 cases) had a college and/or graduate degree, and 1.1% (2 cases) was missing. I also found that 62% (116 cases) of the respondents' mothers were employed in professional fields or office type occupations, while 16% (30) were employed in nonprofessional occupations, and 21.9% (41) were not reported. Of all the respondents' mothers, 16.6% (31 cases) worked part-time, while 64.2% (120 cases) worked full-time, and 19.3% (36 cases) did not respond on this measure.

In total, of the survey sample population, 50.8% (95 cases) of the respondents' fathers had gone to high school and/or some college, 47.1% (88 cases) had reported that their fathers had a college and/or graduate degree, and 2.1% (4 cases) were missing. I also found that 51.3% of the respondents' fathers were employed in a professional fields or "office" type occupation, while 21.4% (40) were employed in nonprofessional occupations, and 27.3% (51) were not reported. Of all the respondents' fathers, 1.1% (2 cases) worked part-time, while 74.3% (139 cases) worked full-time, and 24.6% (46 cases) did not respond on this measure.

The survey sample population (stage two) was the same sample population for stage three of the study, the consciousness-raising debriefing of survey respondents. Therefore, the demographic information described above pertains to both Stage II and Stage III.



## Stage II: Survey Data

### Part I: Article Abstract Evaluations

The first part of the survey contained the four article abstracts and six evaluation statements, which may be seen in Appendix B. The maximum evaluation score is 30, the summation of strongly disagree (5), indicating a poor evaluation. The minimum evaluation score is 6, the summation of strongly agree (1), indicating a good evaluation score. Similar to the procedure described earlier, the evaluation scores of each article abstract were collapsed into two categories, 1 - low and 2 - high. A low score (category 1) indicated a good evaluation. A high score (category 2) indicated a poor evaluation. Article abstract #1 had a range of scores from 6 to 23, with 1 missing case. The median was 15. Article abstract #2 had a range of scores from 7 to 24, with 2 missing cases. The median was also 15. Article abstract #3 had a range of scores from 7 to 50, with one missing case. The median was again 15. Article abstract #4 had a range of scores from 6 to 23, with one missing case. The median was 13.

The first article abstract, "The Responsive Community: A Communitarian Perspective," was reported to be authored by a woman, Joanna Berk. The abstract was given low evaluation scores (strongly agree) which indicated a good evaluation, in 50.3%, 94 of the cases. However, 49.2% (92 cases) of the survey sample population gave the abstract high evaluation scores (strongly disagree), indi-

cating a poor evaluation.

The second article abstract, "Is Bigger Better? Explaining The Relationship Between Organization Size and Job Rewards," was reported to be authored by a man, Mark Buren. The abstract was given low evaluations scores (strongly agree) which indicated a good evaluation, in 58.3%, 109 of the cases. However, 40.6% (76 cases) of the survey sample population gave the abstract high evaluation scores (strongly disagree), indicating a poor evaluation.

The third article abstract, "The Individualist Polity and The Prevalence of Professionalized Psychology: A Cross-National Study," was reported to be authored by a man, John Meyers. The abstract was given low evaluations scores (strongly agree) which indicated a good evaluation in 57.2%, 107 of the cases. However, 42.2% (79 cases) of the survey sample population gave the abstract high evaluation scores (strongly disagree), indicating a poor evaluation.

The fourth article abstract, "Education, Social Liberalism, and Economic Conservatism: Attitudes Towards Homeless People," was reported to be authored by a women, Sarah Moore. The article was given low evaluations scores (strongly agree) which indicated a good evaluation in 50.8%, 95 of the cases. However, 48.7% (91 cases) of the survey sample population gave the article high evaluation scores (strongly disagree), indicating a poor evaluation.

Overall, the female authored article abstracts were given low evaluation scores, indicating good evaluations. I found 60.4% (113 cases) of the respondents gave the female authors good evaluations.

Conversely, I found 39% (73 cases) of the respondents gave the female authors poor evaluations. There was a difference of 21.4% (40 cases) between positive and negative evaluations.

Overall, the male authored article abstracts were also given low evaluation scores, indicating good evaluations. I found 57.2% (107 cases) of the respondents gave the male authors good evaluations. I also found 42.2% (79 cases) of the respondents gave the male authors poor evaluations. The respondents are more evenly split in their evaluations of the male authors as they were in their evaluations of the female authors. There was a difference of 15% (28 cases) between positive and negative evaluations.

#### Chi-Square Analysis

##### Article Abstract #1 (Female Author)

I ran chi-square tests on article abstract evaluation scores. Crosstabulations of the evaluation scores were run by the demographic information as well as by the respondents' FEM scores. The first of the chi-square tests that was found to be statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 was article abstract #1 by the recoded school year. By recoded school year, I am referring to the categories that I created to collapse the school year data. I divided the data into two categories 1 - 1st year in college and 2 - other years in college. The Pearsons' Chi-square value was 6.92. The significance value was .009. Although significant, there was a weak relationship because, the Cramer's V value was .009.

These findings indicate that 57% of 1st year students and 36.2% percent of students in school years other than their first, gave low or good evaluations. For the first article abstract (by a female), the finding also indicate that 43% of 1st year students and 63.8% of students is years other than their first year, gave high or poor evaluations. This demonstrates that first year students are more likely to give a female author good evaluations than students in years other than their first year of college. These finding may be seen in Table 13.

Table 13

Recoded Article Abstract #1 Evaluation Scores by Recoded Years in School

Article Abstract #1	1st Year in College	Other Years in College
Low	57%	36.2%
High	43%	63.8%

Article Abstract #3 (Male Author)

Another chi-square test that was statistically significant was recoded article abstract #3 evaluation score by recoded years in school (1= 1st year and 2 = year other than 1st). Pearson's chi-square value was 13.24. The significance value was .0007. A weak relationship is demonstrated by a Cramer's V value of .0003. The findings indicate that 66.4% of the 1st year students and 37.9% of

students in years other than their first gave article abstract #3 (male author) low or good evaluations. The finding also indicate that 33.6% of the 1st year students and 62.1% of students in years other than their first gave article abstract #3 high, poor evaluations. This demonstrates that first year students are more likely to give a male author good evaluation than students in years other than their first year in college. The finding may be seen in Table 14.

Table 14  
Recoded Article Abstract #3 Evaluation Score by Recoded  
School Year

Article Abstract #3	1st Year	Year Other Than First
Low	66.4%	37.9%
High	33.6%	62.1%

Article Abstract #4 (Female Author)

Other chi-square tests that were found to be significant were recoded article abstract #4 evaluation by recoded year in school, recoded age, recoded race, recoded father's education, and sex of the respondent. The first significant value was found in recoded abstract article #4 evaluation score by recoded school year. I recoded the school year as noted earlier. The Pearson's chi-square value was 4.398. The significance value was .030. The Cramer's V value was .03597 indicating a weak relation between the respondent's

year in school and the evaluation of article abstract #4. The findings indicate that 56.3% of first year students and 39.7% percent of students in years other than their first gave low, good evaluations. The findings also indicate that 43.8% of first year students and 60.3% of students in years other than their first gave high, poor evaluations. This demonstrates that first year students are more likely to give female authors good evaluations than students in years other than their first year of college. The finding may be seen in Table 15.

Table 15  
Recoded Article Abstract #4 Evaluation Scores  
According to Recoded School Year

Article Abstract #4	1st Year in College	Other Years in College
Low	56.3%	39.7%
High	43.8%	60.3%

The second significant finding was abstract article #4 evaluation score by recoded age. Here I recoded the ages of the student survey sample population to get rid of the empty cells. I divided the data into two groups, 1 - low (16 to 19 years of age) and 2 - high (20 to 32 years of age). The Pearson's chi-square value was 3.822. The significance value was .051. The Cramer's V value was .051, also indicating a weak relation between the age of the respondent and the evaluation of article abstract #4. The findings indi-

cate that 55.2% of the students ages 16-19 and 38.1% of the students ages 20-32 gave low, good evaluations. The findings also indicate that 44.8% of the students ages 16-19 and 61.9% of students ages 20-32 gave high, poor evaluations to article abstract #4. This demonstrates that students within the age group of 16-19 are more likely to give a female author good evaluations than students within the age group of 20-32. The finding may be seen in Table 16.

Table 16  
Recoded Article Abstract #4 Evaluation Scores  
According to Recoded Age

Article Abstract #4	16 to 19	20 to 32
Low	55.2%	39.1%
High	44.8%	61.9%

The third significant finding was abstract article #4 evaluation score by recoded race. I recoded race to get rid of the empty cells. I divided the data into two groups, 1 - white and 2 - minority. The Pearson's chi-square value was 5.19. The significance value was .023. The Cramer's V value was .168, also indicating a weak relation between the race of the respondent and the evaluation of article abstract #4. The findings indicate that 46.6% of the white students and 67.6% of the minority students gave low, good evaluations to article abstract #4. The findings also indicate that 53.4% of the white students and 32.4% of the minority students gave

high, poor evaluations to article abstract #4. This demonstrates that minority students are more likely to give a female author good evaluation scores than white students. The finding may be seen in Table 17.

Table 17  
Recoded Article Abstract #4 Evaluation Scores  
According to Recoded Race

Article Abstract #4	White	Minority
Low	46.6%	67.6%
High	53.4%	32.4%

The fourth significant finding was abstract article #4 evaluation score by recoded father's education. I recoded father's education to get rid of the empty cells. I divided the data into two groups, 1 = high school and/or some college and 2 = college or graduate degree. The Pearson's chi-square value was 10.99. The significance value was .0009. The Cramer's V value was .0009, again indicating a weak relation between the respondent's father's education and the evaluation of article abstract #4. The findings indicate that 63.2% of the respondents with fathers who fall in the first evaluation category and 38.6% of the respondents with fathers who fall in the second evaluation category gave low, good evaluations to article abstract #4. The findings also indicate that 32.4% of the respondents with fathers who fall in the first evaluation category



and 61.4% of the respondents with fathers who fall in the second evaluation category gave high, poor evaluations to article abstract #4. This demonstrates that students with fathers with high school and/or some college educations are more likely to give female authors good evaluations than students with fathers with college and/or graduate degrees. The finding may be seen in Table 18.

Table 18  
Recoded Article Abstract #4 Evaluation Scores  
According to Recoded Father's Education

Article Abstract #4	High School Some College	College or Graduate Degree
Low	63.2%	38.6%
High	32.4%	61.4%

The fifth significant finding was abstract article #4 evaluation score by sex of the respondent. The Pearson's chi-square value was 14.08. The significance value was .0002. The Cramer's V value was .0002, again indicating a weak relation between the respondent's sex and the evaluation of article abstract #4. The findings indicate that 61.2% of the female respondents and 32.3% of the male respondents gave low, good evaluation scores to article abstract #4. The findings also indicate that 38.8% of the female respondents and 67.7% of the male respondents gave high, poor evaluation scores to article abstract #4. This demonstrates that women were more likely to give low, good evaluations to article abstract #4. The finding may be

seen in Table 19.

Table 19  
Recoded Article Abstract #4 Evaluation Scores  
According to Sex

Article Abstract #4	Female	Male
Low	61.2%	32.3%
High	38.8%	67.7%

Combined Female Authors' Evaluation Scores

I ran chi-square tests on the recoded combined female authors' evaluation scores and the recoded combined male authors' evaluation scores by the sex of the respondents. Only the female authors scores were statistically significant. The recoded female evaluation total was divided into two categories, those above and below the median, which was 29. The categories were, 1 = low/good evaluation (below 29) and 2 = high/poor evaluation (above than 29). The Pearson's chi-square value was 4.177. The significance value was .041. The Cramer's V value was .041, indicating a weak relation between the respondent's sex and the evaluation score of the female authors' article abstracts. The findings indicate that 66.1% of the female respondents and 50.8% of the male respondents gave low or good evaluations to the female authors. The findings also indicate that 33.9% of the female and 49.2% of the male respondents gave high or poor

evaluations to the female authors. This demonstrates that the female authors were more likely to receive good evaluations. The female authors were also more likely to receive good evaluation from female students than male students. The findings for the female authors' evaluation scores may be seen in Table 20.

Table 20  
Recoded Female Authors Total Evaluation Scores by  
Sex of the Respondent

Recoded Female Total	Female	Male
Low/Good	66.1%	50.8%
High/Poor	33.9%	49.2%

#### Stage II: FEM Scale Scores

##### Part II: FEM Scale Scores (Recoded)

Overall, the respondents were placed within two categories of FEM Scores, which were recoded and divided according to the median (74), 1 = low and 2 = high. The total range of scores was between 51-95. The first category was low FEM Scores and included scores that were below a score of 74. This category indicated high sexist attitudes and strong anti-women, anti-feminist attitudes. The second category was high FEM Scores and included scores that were above 74. This category indicated low sexist attitudes and pro-women, pro-feminist attitudes. I found 49.7% (93 cases) of the respondents fell

within the low category and 48.1% (90 cases) of the respondents fell within the high category. This indicated that some strong sexist attitudes and anti-women, anti-feminist attitudes existed within the sample population. However, 48% of the respondents had low sexist attitudes, indicating that the sample population was fairly evenly divided in their attitudes towards women.

Average FEM Scale Score Per Class and According to Sex of the Student

I calculated the average FEM Scores for each of the graduate instructors' classes, as well as the average FEM Scores for the female and male students in all four classes. The female graduate instructors' classes had an average FEM Scores of 73.76 and 71.50, indicating a strong sexist, anti-women, anti-feminist attitudes. The female students in one of the female graduate instructor's class averaged a Fem Score of 77.44, indicating low sexist attitudes, pro-women, pro-feminist attitudes. The female students in the other female graduate instructor's class averaged a FEM Score of 74.91, indicating high, strong sexist attitudes. The male students in the female graduate instructors' classes averaged FEM Scores of 69.38 and 66.88, both indicating high, strong sexist attitudes.

Overall, both female graduate instructors' classes taken together averaged a FEM Score of 72.71, strong sexist attitudes. The female students in both classes averaged a FEM Score of 76.23, low sexist attitudes. However, the average FEM Score (68.26) for the male students in both classes supported what was found during Stage

I and Stage III of the research.

In calculating the average FEM Scores for the male graduate instructors' classes, I found one class to have a FEM Scores of 76.43, indicate low sexist, pro-women, pro-feminist attitudes. The female students in this class averaged a Fem Score of 78.29, also indicating low sexist attitudes, pro-women, pro-feminist attitudes. The other male graduate instructor's class had a FEM Score of 74.91, indicating strong sexist attitudes. The female students in this class averaged a FEM Score of 75.84, indicating low sexist attitudes. The male students in both male graduate instructors' classes averaged FEM Scores of 72.71 and 71.11, both indicating strong sexist attitudes.

Overall, both male graduate instructors' classes taken together averaged a FEM Score of 75.71, indicating high, strong sexist attitudes. The female students in both classes averaged a FEM Score of 77.01, low sexist attitudes. However, the average FEM Score (72.15) for the male students in both classes contradicts this finding. These finding may be seen in Table 21.

These averaged FEM Scores indicate that the female graduate instructors' classes have students with stronger sexist attitudes than the male graduate instructors' classes. Overall, the females students demonstrated low sexist, pro-women, pro-sexist attitudes in both the female and male graduate instructors' classes. The male students, on the other hand, demonstrated high, strong sexist attitudes, and anti-women, anti-feminist attitudes in both the male and

female graduate instructors' classes.

Table 21  
The Student Average FEM Scores for Female and Male  
Graduate Instructors' Classes

Instructor	Overall Score	Female	Male
Female #1	73.76	77.44	69.38
Female #2	71.50	74.91	66.88
Both Female Instructors	72.71	76.23	68.26
Male #1	76.43	78.29	72.71
Male #2	74.91	75.84	71.11
Both Male Instructors	75.71	77.01	72.15

\*Note: A student average FEM score below 74 indicates strong sexist attitudes, and anti-women, anti-feminist attitudes. A student average FEM score below 74 indicates low sexist attitudes, and pro-women, pro-feminist attitudes.

### Chi-Square Analysis

I ran chi-square tests on the uncollapsed FEM scores and Recoded FEM scores (1= less than 74, 2= greater than 74) by the demographic variables. There was no statistical significance found on any variable in relation to the uncollapsed FEM Scores. There were, however, several significant relationships found with the recoded FEM Scores in relation to the demographic variables.

The first statistically significant relationship was the re-

coded FEM score by the sex of the student. It was significant at an alpha level of .05. The Pearson's chi-square value was 17.76 with a significance value of .00003. The finding indicates that 39.7% of the female students and 72.6% of the male students in the survey sample had high, strong sexist, anti-women, anti-feminist attitudes. It also indicates that 60.3% of the female students and 27.4% of the male students in the survey sample have low sexist, pro-women, pro-feminist attitudes. The Cramer's V value was .312, indicating a moderate relationship. The findings maybe seen in Table 22.

Table 22  
Recoded FEM Scores by Sex of the Student

Recoded FEM Scores	Female	Male
Less Than 74 Anti-Women Attitudes	39.7%	72.6%
Greater Than 74 Pro-Women Attitudes	60.3%	27.4%

The second finding that was statistically significant was the recoded FEM Score by the recoded mother's education. I divided the data into two dichotomous categories, 1 - high school and some college and 2 - college or graduate degree, as I had done with father's education. The Pearson's chi-square value was 3.9 with a significance value of .04858. This finding indicated that 44.6% of the respondents' mothers who had a high school education and/or some

college had high sexist attitudes. However, 55.4% of the respondents' mothers with the same educational background had low sexist attitudes. Of the respondents with mothers who had a college or a graduate degree, 59.3% had high sexist attitudes while 40.7% had low sexist attitudes. The Cramer's V value was .146, indicating a weak relationship. The findings maybe seen in Table 23.

Table 23

## Recoded FEM Scores by Recoded Mother's Education

Recoded FEM Scores	High School/ Some College	College or Graduate Degree
Less Than 74 Anti-Women Attitudes	44.6%	59.3%
Greater Than 74 Pro-Women Attitudes	55.4%	40.7%

The third relationship that was statistically significant was the recoded FEM Score by the recoded father's education. I recoded father's education as I had previously. The Pearson's chi-square value was 5.77 with a significance value of .01633. This finding indicated that 42.6% of the respondents' fathers who had a high school education and/or some college had high sexist attitudes. However, 57.4% of the respondents' fathers with the same educational background had low sexist attitudes. Of the respondents' fathers who had a college and/or a graduate degree, 60.5% had high sexist



attitudes while 39.5% had low sexist attitudes. The Cramer's V value was .146, indicating a weak relationship. The findings may be seen in Table 24.

Table 24  
Recoded FEM Scores by Recoded Father's Education

Recoded FEM Scores	High School/ Some College	College or Graduate Degree
Less Than 74 Anti-Women Attitudes	42.6%	60.5%
Greater Than 74 Pro-Women Attitudes	57.4%	39.5%

### Stage III: Consciousness-Raising Debriefing

The following section describes the findings of Stage III, the consciousness-raising debriefing. The order of presentation during the debriefing was similar to the order of the materials presented in Chapter II. The student survey sample population was informed of the basis of the study, which was personal experiences. They were also informed of the process through which I developed the methods used in the study, why I chose these methods, and the studies that the methods expanded upon. I believe this debriefing to be consciousness-raising because nothing was withheld from the respondents. I also utilized a anti-sexist approach to the debriefing discussion. The methods chapter elaborated each of these concerns.

The findings are put in journal entry format. I did this because I believe that the findings raise personal matters, and, therefore, are not amenable to a strict or academic writing structure. I only discuss the debriefing experiences that support the notion the sexism exists in the classroom. The rest was all pretty much neutral.

Journal Entry: Male Graduate Instructor #2 (1/23/97)

Overall, the atmosphere of the class seemed to be tense. The debriefing for this class occurred the same day as the final unobtrusive observations. The students determined that I was observing them, and not the male instructor of the course. It seemed as if this was not appreciated by them. I say this because as I walked into the class, students placed books on the desks next to them so that I could not sit by them. I was also given some harsh looks.

Once the male graduate instructor entered the classroom things seemed to relax a bit. He had given the students an extra-credit assignment the prior period. The assignment was to break a social norm by wearing their pajamas to class. The assignment was well received by the students. My survey, on the other hand, was not. Three female students refused to participate in my study when I passed out the survey. They were upset because they were not going to get anything for their time and trouble, e.g., extra- credit points. As the other students were filling out the surveys, these three women were doing other things. One woman was sleeping. The second

was reading a romance novel. The third picked at her nails for 20 minutes. When I noticed that they were not participating in the study, I collected their surveys from them. One woman flung the instrument at me and gave me a very unwelcoming look. As the three left the class, I overheard one saying, "that bullshit was a waste of my time." I left the class feeling disappointed and angry that my study was degraded in such a manner.

Journal Entry: Male Graduate Instructor #1 (1/30/97)

Overall the students seemed interested in the subject matter of my study. However, the male students made it quite clear that they did not agree that sexism existed in the classroom. Nor did they agree with the studies that I noted to support my responses to their questions, i.e., the chilly climate literature. No female students spoke during the debriefing. However, three female students did approach me after the study was over. They relayed their agreement and support of my study. They told me that they had experienced sexism in the classroom, i.e., the chilly climate. I asked the women why they did not speak-up during the debriefing. They did not have a clear answer to my question. One female concluded that "it just wasn't worth interrupting the boys, they wouldn't hear us anyway." Another woman added, "we are used to it, you were having a hard time getting the (the males students) to listen to you, what makes you think that they would listen to us."

During the debriefing, I mentioned many of the studies that

are found in Chapter II, the literature review. I assured the students, particularly the male students, that the studies did not indicate that they were sexist. I pointed out how the studies draw our attention to how our behaviors are influenced by the sexist ideologies that exist within our society. This did not set many of male students at ease. One male student asked me what my credentials were to do such a study. He then realized that he had just supported the studies that he was refuting. This male student approached me after the class was dismissed and apologized for questioning my integrity.

Other male students seemed to get even more upset by the statement. For example, a male student questioned what I meant by saying that our society was sexist. He wanted me to give examples. He did not agree, because he believed that we have come a long way, and that our society is no longer sexist. He challenged my statement by noting that "if our society is sexist, then how can you, a woman, be able to go to college and get a doctorate degree." Again, I referred him to many of the studies noted in the literature review. This did not work.

I then referred this student to Dr. Kilbourne's video, "Killing us Softly." Dr. Kilbourne has done an analysis of sexism in advertising. I thought that referring to a visual example would help. Nonetheless, he along with other students, did not understand what was wrong with objectifying women to sell products. They thought it was just appreciating the female form. I concurred that there was

nothing wrong with this form of appreciation. However, when a woman's physical appearance is solely what she is appreciated for, it becomes a problem.

I then referred to student evaluations and the mentioning of female appearance, as seen in the chilly climate literature. I informed the students that it had been found that students, when evaluating their professors' teaching ability, will comment on a female faculty member's appearance more than a male faculty member's appearance. This finding was dismissed by the students. The male students' consensus was that when students comment on a female professor's appearance, they are just being nice.

At one point during the debriefing, a male student asked the male graduate instructor if he agreed with the notion that sexism existed in the classroom, and if he agreed with my responses to their questions. The male instructor stated that he did not do the research and could not say. The response, although a diplomatic one, seemed as if the graduate instructor agreed with me, but remained non-committed. He probably did not want to disagree with the notion that sexism existed in the classroom in front of the students. Judging by the male instructor's reaction, I believed, he also devalued my work.

I left the debriefing feeling annoyed and frustrated. I questioned my abilities as a feminist researcher. I wondered if I had the ability to relay the information that I believe to be important. Nonetheless, I did not feel as if I was under any personal attack

from the students in the class. I felt as if they were challenging the material more than challenging me.

Journal Entry: Female Graduate Instructor #1 (2/3/97)

Overall the class climate was very similar to first male graduate instructor's class. As in his class, students placed books on the desks next to them so that I could not sit by them. The students deduced that I was not there to observe the female instructor, but them. During my second observation of female graduate instructor #1's class, a male student inquired why I was present. He questioned, "what is this lovely women doing in our class?" I told the students that they would be fully informed of the reasons for my presence in their class after a few days of classes. I also told them that if they really need to know I would tell them after class. No one spoke to me after that inquiry was made, until the debriefing.

I had a strong feeling that the debriefing was not going to go very well. My beliefs were confirmed when, before I had even handed out the survey, a male student interrupted me mid-sentence. As I was giving an introduction to the survey, similar to the consent form which may be found in Appendix B, the male student interrupted with a question. Without raising his hand, he questioned whether they were going to get any extra-credit points for participating in the study.

As I had thought, the debriefing for this class was very difficult and quite distressing. The students, both male and female,

challenged me, as well as the literature that I referred to supporting my study. Unlike male graduate instructor #1's class, these students seemed angry at me and not the material. I say this because a male student referred to me as a bitch under his breath. Another male student became so enraged that he began shaking his finger in my face as he asked me, "Who do you think you are saying these things to!" A female student could not understand why I thought our society was sexist. She thought that this "sexism stuff" was something feminists conjured up, and that women today don't have to deal with sexism like our mothers had to in the 50's and 60's.

I left the debriefing for this class feeling as if I had been physically and emotionally battered. The emotions that I had gone through that afternoon ran the gamete. I was angry, frustrated, sad, lonely, frightened, and dejected.

Journal Entry: Female Graduate Instructor #2 (2/7/97)

The response of female graduate instructor #1's class had repercussions for female graduate instructor #2's class. Prior to the debriefing of female graduate instructor #2's class, the two female graduate instructors called a meeting of the two of them and myself. They informed me that the conscious-raising debriefing was not very well received by female graduate instructor #1 and her class. Nor did it seem like something female graduate instructor #2 wanted to participate in. I knew from the outset that I might meet with resistance from students, however, I never expected to meet with re-

sistance from the female graduate instructors.

Word had gotten-out that the debriefing strategy had the potential to be explosive. Yet, I had thought that I had maintained order and been very respectful of both students and graduate instructors. Nonetheless, female graduate instructor #2 did not want to risk upsetting her students. She asked me to script my debriefing and keep it short. She said that if I did not comply, I could not utilize her class for my study. I complied with her demands. I gave her a copy of the debriefing script. The debriefing script included a statement which described the nature of the study. It was as follows:

The focus of this study is an examination of a variety of social attitudes, particularly those directed towards women in academe. The research questions are:

1. Is women's scholarship devalued by students?
2. Are students' attitudes towards women and/or feminism sexist?
3. Is there a chilly, hostile classroom climate for female graduate instructors?
4. Does devaluation lead to chilly behaviors?
5. Are attitudes towards women and/or feminism factors that lead to the chilly, hostile classroom climate for female graduate instructors?

Are there any questions?"

The female graduate instructor thought that it was fine and asked me if I could keep strictly to the script. She then agreed to let her class participate in the study. I felt betrayed by the female graduate instructor in our conversation.

Overall, female graduate instructor #2's class seemed indifferent to my presence in their class. The debriefing was unevent-



ful. No questions were asked of me or about the study.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

#### **Introduction**

This chapter presents interpretations of the statistically significant findings of each research stage seen in the previous chapter. Due to the nature of this dissertation study, it must be noted that the research findings and interpretations may only be generalized to the sample population and not students in general. Additionally, this chapter will discuss some concluding thoughts and suggestions for further research.

Let me begin by restating the research questions. The research questions are as follows:

1. Is women's scholarship devalued by students?
2. Are students' attitudes towards women and/or feminism sexist?
3. Is there a chilly, hostile classroom climate for female graduate instructors?
4. Does devaluation lead to chilly behaviors?
5. Are attitudes towards women and/or feminism factors that lead to the chilly, hostile classroom climate for female graduate instructors?

## Stage I: Unobtrusive Observations Interpretations

### Significant T-Scores Values

As noted in the previous chapter, a significant t-score was found in comparing the grand means of the uncollapsed total female student hostile behaviors and the recoded total female students observed hostile behaviors in female and male graduate instructors' classes. Both findings indicate that female students behave in a hostile manner significantly more than male students in male graduate instructors' classes.

However, the t-score in comparing the average female student total observed hostile behaviors in female and male graduate instructors' classes was not found to be significant. Female students in male graduate instructors' classes averaged 3.7 observed hostile behaviors. The male students in male graduate instructors' classes averaged 4.1 observed hostile behaviors. Therefore, the male students in the male graduate instructors' classes had a higher average of hostile behaviors than the female students. The t-scores for the total and the recoded total female observed hostile behaviors may have been significant because there were 34 more females than males registered for male graduate instructors' classes. The significant findings are not indications that females on average behave in a more hostile manner than males in male graduate instructors' classes. I believe the significant findings are indications that females were responsible for more observed hostile behaviors because there

were more females registered for the male graduate instructors' classes.

Statistical significance was also found in comparing the means of the average times males and females sleep during class. It was found that the average time male and female students slept in the observed classes was significantly higher in male graduate instructors' classes. I also found the average number of times female students were tardy for class to be significantly higher in male graduate instructors' classes than in female graduate instructors' classes. However, I believe that both findings are due to the early hours that the male graduate instructors' classes were scheduled. The males taught at 8:00 a.m. and 9:30 a.m.. The females taught at 12:00 p.m.

The last statistically significant t-score found was in the comparison of the average times male students talk to other students during lectures in female and male graduate instructors' classes. The males students in my sample population were found to talk to other students more during female graduate instructors' lectures than during male graduate instructors' lectures. This finding supports Sandler's 1992 study, in which she reported that students would talk during class more in a female's class than a male's class.

As Paludi and Strayer reported, women are often depicted as less intelligent, therefore males may be less likely to be attentive in class. It has also been found that students grant less credence to statements made by women. As a result of social learning, we are

taught that work performed by women is less valuable. From a liberal feminist perspective, socialization forces people to grow up with distorted and harmful ideas about female and male, resulting in gender inequality. These cultural ideas impact our behaviors. Therefore, the male student sample population may believe that what women have to say is not important.

This finding is a result of the gender hierarchy that exists under patriarchy. From a radical feminist perspective, the male students may have spoken more during the female instructors' class lectures than the males because they are in competition with the females for power. This competition is a manifestation of core patriarchal values and beliefs. Talking during the female graduate instructors' classes may have been a vehicle through which the male students could assert dominance.

#### Significant Chi-Square Value

The recoded total female observed behaviors when crosstabulated by the graduate instructors' sex indicated that women behave statistically more hostile in male graduate instructors' classes than in female graduate instructors' classes. This findings may be due to similar reasons for the statistically significant t-scores. To reiterate, there were more female students registered for male graduate instructors' classes than in female graduate instructors' classes.

This finding may also be due to the creation of a women's

space. This new space may have been created because of the larger number of females than males registered for the classes. Within the male graduate instructors' classes, 66% were females and only 34% were males. The female students in these classes all sat in the front rows of chairs, while the male students sat in the last rows of chairs. The female students also encouraged each other to ask and answer questions in class.

The creation of a women's space, or a new spaces as Mary Daly refers to it, is a place in which women participate in their own revolution (Daly, 1973, p. 40). With a larger number of women than men, the female students may have felt free to become who they are, "in which there are real and significant alternatives to the pre-fabricated identities provided within the enclosed spaces of patriarchal institutions," such as a classroom (Daly, 1973, p. 40). There is a diffused identity within this new space, as opposed to the foreclosed identity allotted to women within higher education and other patriarchal spaces. This identity is "an open road to discovery of the self and of each other" (Daly, 1973, p. 40). The discovery may have led the female students in the male graduate instructors' classes to challenge, by acting in a hostile manner, the power that males have due to patriarchy. Also, the female students may have empathized, respected, and/or supported the female graduate instructors more than the male instructors, therefore, inhibiting female students hostile behavior in female graduate instructors' classes.

## Stage II: Part 1, Article Abstract Evaluation Interpretations

### Research Question #1

The first research question, which lays the foundation for this dissertation study, is whether women's scholarship is devalued by students. The literature indicates that students do devalue women's contributions to higher education. Simeone reported that women more often than men have their work evaluated less positively than it deserves (Simeone, 1987, p. 143). However, the research findings (Stage 2, Part I), do not concur with the literature. All four of the abstract articles were given low, meaning good evaluations by the student sample population.

However, it was found that a larger percentage of the student sample population gave the male authored article abstracts low, good evaluations; 58.3% and 57.2% as compared to 50.3% and 50.8% for the female authored article abstracts. Although this is a slight difference, and one that was not statistically significant, it is a difference consistent with previous research in the direction of males receiving better evaluations.

### Significant Chi-Square Values

What was found to be statistically significant was the chi-square analysis of article abstract #1 by recoded school year. The crosstabulations of article abstracts #3 and #4 by school year were also significant. Article abstracts #1 and #4 were female authored,

while article abstract #3 was male authored. So as not to be redundant, I will discuss the findings of the crosstabulations of all three article abstract by school year at once.

Overall, when the article abstracts were crosstabulated by the recoded school year, students in their first year were found to give significantly lower (good) scores than students in years other than their first year of college, 57%, 66.4%, and 56.3% respectively. I believe that this finding is a result of the first year student sample populations inability and/or lack of confidence to critically analyze scholarly writing.

In Stage II, Part I of the survey, I requested that the students critically evaluate the article abstracts. The students in their first year of college may not have had the ability to critically evaluate scholarly materials. Within our educational system prior to college, we are not taught to think freely and/or to critically assess or question the materials presented to us. We are, in contrast, educated to simply understand and regurgitate the materials. Therefore, these findings may be a result of the lack of tools that the students needed to critically evaluate an article abstract. In turn, the students gave positive score because they could not discern any deficiencies of the article abstracts.

This interpretation is supported by the findings that students in years other than their first were significantly less likely to give low, good evaluations to article abstracts #1, #3, and #4. Only 36.2%, 37.9%, and 39.7% of students in years other than their first



gave low, good evaluations, respectively.

In re-examining the titles of the article abstracts, I realized that article abstract #2 was the most understandable for first year students. The title of article abstract #2 is "Is Bigger Better? Explaining the Relationship Between Organization Size and Job Rewards". This abstract may have been easier for first year students to digest and critique because they may have been able to identify with the topic. This may have been why it did not receive more pronounced positive evaluation scores.

Also found to be statistically significant was the crosstabulation of article abstract #4 by recoded age. I believe that this finding may be interpreted in the same manner as those found above because of the association of age with school year. First year students often fall within the age category of 16 to 19, recoded group 1.

The next statistically significant crosstabulation was article abstract #4 by recoded race. It was found that 67.6% of the minority student sample population gave significantly lower, good evaluations than non-minority students. I do not believe that this finding is a necessarily reflection of race, but perhaps more reflective of income.

Possible factors for this finding could include family income and education. Of the minority student sample population, 67% fall below the family income category of \$60,000 a year, 58% fell below \$50,000 a year, and 40% fell below 40,000 a year. The lower the

family income, the more likely the student had been educated in a school located in a lower income area. As seen in the educational trends nation wide, schools located in lower income areas are in dire straights. Similar to the interpretations above, these student would not have been taught to critically evaluate scholarly material and would not have been confident to do so. In turn, the minority students may have given lower, good evaluations because of their inexperience to evaluate the article abstracts. However, further investigation of this finding is needed.

Further investigation is also required for another significant finding. The crosstabulation of article abstract #4 by recoded father's education was found to be statistically significant. It was found that 63.2% of the respondents with father's with high school and/or some college gave significantly lower, good evaluations. Maybe the students could relate, consciously or unconsciously, to the article abstract more since education was the first word in the title. The students may have been more able to relate with the topic of this article abstract.

The last statistically significant chi-square value of Stage II, Part I (article abstract evaluations) were found in the cross-tabulations of article abstract #4 (female author) and in recoded female authors total evaluation scores, both by the sex of the respondent. The first finding indicated that female students, 61.2%, gave article abstract #4 better evaluations than male students. The second finding indicated that female students, 66.1%, gave female

authored article abstracts better evaluations than male students. The male students, 32.3%, were less likely to give low, good evaluations to article abstract #4. The male students, 50.8%, were also less likely to give low, good evaluations to the recoded female authors total evaluations. In both crosstabulations, the male student sample population were more likely to give high, poor evaluations to article abstract #4 and to the recoded female authors total evaluation scores, 67.7% and 49.2% of the time respectively. In other words, the male students were significantly more likely to devalue the female authors contributions to higher education than the female students.

These findings maintain the conclusions of previous studies. The present research gives continued support to the notion of a pervasive devaluation of women's contributions to higher education in relation to men's contributions. This may be a result of men's ideas and work being valued more than women's ideas and work even when their ideas and work are similar (Paludi & Strayer, 1985, p. 359). Because of gender stereotypes, men are seen as more competent than women for the same behaviors or ideas of work. Therefore, men's contributions are more often positively evaluated by students (Paludi & Strayer, 1985, p. 359). As Paludi and Strayer have found, this overall discriminatory ideology is greater in males, who maintain more stereotypical values than females. Therefore, as the data indicate, the female students would be more likely to give low, good evaluations to the female authors, than would the male students.

From a socialist feminist perspective, these findings are consistent with the gender hierarchy that exists under patriarchy. As long as men hold power in society and control social institutions, women's contributions will be relegated to the least amount of prestige (Tong, 1989, p. 174). Women's contributions to academe will, therefore, be devalued and underestimated.

#### Research Question #4

Research question #4 addresses the issue of the devaluation of women's contribution to higher education and the chilly, hostile classroom climate. Research question #4 inquires whether this devaluation leads to the creation of the chilly, hostile classroom climate for female graduate instructors.

Other data support the interpretation of these findings. For example, as noted earlier, the male students (49.2%) were significantly more likely than the female students (33.9%) to give female authors high, poor evaluations. The male student sample population were also more likely than the female student sample population to behavior in a hostile manner in the female graduate instructors' classes. The males were responsible for 58% of the observed hostile behaviors in the female graduate instructors' classes. However, the males were only responsible for 33% of the observed hostile behaviors in the male graduate instructors classes. The qualitative findings of this study indicate that this may be a result of the male students devaluation of women's contributions to higher educa-

tion.

## Stage II: Part 2, FEM Scores Interpretations

### Research Question #2

Research question #2 examines whether students' attitudes towards women and/or feminism are sexist. The average FEM Score per class indicated that the female student sample population demonstrated relatively low sexist, pro-women, and pro-feminist attitudes. Further, I also found that the male student sample population demonstrated strong sexist attitudes, and anti-women, anti-feminist attitudes.

### Significant Chi-Square Values

A significant finding was discovered in the crosstabulation of the recoded FEM Score by the sex of the respondents. The finding indicates that 72% of the males had sexist attitudes. The finding also indicates that the majority, 60.3%, of the females had pro-women attitudes. These findings concur with the previously noted studies in Chapter II about sexist attitudes being greater for males than females.

These findings may be tied to the root of gender hierarchy, which defines sexism. Many radical feminists call our attention to the patriarchal nature of our society. Our society is a male-dominated hierarchy where women fall and are placed on the bottom tiers.

As many feminist standpoint epistemologists have noted, women are aware of their place in this hierarchy. Not only are women aware of their assignment to lesser positions and role prescriptions, they are aware of the different values that have resulted in pervasive male domination (Figueira-McDonough, 1985, p. 121). Another result of sexism, differing allocations, assignments, expectations, and attitudes, is the devaluation of women and the creation of women as other. Therefore, women, who are aware of all of this (as the literature points out) are more likely to be less sexist than men who are at the top of the hierarchy. This would concur with the finding that the female students scored as less sexist than the male students on the FEM Scale.

#### Research Question #5

Research question #5 addresses attitudes towards women and the chilly climate. Research question #5 is, are attitudes towards women and/or feminism factors that lead to the chilly, hostile classroom climate for female graduate instructors?

The male student sample population was found to be responsible for 58% of the hostile behaviors in the female graduate instructors' classes. It was also found that 72.6% of the male student sample population held sexist attitudes. Although not quantitatively significant, I believe that the males students' FEM scores might still be an indication of their behavior in a female graduate instructors' classes. Their behaviors may have been a demonstration of their

assertion or recapturing of power or the upper hand in the classroom environment and/or their disregard for women's contributions.

Another set of statistically significant findings were found in the crosstabulation of the recoded FEM Scores by mother's and father's education. The findings, surprisingly, contradict previous studies. They indicated that 59.3% and 60.5% of respondents with mothers and fathers with college and/or graduate degrees (respectively) had more sexist attitudes than students whose parents had less education. Of the sample population with mothers and fathers with just high school and/or some college educations, 55.4% and 57.4% had pro-women attitudes, respectively. This may be an artifact of how I dichotomized the data into two extreme categories.

### Stage III, Consciousness-Raising Debriefing Interpretations

#### Research Questions #3 and #5

Research question #3 and #5 both explore the issue of the chilly climate for women. Research question #3 examines whether there is a chilly, hostile classroom climate for female graduate instructor. Research question #5 examines whether attitudes towards women and/or feminism are factors that lead to the chilly, hostile climate for female graduate instructors. The most difficult and degrading debriefing experience occurred in female graduate instructor #1's class. This class had an overall average FEM Score that indicated strong sexist attitudes. The males were most vocal in this

class and averaged a FEM Score that indicates strong sexist attitudes. This makes my experience in this class interpretable.

I believe that this finding may be a result of the collective efforts of men to dominate and control women (Johnson, 1995, p. 111). By asking most, if not all of the questions, the male students were able to take control of the debriefing. The male students established their reality, one that excluded the female experience by taking control of the discussion. As radical feminist Mary Daly would argue, the male students created a false reality for the female student by posing and hiding certain questions, questions with androcentric answers (Daly, 1990, p. xxxv). In turn, they were able to remove women from the center of the discussion. For example, the male students in female graduate instructor #1's class did not believe that a chilly climate for women existed in the classroom. Therefore, if a female student did experience any hostility in a classroom, it was perceived as being her fault and not the result of sexism.

Only the male perspective was being heard and addressed during the debriefing in the class. This perpetuated the post-modern feminist notion of women as other. By this I am referring to the assumption that women have historically and continue to be created and defined as other by men who control discourse (de Beauvoir, 1989, pp. x-xlii). This also constrained the female students, in addition to myself, to express ourselves within the male-centered environment (Andersen, 1995, p. 358). Our realities were not explored, nor even



seen as being realities.

The other difficult debriefing experience occurred in male graduate instructor #1's class. Again, the males were the most vocal. Their average male FEM Score was 74.91, indicating strong sexist attitudes.

There was friction between myself and many of the male students in this class. This may have been a result of their resistance to recognize research conducted by a woman, for women, and their resistance to raise-consciousness. Therefore, the male students labeled my study worthless, inappropriate, and unworthy of their time and attention. In turn, I felt alienated, as if I was being forced back into the private sphere of teaching rather than staying in the public sphere of research. This may have been due to the fact that my research was delegitimated by many of the male students.

As Maher and Tetreault found in their study, research is viewed as a public sphere, and teaching as a private sphere. Classroom teaching is a private sphere and is associated with females, since females are relegated to the private sphere which holds low status within our society. Research, on the other hand, is associated with the public sphere, which is male and holds high status. Because of this, I may have been regarded by many of the male students as having less knowledge, less authority, lower status (Maher & Tetreault, 1994, pp. 90-126).

It is not that women do less research; but that there are less women in higher education. Therefore, there is less research pro-

duced by women. The research that is produced by women tends to be trivialized by students, due to the subject matter, the methodology, and/or the theory, as well as by any other reason one can dream-up. This may have contributed to the chilly reception that I received during this debriefing session.

The female students in this class averaged a female FEM Score of 78.29, indicating pro-women attitudes. This may explain my experience of some female students supporting me after the debriefing. These women could identify with my experience because they themselves have experienced alienation. As suggested by Adrienne Rich and Dorothy Dinnerstein, alienation identifies women, their oppression, and their experiences (Tong, 1989, p. 189). These female students were able to relate to my research because of our common experience of alienation.

The incident within male graduate instructor #2's class involved a negative encounter with three women of color. These women's actions may have been a result of the distrust of white feminist women felt by many minority women. By this I am referring to the exclusion of women of color and other minority women by feminism during the Women's Movement of the 1960s and 70s. Minority women rightly felt as if their voices were silenced and/or ignored by the liberation of their so-called white sisters. This distrust extends through today, and may have been a factor in the devaluation I experienced with these three women of color. These women may have felt that my study was ignoring the issue of race and ethnicity be-

cause no minority graduate instructors participated in the study.

Another experience that I believe must be addressed and was not foreseen, was the predicament that I faced with the female graduate instructors. The women that I had invited to participate in my study hold strong pro-women, pro-feminist attitudes. I did not believe that I would meet with any resistance from these two sisters. However, the only resistance from the graduate instructors that did occur was generated from them.

This finding contradicts the concept of sisterhood. This may be due to the competition that exists among female graduate students and female graduate instructors in academe. Within academe, as well as within other institutions, competition occurs because of scarce material and emotional resources, as is explained by marxist feminism (Fox Keller & Moglen, 1987, p. 495). Female graduate students and instructors are competing over classes, funding, and recognition from professors and administration. Therefore, the feminist notion that sisterhood is capable of triumphing over personal competition and conflict seems to be far reached, or at least, very optimistic.

I do not enjoy believing that the notion of sisterhood being powerful is a defunct notion. But, it at least has certainly been anything but achieved. However, I do believe that competition and envy exists among even women. This last debriefing finding was the most painful and disturbing to me of the whole dissertation experience.

To interpret these feelings I can only rely on feminist inter-

pretations of sibling rivalry. The female graduate student environment at Western Michigan University is one that is quite supportive. However, we are "at the same time being trained for jobs that may not in fact be plentiful enough to go around" (Fox Keller & Moglen, 1987, 507). We are all competing for degrees, recognition, and jobs. Undermining another woman's work may be the cause of the competition.

### Summary and Conclusions

This study investigated the impact of student evaluations and attitudes towards women on their behavior in female graduate instructors' class in the Department of Sociology at Western Michigan University. The quantitative findings provide some insight into the research questions. For example, in utilizing the FEM Scale I found that the male students had stronger sexist attitudes than the female students. This may have been an indication of my observation that the male students averaged more hostile behaviors than the female students in female graduate instructors classes.

However, many of the qualitative finding gave us more insight on the experiences of female graduate instructors. For example, the observations and consciousness-raising debriefing experiences demonstrate that the idea that women have made it and are no longer subjected to a climate of oppression within higher education is a myth. This buttresses the ideological hegemony that dominates our society by underestimating the discrimination against women in aca-

deme. Such disregard for the discrimination that occurs against 52% of our population only perpetuates sexism within the very place where we should know better. The devaluation of women's ideas, methods, theories, and overall contributions to their field, allows for, if not encourages, the silencing of a whole group. By viewing research conducted by women as worthless and/or unworthy of attention, as did some of the male students in this study, we continue to view women as second rate scholars. I believe this to be reflective of the negative association with anything female in our patriarchal, misogynistic culture.

This second rate status remains consistent whether a female is a Ph.D. or a graduate instructor. As the literature indicates, female professors experience a chilly, hostile classroom climate. As this study indicates, female graduate instructors also experience a chilly, hostile classroom climate. However, I believe that this study demonstrates that female graduate instructors are more of a target than male graduate instructors for students hostile.

While these findings may initiate an abundance of other research questions, they may also be utilized to grant voice to those usually silenced within academe. Some of the interpretations of these findings are personal because they are a reflection of my experiences; therefore, further studies are imperative so that more experiences may be understood. For example, additional variables could include the impact of the gender, sexual orientation, and ethnicity of the researcher on the student sample population's behavior

in class and evaluation of scholarship. An important aspect of further research should be the inclusion of the impact of the recent backlash against feminism on student's behavior, FEM Score, and evaluation of feminist scholarship. With the introduction of additional variables, more experiences will be uncovered and understood. Many more women's voices will be and must be heard so that the silence can come to an end.

## **Appendix A**

### **Research Instrument: Stage I, Unobtrusive Observation Tally Form**

### Observation Tally Sheets

<u>Sex of Instructor:</u>	<u># of Females Students Present:</u>
<u>Topic of Lecture:</u>	<u># of Males Students Present:</u>
<u>Time of Class:</u>	

<u>Verbal Behaviors</u>	<u>Tally</u> <u>for Females</u>	<u>Tally</u> <u>for Males</u>
-------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------

Number of times students speak.

Length of time students speak.

Number of times female students interrupt other male and/or female students.

Number of times male students interrupt other male and/or female students.

Number of times male/female students interrupt professors.

Talking during lectures (with other students).

Direct verbal confrontation with the faculty member.

Speaking without raising their hand (if applicable to classroom environment).

<u>Nonverbal Behaviors</u>	<u>Tally</u> <u>for Females</u>	<u>Tally</u> <u>for Males</u>
----------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------

Tardiness (without faculty knowledge).

Leaving class early (without faculty knowledge).

Rolling of eyes in disapproval or disagreement.

Crossing of arms, gesturing in disapproval or disagreement.

Laughter and sighing at statements made by faculty in disagreement, disbelief (when not applicable).

Sleeping in class.

Passing notes during lectures.

Doing other work during class (i.e., other class work, adjusting one's schedule, doing their nails, etc., note for how long).

Leaving class to get a snack or other.



Packing-up before class is dismissed.

Reading newspapers or other materials.

Checking the clock, watch for time note when this occurs.

Restlessness.

"Sleepy" posture (i.e., head down on desk).

Drawing, Doodling.

Other Observations:

Seating arrangement according to gender.

When passing materials out or back who, male or female, gets up to walk to Instructor as compared to who makes the Instructor walk to them.

Which gender of student tends to dominate class discussion.

Which gender speaks when spoken to as compared to just speaking out.  
(note tone of voice, completion of thoughts.)

Describe situation after class, who stays to talk to Instructor.

**Appendix B**  
**Research Instrument: Stage II,**  
**Survey Instrument**

# Consent Form

## Western Michigan University Department of Sociology

Principal Investigator: Joanne Ardovini-Brooker

I have been invited to participate in a doctoral dissertation research project entitled "Evaluations." I understand that this research consists of two separate parts each of which involve forming impressions.

My consent to participate indicates that I will be asked to complete two surveys with the researcher. For the first part, I will be asked to read four short article abstracts, and then give my evaluation of the author's scholarship.

For the second part, I will read twenty statements and then give my evaluation of those statements. I understand that some of the statements may be offensive and that I may withdraw my consent to participate at the present time or any time hereafter if I find the material offensive, without penalty or effect on my grades or relationship to Western Michigan University. I understand that, in total, the two parts will take approximately 20 minutes.

As in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to the participant. If an accidental injury occurs, appropriate emergency measures will be taken; however, no compensation or treatment will be made available to the participant except as otherwise stated in this consent forms.

I understand that all of the information collected from me is strictly anonymous. That means that my name will not be paired with my data, or appear on any papers on which this information is recorded.

Although there may be no immediate benefits to my participating, there may eventually be benefits to the field of sociology.

My signature below indicates that I understand the purpose and requirements of the study and that I agree to participate. If I have any questions or concerns about this study, I may contact the researcher at 387-5294. I may also contact the Chair of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (387-8298) or the Vice President for research (387-8298) with any concerns that I have.

Signature

Print Name

Date

### DIRECTIONS

In this packet you will find abstracts of four articles taken from The American Sociological Review. Each article abstract has been written by four different authors within the field of Sociology. At the end of each article you will find a series of statements. You are not presumed to be knowledgeable about the topics or the field of Sociology. I am interested in the ability of college students to make critical evaluations of scholarly writings. You are to evaluate each abstract on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being strongly agree and 5 being strongly disagree.

Please complete this packet in the order that it is given to you.

Thank you for your time.

Abstract # 1

**Title:** "The Responsive Community: A Communitarian Perspective"

**Author:** Joanna Berk

"Authentic communities, ones that are responsive to the "true needs" of all community members, reflect the appropriate balance of order and autonomy. The traditional contradiction between order and autonomy can be minimized by responsiveness that considers the community's historical position. When centripetal forces pull too much toward order, an emphasis must be placed on autonomy. When centrifugal forces pull too much toward autonomy, order must be given greater weight. The relationship between centripetal and centrifugal forces is peculiar. Like a symbiotic relationship, the forces enhance each other. However, at a point where one force gains undue supremacy over the other, they become antagonistic. This relationship, labeled inverting symbiosis, informs communitarian analysis of the current social conditions and therefore must be applied within context. As communities develop particularistic identities, boundaries between members and nonmembers evolve. To reduce the potential for conflict, layered loyalties (allegiances to multiple communities) must be fostered. Ultimately, an overarching "community of communities" must develop to respond to the needs of constituent communities as those communities are responsive to their constituent members."

You are to evaluate this abstract on a scale of 1 to 5:

Strongly Agree = 1      Agree = 2      N/A - Neutral = 3  
Disagree = 4      Strongly Disagree = 5

1. The author is persuasive in their argument.  
1      2      3      4      5
2. The author has a scholarly writing style.  
1      2      3      4      5
3. This author demonstrates professional expertise within the field of Sociology.      1      2      3      4      5
4. The author was able to hold the reader's interest.  
1      2      3      4      5
5. The author probably holds a high professional status position within the field.      1      2      3      4      5
6. I believe that the article has value within the field of Sociology.      1      2      3      4      5

Abstract # 2

**Title:** "Is Bigger Better? Explaining The Relationship Between  
Organization Size and Job Rewards"  
**Author:** Mark Buren

"Do employees in large organizations receive different economic and noneconomic job rewards than do employees in small organizations? If so, what explains the relationship between organization size and job rewards? We examine these questions using a recent nationally representative data set that provides information on organizations and their employees in the United States. We find that employees in large organizations have higher earnings, more fringe benefits and opportunities for promotion, but less autonomy on the job than do workers employed by small organizations. Our theoretical framework identifies several possible reasons for the relationship between organization size and job rewards, including industrial, geographic, organizational, and individual variables. Whether a firm has internal labor markets is the correlate of organization size most consistently related to job rewards."

You are to evaluate this abstract on a scale of 1 to 5:

Strongly Agree - 1      Agree - 2      N/A - Neutral - 3  
Disagree - 4      Strongly Disagree - 5

1. The author is persuasive in their argument.  
1      2      3      4      5
2. The author has a scholarly writing style.  
1      2      3      4      5
3. This author demonstrates professional expertise within the field of Sociology.  
1      2      3      4      5
4. The author was able to hold the reader's interest.  
1      2      3      4      5
5. The author probably holds a high professional status position within the field.  
1      2      3      4      5
6. I believe that the article has value within the field of Sociology.  
1      2      3      4      5

Abstract # 3

**Title:** "The Individualist Polity and The Prevalence of  
Professionalized Psychology: A Cross-National Study"

**Author:** John Meyer

"Contemporary societies are organized around models in which both collective and individual goods, resources, and other properties are central. These models are highly developed and rationalized so that scientific and cultural scrutiny of their core elements are highly legitimated. In almost all of these models, the individual is such a core element--as an ultimate sovereign, beneficiary, and as a component of the collective. This produces social arrangements in which scientized and professionalized attention to the inner structure and behavior of the individual receives much public attention. Using multiple indicator models, we show that those modern polities strongly centered on the individual as a core component create higher levels of professionalized psychology than do other polities, even when general social and economic resources and complexity (and some other controls) are held constant."

You are to evaluate this abstract on a scale of 1 to 5:

Strongly Agree = 1                      Agree = 2                      N/A - Neutral = 3  
Disagree = 4                      Strongly Disagree = 5

1.     The author is persuasive in their argument.  
      1        2        3        4        5
2.     The author has a scholarly writing style.  
      1        2        3        4        5
3.     This author demonstrates professional expertise within the  
      field of Sociology.  
      1        2        3        4        5
4.     The author was able to hold the reader's interest.  
      1        2        3        4        5
5.     The author probably holds a high professional status position  
      within the field.  
      1        2        3        4        5
6.     I believe that the article has value within the field of  
      Sociology.  
      1        2        3        4        5

Abstract # 4

**Title:** "Education, Social Liberalism, and Economic Conservatism:  
Attitudes Towards Homeless People"  
**Author:** Sarah Moore

"Numerous studies link education to liberal attitudes, such as tolerance and support for civil liberties, yet explanations for this association remain controversial. These models have been proposed: Liberal attitudes result from cognitive and personality development, from direct socialization, or from "ideological refinement." Tests of these models predicting social attitudes have failed you resolve the controversy. We argue that the mechanism by which education influences attitudes can be clarified by considering economic attitudes as well as social attitudes. We focus on attitudes toward homeless people, an issue with both social and economic components. Using a nation-wide survey, we find that education is associated with greater tolerance for homeless people but less support for economic aid to the homeless. These data support the socialization model, and we conclude that education socializes students to the "official culture," which in the United States includes values of equal opportunity and equal respect--but not equal outcomes."

You are to evaluate this abstract on a scale of 1 to 5:

Strongly Agree = 1      Agree = 2      N/A - Neutral = 3  
Disagree = 4      Strongly Disagree = 5

1. The author is persuasive in their argument.  
1      2      3      4      5
2. The author has a scholarly writing style.  
1      2      3      4      5
3. This author demonstrates professional expertise within the field of Sociology.  
1      2      3      4      5
4. The author was able to hold the reader's interest.  
1      2      3      4      5
5. The author probably holds a high professional status position within the field.  
1      2      3      4      5
6. I believe that the article has value within the field of Sociology.  
1      2      3      4      5



## DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Are you?
  1. Male
  2. Female
2. Are you?
  1. White, Non-Hispanic
  2. Black or African-American, Non-Hispanic
  3. Mexican American, Puerto Rican, or other Hispanic
  4. Latino(a) American
  5. Asian American
  6. Native American
  7. Other \_\_\_\_\_
3. Are you currently a:
  1. Freshman
  2. Sophomore
  3. Junior
  4. Senior
4. How old were you on your last birthday? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Which of the following categories represents your total family income for the last year before taxes?
  1. Less than 9,000
  2. \$10,000-\$19,999
  3. \$20,000-\$29,999
  4. \$30,000-\$39,999
  5. \$40,000-\$49,999
  6. \$50,000-\$59,999
  7. 60,0000 or over
7. What is the highest level of education that your Mother has completed?
  1. High School or less
  2. Some college/technical school
  3. Bachelor's degree
  4. Graduate degree
8. What is the highest level of education that your Father has completed?
  1. High School or less
  2. Some college/technical school
  3. Bachelor's degree
  4. Graduate degree
8. What is your Mother's occupation? (indicate full or part-time)

9. What is your Father's Occupation? (indicate full or part-time)

You are to evaluate this abstract on a scale of 1 to 5:

Strongly Agree = 1

Agree = 2

N/A - Neutral = 3

Disagree = 4

Strongly Disagree = 5

1. It is all right for women to work but men will always be the basic breadwinners.  
1      2      3      4      5
2. A woman should not expect to go to the same place or have the same freedom of action as a man.  
1      2      3      4      5
3. Realistically speaking, most progress so far has been made by men and we can expect it to continue that way.  
1      2      3      4      5
4. A woman should be expected to change her name when she marries.  
1      2      3      4      5
5. Women who join the Women's Movement are typically frustrated and unattractive people who feel they lose out by the current rules of society.  
1      2      3      4      5
6. As head of the household, the father should have final authority over his children.  
1      2      3      4      5
7. A women who refuses to give up her job to move with her husband would be to blame if the marriage broke up.  
1      2      3      4      5
8. Profanity sounds worse generally coming from a woman.  
1      2      3      4      5
9. A woman who refuses to bear children has failed in her duty to her husband.  
1      2      3      4      5
10. Women are basically more unpredictable than men.  
1      2      3      4      5
11. The "clinging vine" wife is justified provided she clings sweetly enough to please her husband.  
1      2      3      4      5
12. One should never trust a woman's account of another woman.  
1      2      3      4      5

13. A working woman who sends her six month old baby to a daycare center is a bad mother.  
1 2 3 4 5
14. Women should not be permitted to hold political offices that involve great responsibility.  
1 2 3 4 5
15. It is desirable that women be appointed to police forces with the same duties as men.  
1 2 3 4 5
16. Women have the right to compete with men in every sphere of activity.  
1 2 3 4 5
17. A woman to be truly womanly should gracefully accept chivalrous attentions from men.  
1 2 3 4 5
18. The unmarried mother is morally a greater failure than the unmarried father.  
1 2 3 4 5
19. It is absurd to regard obedience as a wifely virtue.  
1 2 3 4 5
20. Whether or not they realize it, most women are exploited by men.  
1 2 3 4 5

Thank You for completing this Questionnaire. All your answers are completely confidential.

**Appendix C**  
**Protocol Clearance From the Human Subjects**  
**Institutional Review Board**

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board

Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008-3899  
616 387-6293

---

**WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY**

---

To: Dr. Susan Caringella-MacDonald  
Joanne Ardovini-Brooker

From: Richard A. Wright, Chair *Richard A. Wright*  
Human Subjects Institutional Review Board

Subject: HSIRB Project # 96-09-06

Date: September 13, 1996

This is to inform you that your project entitled "Discrimination Against The Female Faculty Member," has been approved under the expedited category of research. This approval is based upon your proposal as presented to the HSIRB, and you may utilize human subjects only in accord with this approved proposal.

Your project is approved for a period of one year from the above date. If you should revise any procedures relative to human subjects or materials, you must resubmit those changes for review in order to retain approval. Should any untoward incidents or unanticipated adverse reactions occur with the subjects in the process of this study, you must suspend the study and notify me immediately. The HSIRB will then determine whether or not the study may continue.

Please be reminded that all research involving human subjects must be accomplished in full accord with the policies and procedures of Western Michigan University, as well as all applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulations. Any deviation from those policies, procedures, laws or regulations may cause immediate termination of approval for this project.

Thank you for your cooperation. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Project Expiration Date: September 13, 1997

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alcoff, L. & Potter, E. (1993). Feminist epistemologies. New York: Routledge.
- Andersen, M.L. (1994). Thinking about women: Sociological perspectives on sex and gender (4th ed.). New York: MacMillan.
- Barrett, N.S. (1979). Occupations, earnings, and career opportunities. In Smith, R.E. (Ed.), The subtle revolution (pp. 63-98). Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Basow, S.A., & Silberg, N.T. (1987). Student evaluations of college professors: Are female and male professors rated differently?. Journal of Educational Psychology, 79(3), 308-314.
- Belk, S.S., & Snell, Jr., W.E. (1986). Beliefs about women: Components and correlates. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 12(4), 403-413.
- Bennett, 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(2), 170-179.
- Berg, B.L. (1995). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bergmann, B.R. (July/August 1985). Comparable worth for professors. Academe, 8-10.
- Biddlecombe, L., Browne, J., Charlton, B., Dowden, H., Northcott, C., Onslow, J., Priestley, J., & Thompson, J. (1989). Learning the hard way: Women's oppression in men's education. London: MacMillan.
- Bogue, D.J. (1985). The population of the United States: Historical trends and future projections. London: MacMillan.
- Briskin, L. (1991). Feminist pedagogy: Teaching and learning liberation. Ottawa, Ontario: Social Science Division of York University.
- Brooks, V.R. (1982). Sex differences in student dominance behavior in female and male professors' classrooms. Sex Roles, 8(7), 683-690.

- Buckless, F.A., Ravenscroft, S.P., & Baldwin-Morgan, A.A. (1996). The academic underclass: Accounting for women as adjuncts. <http://les.man.ac.uk/cpa96/txt/buckless.txt>.
- Burn, S.M. (1996). The social psychology of gender. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Chamberlain, M.K. (1988). Women in academe: Progress and prospects. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Daly, M. (1973). Beyond god the father: Towards a philosophy of women's liberation. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Daly, M. (1990). Gyn/ecology: The metaethics of radical feminism. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Davies, S., Lubelska, C., & Quinn, J. (1994). Changing the subject: Women in higher education. London: Taylor & Francis.
- de Beauvoir, S. (1989). The second sex. New York: Vintage Books.
- Dion, K.L. (1987). What's in a title? The Ms. stereotype and images of women's titles of address. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11, 21-36.
- Dunlap, D.M., & Schmuck, P.A. (1995). Women leading in education. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Eagly, A.H., & Mladinic, A. (1989) Gender stereotypes and attitudes towards women and men. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15(4), 543-558.
- Eliot, R.S., Ferree, M., & Miller, F.D. (1975). A short scale of attitudes towards feminism. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 6, 51-56.
- Figueira-McDonough, J. (1985) Gender, race, and class: Differences in levels of feminist orientations. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 21(2), 121-142.
- Fox Keller, E., & Moglen H. (1987). Competition and feminism: Conflicts for academic women. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 12(3), 493-511.
- Friedan, B. (1984). The feminine mystique. New York: Dell.
- Gere Lewis, M. (1993). Without a word: Teaching beyond women's silence. New York: Routledge.

- Green, G.P., & Becker, E.H. (1997). Employment and earnings: Volume 44 Number 1. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Hall, R.M., Sandler, B. (1982). The classroom climate: A chilly one for women?. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges Project on the Status and Education of Women.
- Henslin, J. (1997). Sociology: A down-to-earth approach (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- hooks, b. (1994). Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom. New York: Routledge.
- Hoover, R. (1996, May 21). Few women at U-M are making it to the top. The Detroit News. [HTTP://netnews.com/menu/stories/48815.htm](http://netnews.com/menu/stories/48815.htm).
- Humm, M. (1992). Modern feminism: Political, literary, cultural. New York: Columbia University Press.
- James, J. & Farmer, R. (1993). Spirit, space & survival: African American in (white) academe. New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, A.G. (1995). The Blackwell dictionary of sociology: A user's guide to sociological language. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Krupnick, C.G. (1985). Women and men in the classroom: Inequality and its remedies. On Teaching and Learning: The Journal of Harvard-Danford Center, 1, 19-25.
- Kulis, S. (1997). Gender segregation among college and university employees. Sociology of Education, 70(2), 151-173.
- Ligh, P. (1996, April 4). Female profs say Yale has far to go on tenure road. Yale News. [HTTP://www.yale.edu/ydn/paper/4.4.96/4.496storyno.AC.htm/](http://www.yale.edu/ydn/paper/4.4.96/4.496storyno.AC.htm/).
- Luke, C. & Gore, J. (1992). Feminisms and critical pedagogy. New York: Routledge.
- MacKinnon, C.A. (1987). Feminism unmodified: Discourses on life and law. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- MacLean, B.D. & Milovanovic, D. (1991). New directions in critical criminology. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Maher, F.A. & Thompson Tetreault, M.K. (1994). The feminist classroom. New York: Basic Books.



- Marchand, M.H., & Parpart, J.L. (1995). Feminism/postmodernism/development. London: Routledge.
- Martin, E. (1984). Power and authority in the classroom: Sexist stereotypes in teaching evaluations. Signs, 9(3), 482-492.
- Maynard, M. & Purvis, J. (1994). Researching women's lives from a feminist perspective. Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis.
- Middleton, S. (1993). Education feminists: Life histories and pedagogy. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Moses, Y.T. (1989). Black women in academe. Washington, DC: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges.
- National Council for Research on Women, The. (1996). Affirmative action: Beyond the glass ceiling and the sticky floor. Issues Quarterly, 1(4), 1-28.
- Nicholson, L.J. (1990). Feminism/postmodernism. New York: Routledge.
- Paludi, M.A., & Strayer, L.A. (1985). What's in an author's name? Differential evaluations of performance as a function of author's names. Sex Roles, 12(3/4), 353-361.
- Pigford, A.B. (Nov. 1988). Being a black faculty member on a white campus: My reality. Black Issues in Higher Education, (Nov): 76.
- Porter, N., Geis, F.L., & Jennings, J. (1983). Are women invisible as leaders?. Sex Roles, 9(10), 1035-1049.
- Reich, R.B. & Nussbaum, K. (1994). 1993 handbook on women workers: Trends and issues. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor and Women's Bureau.
- Reinharz, S. (1992). Feminist methods in social research. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reskin, B. & Padavic, I. (1994). Women and men at work. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Sadker, M. & Sadker, D. (1986). Sexism in the classroom: From grade school to graduate school. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(7), 512-515.
- Sandler, B.S. (1991). Women faculty at work in the classroom, or, why it still hurts to be a women in labor. Communication Education, 40, 6-15.

- Sandler, B.R. (1992, May). Success and survival strategies for women faculty members. Washington, DC: The Association of American Colleges, 1-12.
- Sandler, B.R., & Hall, R.M. (1986). The campus climate revisited: Chilly for women faculty, administrators, and graduate students. Washington, DC: The Project on the Status and Education of Women Association of American Colleges.
- Schneir, M. (1992). Feminism: The essential historical writings. New York: Vintage Books.
- Simeone, A. (1987). Academic women: Working towards equality. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Smith, E.R., Ferree, M.M., & Miller, F.D.. (1975). A short scale of attitudes towards feminism. Representative Research in Social Psychology 6, 51-57.
- Stacey, J., Bereaud, S., & Daniels, J. (1974) And Jill came tumbling after: Sexism in American education. New York: Dell.
- Swim, J.K. & Sanna, L.J. (1996). He's skilled, she's lucky: A meta-analysis of observers' attributions for women's and men's successes and failures. The Society for Personality and Social Psychology, 22(5), 507-519.
- Tong, R. (1989). Feminist thought: A comprehensive introduction. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Vartuli, S. (1982). The Ph.D. experience: A woman's point of view. New York: Praeger.
- Welch, L. (1990). Women in higher education: Changes and challenges. New York: Praeger.
- Wilson, R. (June 1997). At Harvard, Yale, and Stanford, women lose tenure bids despite backing from departments: Some female academics see a pattern in the difficulties they face at top universities. The Chronicle of Higher Education, XLIII, 39, A10.