

Spring 2018

Gender Bias in Higher Education: A Case Study of Rollins College

Zoe Mitchell
zmitchell@rollins.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.rollins.edu/honors>



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mitchell, Zoe, "Gender Bias in Higher Education: A Case Study of Rollins College" (2018). *Honors Program Theses*. 70.
<https://scholarship.rollins.edu/honors/70>

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Program Theses by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact rwalton@rollins.edu.

Gender Bias in Higher Education: A Case Study of Rollins College

Zoe Mitchell
Department of Anthropology
Rollins College

Acknowledgements

This project would not have been possible without the help of my thesis advisor, Dr. Ashley Kistler. I would like to thank her for her unconditional support and encouragement and her expert advice throughout this process. I would also like to express my gratitude to my thesis committee, Dr. Shan-Estelle Brown, Dr. Nolan Kline, and Dr. Margaret McLaren, for their helpful feedback and guidance. Additionally, I would like to thank my interviewees for their candor and willingness to share their experiences with me. Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for supporting me during this project.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
Methodology	4
Thesis Overview.....	6
2. Literature Review	8
On Ethnography.....	8
Ethnography of Higher Education	9
Feminism and the Academy	10
History of Women in Higher Education	14
Current Issues.....	18
3. Gender at Rollins College	26
History of Rollins College.....	26
Women at Rollins College.....	27
Current Overview of Gender at Rollins College	33
4. Gender and Faculty-Student Interactions.....	36
Classroom Experience.....	36
Emotional Labor	43
Student Evaluations	45
5. Gender and The Academic Institution	49
The Old Boys' Club.....	49
Faculty Meetings/Positions of Power.....	53
Policies—Parental Leave	56
6. Gender and Compensation	62
Controversy about Market Pay	63
Attempted Improvements/Reparations.....	69
Silencing	71
7. Conclusion	73
Recommendations	75
References	78
Appendix	81

Chapter One: Introduction

Introduction

Halfway through my undergraduate career, I had a strange interaction with a professor. I was a junior in college and the newly appointed co-president of “Voices for Women,” our feminist club on campus. One of my first duties was to represent the club at the R-Compass fair, where all of the clubs on campus set up tables in the gym and try to recruit first year students and other new members. I spent two hours shaking hands, introducing myself, and asking people to write their answer to “What Does Feminism Mean to You?” on our little trifold board.

I saw one of my old professors, who was hanging out at the fair and eventually walked over to say hi. After the usual catch-up questions, I asked my professor, “Hey! Do you want to write what feminism means to you on our board?”

Something peculiar happened. The professor suddenly got flustered.

“I’d have to think about that,” he replied.

“Oh, that’s ok!” I responded, trying to stay upbeat. “I know it’s a tough question, I still haven’t written anything yet!”

He looked uncomfortable.

“Um ... I guess I would say that ... feminism is over? And it’s just causing trouble?” he responded.

I felt my face get hot and my heart start beating fast. Keep in mind; he said this to my face after watching me introduce myself as the president of our feminist club for two hours! I couldn’t believe it.

“Do you believe that all social movements for equality are over?” I asked.

He got even more flustered.

“Well ... I guess that would depend on where it was happening ... and when ...”

“Do you think we have equality in this country, today?” I pressed.

With that, my flustered professor could not think of a reply and walked away from the conversation. I was stunned. Here was a man I respected, who has a PhD—and he thought feminism was over? What’s worse, he disrespected me enough to tell me to my face?! I was equal parts livid and disheartened. How was my professor not aware of the inequalities and discrimination women face? While this was a discouraging and enlightening interaction, it was my first experience with gender bias in higher education.

Unfortunately, this type of experience is not an isolated incident among women in academia. Although women are attending college and graduating with advanced degrees at higher rates than men in many areas, inequalities and prejudices persist. This issue does not pertain only to students; gender affects faculty and staff members of institutions of higher education as well. When accomplished geobiologist Dr. Hope Jahren was asked about backlash she faced for writing about sexism in the sciences, she responded, “I have learned that nothing gets readers so fired up as saying something everyone knows is true. My next piece will be called “Water Is Wet” (O’Connor 2016).

Sexism, however, is not relegated to scientific fields. It can affect the career trajectories of faculty members across all disciplines, at research institutions and liberal arts colleges alike. Though much research has been conducted on this subject, there is a lack of ethnographic research on the culture of higher education; additionally, current research shows that inequality of gender in academia continues to be an issue that can cause repercussions when discussed (Wisniewski 2000, Perger 2016). This project thus assists in filling the gaps of knowledge in

these areas, while developing an assessment of gendered experience among faculty at Rollins College.

In this thesis, I use ethnographic methods to examine gendered experiences of faculty on college campuses, using Rollins College as a case study. Specifically, I consider how gendered biases, norms, and identities influence the development of one's career and one's experiences working in academia and higher education. I examine if experiences of male and female faculty vary, and to what these differences in experience can be attributed. Subcategories I investigate are gender's influence on interactions with students; gendered experiences in the academic institution; and gender's impact on the issue of compensation. I will contextualize the information collected through this research within information on the history of women and gendered issues at Rollins College.

Through my research, I argue that though academia is often considered a liberal environment, there are nevertheless serious problems relating to gender inequity that plague the experience of faculty members, and the denial of such problems only reinforces existing issues. On this note, it is often the women and others who speak up about oppressive systems who are most affected, and solutions are not as simple as just including women in more spaces or promoting their voices. It is important to recognize that women are capable of being complicit in the oppression of women and other minorities. Therefore, those who are advocates for breaking down structures of inequality deserve to be heard, and their experiences with and ideas about academia are what will effect change on college campuses in this regard. This thesis thus provides a platform for faculty members to share their experiences, views, and opinions regarding their experiences as faculty members as they relate to gender at Rollins College.

Methodology

The ethnographic portion of my research was conducted using semi-structured interviews with faculty members of Rollins College. I conducted nineteen interviews with male and female faculty members across different academic disciplines and ranks. Administrators were also interviewed for supplemental data; the number and identities of these interviews will not be disclosed to protect anonymity. I reached out by email to a demographically representative group of faculty members from all different divisions of the college (Humanities, Social Sciences, Sciences, Expressive Arts, and Business), chosen with the help of my advisor. However, I ended up only interviewing professors from Humanities, Social Sciences, and Sciences, because those were the only people who agreed to be interviewed. To protect identity, throughout my thesis I will refer to people by their discipline and gender, rather than by their names. I use binary language throughout, to align with how my population self-identified, but I acknowledge that nonbinary faculty members exist, and that their experiences might be similar or different to what I encountered.

These interviews contained specific, yet open-ended questions focusing on the interviewee's academic background and motivations for becoming a professor; their experience working in higher education as it relates to their gender identity; discrimination faced based on gender identity; gender and its effects in a classroom setting; and opinions on the origins of and solutions for gender-based inequity [interview guide can be found in Appendix]. Each interview ranged between thirty minutes to an hour. My interview guide was the same for all of my interviewees, but conducting separate interviews allowed me to specialize follow-up questions based on the interviewee's answers.

To analyze the interviews, I discerned major themes through an analysis of my notes and transcriptions of interviews. I decided on the themes based on a combination of analyzing the most common responses among interviewees and including anecdotes from interviews that stood out as particularly significant or meaningful. This process was completed holistically, without the aid of software or statistical analysis; while this gave me the freedom to structure my thesis in a way that I believe best contextualized the data found from interviews, my own opinions and judgments of important themes in the data could have influenced my determining of the themes. Once the themes and structure of the thesis were decided on, I color coded my transcriptions based on theme, and used this coding method to inform the quotes, anecdotes, and examples from my data used in each chapter.

My background in intersectional feminism, as well as my interest in academia and status as a student of Rollins College, and therefore my investment in the topic, is an important potential bias to note. By using topical interviews, I attempted to avoid letting this bias affect my interviews by making sure to ask questions that were not leading or accusatory. I also avoided stating my own opinions and background during interviews as much as possible, and instead allowed the interviews to move naturally and in the direction that the interviewee turned them, without prompting or encouragement on my end.

My positionality as a white, female student of Rollins College is important to note when discussing my biases. It is possible that my being a white woman affected my participants' responses to questions regarding gender. While I obtained my participants' consent to interview them on these subjects and informed them of the content of the interview beforehand, it is still possible that their answers may be affected depending on differing or similar gender identities. It is difficult to determine if this occurred, and to what extent.

Additionally, it is possible that my affiliation with Rollins College affected interviewees' answers regarding criticism of the institution. The lack of a written record of their participation as well as the use of pseudonyms in notes and publication are attempts to encourage the most possible candor and trust regarding this issue; however, this affiliation may still have affected participants' answers.

This research project has important limitations to note. As I intend to graduate in May 2018, I am limited by the amount of time my research can span. I will not be able to conduct multiple interviews that span time to assess progress of an issue, for instance; rather, I can only assess my interviewees' feelings on this topic at this specific moment in time. This limitation means that my research will present more of a snapshot of faculty at present, instead of a comparative progression. I am also limiting the scope of my research by choosing to focus only on faculty members at Rollins College. As I did not be interviewing staff members or students, I am only looking at academia through the specific lens of faculty members. Instead of widening my scope to multiple institutions in the area, my project is more of a case study of Rollins in particular. As a result, my interviewees are limited to faculty of a liberal arts college as opposed to a larger research institution. My interview pool is also smaller than if I had access to a larger institution, and I am limited demographically to the demographics of Rollins' faculty.

Thesis Overview

To analyze my interviews, I have found common themes among my responses and will discuss these in depth in the coming chapters, relating them to the themes discussed in the literature review as well as contextualizing them with the history of the college. In Chapter Two, I provide an overview of relevant literature to contextualize the topic, including sections on ethnography, feminism in the academy, a history of women in higher education, and current

issues. In Chapter Three, I review gender at Rollins, including the history of Rollins as an institution and the history of women at Rollins, including changes in policy such as Title IX and maternity leave, and provide an overview of women at Rollins currently.

In Chapter Four, I begin to analyze the first of the themes discovered during my interviews, which is gender and its influence on faculty and student interactions. In Chapter Five I discuss gender and its influence on faculty members' experiences at Rollins as an institution. This includes the culture of Rollins and how it relates to gender, the effect of policies such as maternity leave, and faculty's changing experience with gender over the course of their career. Chapter Six provides an analysis of compensation and gender at Rollins. Lastly, I reflect on the problems established by my data and propose potential solutions, including both those suggested by my interviewees and my own additions.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Introduction

To provide context for my ethnographic research and analysis, I will review literature on related subjects. I first provide a background of ethnography and its history in higher education, and continue with an overview of feminism in the academy and women in higher education. Lastly, I present current issues for women in academia.

On Ethnography

My ethnographic investigation into gender bias in higher education at Rollins College necessarily requires an understanding of anthropological and ethnographic frameworks, as I use these frameworks to conduct, analyze, and synthesize my research. Fieldwork is the hallmark of anthropological research and the method that anthropologists use to test hypotheses, collect information, or interpret actions, with the underlying common goal of understanding various aspects of people's lives. Fieldwork involves entering a community and studying them through various methods such as participant observation and ethnographic interviews. The focus of the ethnographer is not to find large-scale patterns, but rather "on small-scale studies defined by individuals and their community" (Cohen 2015: 11). Ethnography is the composition of such fieldwork, detailing the aspects of culture investigated or the answers and analyses of hypotheses examined. Ethnography yields largely qualitative data and can even be viewed as the root of all qualitative approaches (Wisniewski 2000: 6).

Fieldwork is conducted partially through participant observation, meaning the anthropologist becomes a part of the culture and observes it as an active participant. This approach accomplishes multiple goals. The most obvious of these goals is the clarity of understanding brought by actually participating in cultural acts. Just as important, though, is the

trust and rapport that is hopefully built through participant observation. Only with this rapport can the anthropologist conduct honest interviews and try to gain an insider (emic) perspective. This perspective is essential, as a person's understanding of their own culture and practices can be very different from outsiders' assumptions.

Fieldwork does not have to be conducted in a culture separate from one's own, though traditionally that has been the case (Wisniewski 2000: 9). It is possible to conduct ethnographic fieldwork in the culture to which one belongs. Although the anthropologist may already be familiar with the culture, ethnographic methods are still used and can still be productive means for collecting qualitative data.

Ethnography of Higher Education

The ethnographic study of academia and "the culture of higher education" is an area that, unlike the culture of college students or K-12 education, is seldom ethnographically researched (Wisniewski 2000: 8). Richard Wisniewski refers to this phenomenon as "The Averted Gaze" (2000). There are plenty of reasons why academics would be hesitant to study themselves; Wisniewski points out the politics involved in such an endeavor, such as the potential embarrassment of the academy. He explains, "the academy is, after all, a club, and members are expected to be discrete. Like any exclusive club, the academic world fears public scrutiny" (Wisniewski 2000: 8). Such criticisms from one's own colleagues have the potential not only to upset the balance of the institution but also to jeopardize one's own career, or at the very least be brushed off as not a worthwhile area of study. This phenomenon is partially due to "the hierarchical nature of academic ranks and the separation of administrators from faculty"

(Wisniewski 2000: 9). The need to adhere to the social order of the system is all but necessary to achieve academic and career goals; conforming to norms is essential (Wisniewski 2000: 9).

But why study higher education at all? The lack of ethnographic research of the academy is not a sufficient reason. Although ethnographers can, in theory, study a culture simply to gain unknown information, a purpose larger than satisfying one's own curiosity is appreciated. To answer this question, one needs only to look at academia as an institution, and recognize that like all institutions, certain groups have traditionally held power. Academia, traditionally "a bastion of male dominance," is no exception. The relatively small amount of time that women have been included in the institution proves that "ethnographic studies are needed to probe the racial, gender, ethnic, class, and power issues all too often glossed over, especially in earlier periods of scholarship on higher education" (Wisniewski 2000: 14). The intersection of race and gender is an important aspect of women in the academy; while "societal privilege is in fact bestowed upon White women because of their race and men of color because of their gender," women of color, for example, remain minorities in the historically white male academy (Harris 2012: 104). The systems of oppression affecting women in higher education are therefore varied and intersecting. If ethnographic study has the ability to provoke social change or at the very least lead to the acknowledgement of problems, it can likely achieve this with problems within the institution of the academy. Discovering those problems, of course, is the first step of said ethnographic research. Making changes to the structures and foundations of the institution come next.\

Feminism and the Academy

One of the many areas of investigation into ethnography of higher education includes a feminist perspective. A feminist ethnography of higher education not only considers women and

their place in the changing institution but also epistemology and the gendered construction of knowledge itself, as even this is not in fact neutral. Institutions carry hierarchy, inequality, and power dynamics. Viewed critically, these hierarchies can be “seen as a carrier of power relations that subjugate individuals for organizational purposes” (Mackinnon & Brooks 2001: 6). An intersectional approach to analyzing systems of power and the academy must not only include gender, as many other forms of oppression are at play, including race and class. As Dr. Tina Harris explains, “overt and covert discriminatory behaviors exist and create qualitatively different lived experiences for the oppressed and the oppressors” (Harris 2012: 103).

The extent to which women and minorities have been kept out of higher education is proof of the academy’s history as a white, male institution. Historically, “the production and management of knowledge have traditionally been terrains dominated by men” (Mackinnon & Brooks 2001: 17). This means that men defined and controlled the “reproduction of [gendered] knowledge in society” (Mackinnon & Brooks 2001: 17). The constructions and organizations of knowledge, then, were not only simply defined by men but were also linked to masculinity and social systems power. These include “the establishment of an ‘essential’ duality between reason and experience (emotion) and at the same time legitimized and prioritized reason over emotion as the sine qua non of claims to truth” (Mackinnon & Brooks 2001: 17; Seidler 1994). In this way, men established a hierarchy of knowledge defined on their own terms, becoming “protectors and gatekeepers” of modernity (Seidler 1994: 19). Women, then, are automatically disadvantaged, as it is they who have to prove they meet the given standards provided for them by men. Authority as epistemic subjects is thus limited or nearly impossible for women, as the institutionalized systems of knowledge were taken as the standard, “while women were positioned and defined by what they lack” (2001: 17; 1994: ix).

This singular definition of knowledge leaves room for challengers. Feminism, in particular, brought to light the mythologized neutrality of institutional epistemology, critiquing it for presenting as “impartial when it served to legitimate their subordination and oppression” (Mackinnon & Brooks 2001: 17). Acknowledging the problem, however, is only the first step, but it is important; restructuring gendered systems of knowledge requires “permanent questioning... to establish equality for women in patriarchal organizational cultures” (Mackinnon and Brooks 2001: 7). It also requires an analysis of multiple systems of oppression and their effect on inequality in the academy, as gender is not the only system of oppression upheld by these existing epistemologies. The next step is to establish alternative, in this case feminist, epistemological systems, as a “conscious strategy of resistance” (2001: 7).

As women were relegated to the “experience” side of the reason/experience duality, legitimizing experience as a foundation of knowledge was critical. This characterization does not come without challenges, as women’s experiences are not all the same and should not be painted with a broad brush. Doing so denies the “interlocking systems of oppression” that interact and influence women differently (Broido et al. 2015: 599). Kimberle Crenshaw explains, “the problem with identity politics is not that it fails to transcend difference, as some critics charge, but rather the opposite—that it frequently conflates or ignores intra group differences” (Crenshaw 1994). Her concept of intersectionality, or the interactions of multiple systems of oppression in a single identity, helps to explain the experience of women of color, for example (Crenshaw 1994). Crenshaw explains, “the intersection of racism and sexism factors into Black women's lives in ways that cannot be captured wholly by looking at the women race or gender dimensions of those experiences separately” (Crenshaw 1994). Thus, an intersectional approach

must be used in order to not disregard the variety of experiences that exist within an oppressed group.

Though feminists are rightly critiqued for this mistake, the legitimization of experience as knowledge still stands. Beginning with experiences as a way to understand one's identity within an oppressive system is necessary because people "have to start with [their] own experience... to understand how profoundly it influences [their] own perspectives, values, attitudes, and role in society" (Glazer-Raymo 1999: 1). This approach fosters communication, commiseration, and a realization of the commonalities of experience under oppressive systems. Such realizations are necessary, as "even women who have been the target of systemic gender bias and sexist abuse may not think of themselves as such, instead seeing discriminatory acts as isolated and personal—or even wondering if they have done something to cause the abuse" (Meyers 2013: 274). These interlocking systems can be analogized to a birdcage:

Like the wires of a birdcage, when one examines the individual manifestations of sexism too closely, only single actions directly in front of the viewer are visible. Therefore, it is possible to believe mistakenly that one can navigate around the sexist action. However, by stepping back and observing the larger, complex scheme, "a network of forces and barriers which are systematically related and which conspire to the immobilization, reduction, and molding of women" becomes evident (Frye 1983; Broido et. al 2015: 599).

One could argue that for this reason, an epistemology of experience is crucial to breaking down all oppressive systems (including hierarchical structures of knowledge). Importantly, this does not mean simply prioritizing the views or experiences of those from an oppressed group, as people in said groups can be influenced by hegemony and perpetuate systems of dominance that

work against themselves and others. Instead, alternative viewpoints and experiences of those who are advocates for change must be emphasized here.

As I mentioned previously, exploration into the territory of critiquing knowledge (and by extension, the academy, the purveyor and organizer of knowledge) does not come without cost. Along with personal threats of career jeopardization, some are hesitant to believe that a restructuring within an oppressive system is possible at all. The management of such research by the oppressive institution potentially “colonizes the identities of researchers themselves” and causes women to self-censor (Mackinnon & Brooks 2001: 7). There is also the risk of backlash, both personally directed and strong enough to hurt the movement as a whole (Glazer-Raymo 1999: 29). Yet, these fears do not justify a passivity or acceptance of institutional norms. Despite current inequities that remain, the history of women in higher education has shown that epistemological and institutional change has occurred, and that systems of knowledge and power can be shifted through strategies of resistance (Mackinnon and Brooks 2001: 7). Through an analysis of the history of women in higher education, we see how women and others have worked to change the systems of knowledge and power in place, and the areas where work can still be done.

History of Women in Higher Education

In addition to shifting a gendered epistemology, the inclusion of women and other minorities in academic spaces must occur. A wide body of literature has established that institutions are gendered spaces, and academia is no exception. For much of academia’s history, women and people of color have been blatantly excluded. In the United Kingdom, for example, where universities have functioned for centuries, women only began to be “‘admitted’ on a

limited basis as students at the Universities of Cambridge, London, and Oxford in the 1860s and 1870s, sometimes initially in separate classes and examinations” (Mackinnon & Brooks 2001: 71).

Women’s role in the modern academy began to dramatically expand congruently with women in the workforce. This expansion can be attributed to many factors, including World War II, the passage Civil Rights Act and Title IX in the United States, and even control over fertility (Broido et al. 2015: 595).

The rise of middle and upper class women in the workforce coincided with the Civil Rights Movement. Consequently, the passage of the Equal Pay Act in 1963 became the first “major piece of federal equity legislation for women” (Glazer-Raymo 1999: 13). This year was the same one in which Betty Friedan’s *The Feminine Mystique* was published, and women’s oppression, or sexism—then “the problem with no name”—became a part of the collective American conscience ((Glazer-Raymo 1999: 13). The following year saw President Lyndon Johnson pass the Civil Rights Act, Title VII of which “prohibited discrimination based on race, sex, religion, color, and nation of origin (Glazer-Raymo 1999: 14). Prohibiting discrimination is not, however, the same as legislating equity—a sticking point in legislation to come. In terms of combatting sexism, women still had far to go.

Women’s oppressed status in academia at the time was statistically dramatic. Though women were not excluded from the institution altogether, their achievement was severely limited. This limitation translated to a lack of representation in managerial or superlative positions. Women might have been allowed in the academy (albeit in small numbers), but their status was proportionally kept significantly lower than their male counterparts. Men in positions of management maintain the hierarchy, and this has been an apparent trend since the rise of

management as a distinct professional category with the rise of capitalism in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Mackinnon & Brooks 2001: 73). These men control organizational, technical, and personnel matters, and in doing so establish relationship of power among social groups. Men thus solidified their ability not only to maintain power within an organization but also to designate and define “managerial knowledge” (Mackinnon & Brooks 2001: 73). This phenomenon is especially relevant in university and educational settings in general, as these are “key institutions contributing to (gendered) production and reproduction of (gendered) knowledge in society” (Mackinnon & Brooks 2001: 73). Women, of course, are capable of enforcing traditional systems of power in managerial roles as well; for this reason, having women and other people in positions of power who are advocates for changing oppressive systems are necessary for disrupting dominant narratives.

Additionally, discrepancies in status are hegemonically perpetuated through culture. Broido et al. explain that “organizational processes construct symbols and images that support gender differences in organizations—the masterful business leader, the difficult female boss” (2015). Like the perpetuation of all gendered societal norms, such ideas exist to prop up systems of inequality and have real effects on women’s status as leaders in academia.

We can see these effects in statistics of professionals in academia at the advent of Title IX legislation. For example, “In 1970-71, while women were 67 percent of all schoolteachers, they were only 15 percent of all principals, and .6 percent of all superintendents” (Bornstein 1980). In higher education specifically, “9.7% of male faculty members had achieved the rank of professor compared to 2.5% of female faculty members” (Bornstein 1980). This inequity extended to salary as well, as discrepancies in pay were clear: “Women college faculty members received average salaries almost \$2,500 less than their male counterparts” (Bornstein 1980).

While these statistics may not seem shocking today, they were necessary to prove the necessity of legal education reform such as Title IX. As Marian Meyers explains, many viewed the accusations of sexism and inequity in academia as “hyperbolic, overstated, unjust, and unwarranted” (Meyers 2013: 274). The academy (and those in charge of it) were reticent to change, but the passage of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and its final ratification in 1975, proved to be a catalyst for many institutional shifts (Bornstein 1980).

Title IX declares, “No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance” (Bornstein 1980). Title IX applies to all schools, from elementary to university level. Even private institutions are not exempt, as almost all of them receive federal funding. Even the most prestigious academies were forced to comply, despite potential public discontent. Rita Bornstein eloquently explains the importance of legal change on situations of equity, clarifying that “while the basic assumptions and attitudes people hold about appropriate female and male roles, jobs, and behaviors cannot be changed by law, rights, privileges, opportunities, and treatment can be equalized” (1980). As was proven, these legal changes have the power to affect change at a structural level. Unfortunately, this does not guarantee the complicity of all participants, as shifts in culture take much longer to occur.

Title IX’s implementation policy required five processes of universities: “self-evaluation of policy, designation of title IX coordinator, grievance procedures, dissemination of policy, and assurance of compliance” (Bornstein 1980). Basically, schools no longer were able to discriminate based on sex, they needed to evaluate their current policies for doing so, and they needed to set up systems so that violations had a place to be reported and that people knew what

the procedure for this was. Generally, Title IX covered admission and treatment of students, as well as employment in academic institutions. This meant that students could not be barred from attending certain classes or participating in certain sports based on gender; it also meant that many hallowed, prestigious, all-male institutions of higher education were forced to become coeducational.

It is important to note that not allowing discrimination is different from requiring equal treatment. By 1989, for example, fourteen years after the passage of Title IX, women were 53% of all college students, but “only 13 percent of tenured full professors and 11 percent of college and university presidents” (Glazer-Raymo 1999: 172). For women of color, these numbers were even smaller (175). In many aspects of their careers, women were still treated as lesser and unwelcome, and this status affected their career trajectories. Men’s acceptance of women in the academy was rocky at best, making the professional atmosphere a hostile place for women. Despite institutional changes brought on by Title IX, cultural shifts occur more slowly. The culture of academia as a male dominated institution remained and its legacy is still felt today.

Current Issues

The current issues that women face in academia vary widely. The areas I will cover in this review are compensation discrepancies; work overload; underrepresentation and high attrition rates in male-dominated academic fields and management; and backlash received for speaking out about these issues.

Gender inequities in compensation in academia may seem simple to analyze quantitatively, but the existence of this issue is contested. In general, the culture of salaried pay is such that even discussion of one’s pay is taboo. This taboo helps to keep knowledge of pay

inequity from surfacing. Some examples of related issues faced by women in academia today are salary inequity, a lack of compensation for taking on extra responsibilities (and the higher likelihood of female faculty to take on these responsibilities) and tenure inequality.

The extent and nature of these examples of gender bias vary depending both on the identities of the faculty involved as well as the type of institution at which they occur. On the issue of tenure inequality, liberal arts colleges tend to be more equal than research institutions:

The unexplained portion of the gender salary gap at liberal arts colleges is smaller relative to research institutions... This more equal treatment may be the result of greater value placed on overall salary equity at liberal arts institutions, and less emphasis on performance-based pay structures. But, it should be noted that this more equal treatment comes at a cost, as women at liberal arts colleges are paid on average 30% less than their research university counterparts (Barbezat 2005).

No matter what type of institution women work at, they are losing out, either to their female counterparts at large research universities or their male counterparts pretty much anywhere.

Another example of sexism in academia involves role overload. This is a multi-faceted issue, comprising of women's tendency to take on extra responsibilities and their subsequent lack of compensation. Although women in general have transitioned into more career-driven roles, and now "outpace men in college attendance [and] graduate education," there exists pressure for women to maintain traditional roles in the private sphere as well as remain devoted to their chosen career (West 2014: 229). In addition to the struggle to find balance between private and public roles, women can feel more pressure to take on multiple roles in a workplace setting (West 2014: 230). Role overload, then, defined as "an overall feeling of strain that can prevent

an individual from being fully engaged in her daily roles,” is not limited only to women who are mothers or in a romantic relationship (West 2014: 230). The stress of taking on extra responsibilities compounded with frequent sexism faced in the workplace creates an environment in which women are prone to psychological distress and “mental exhaustion” (Edwards 2017: 3). The absence of mentors, a symptom of the “boy’s club” atmosphere of academia, compounds the effects of role overload (Mackinnon & Brooks 2001: 76).

Another effect of role overload on faculty demographics is high attrition rates for female faculty, sometimes referred to as “the leaky pipeline” (Monroe 2016: 239). Attrition of female faculty in their post-doctoral period can be partially explained by the attributes of role overload detailed above, specifically the issue of work-life balance, perpetuated by the perception that women must forfeit a family to attain a successful career. As women generally have greater familial responsibilities than men, female faculty members are more likely to be single than their male counterparts and have a higher divorce rate (Vargas 2002: 26). The burden of balancing home and work life, then, falls disproportionately on women, affecting both their careers and family life. Attrition later in women’s careers relates to the fatigue symptom of role overload. Issues of attrition are especially noticeable in STEM fields, and are “a product of both structural and cultural conditions—from “chilly climates” to overt discrimination and lack of mentoring and role models to inadequate work-family policies” (Monroe 2016: 269). The higher rates of attrition of women from STEM fields result in lower rates of women reaching the rank of full professor in those fields compared to the humanities.

The lack of representation of women in high-ranking positions is not only a problem in the STEM fields. Overall, men dominate fields both in disciplines and management. Contributing to this issue are historical “gendered organizational practices,” as “in the late

nineteenth and early twentieth centuries management was an almost exclusively male social category in both state and capitalist organizations” (Mackinnon and Brooks 2001: 73). Additionally, women’s marginalization has been shown to increase the further they progress in academia, resulting in attrition later in careers and fewer women in managerial positions (Monroe 2016: 270; Edwards 2017). Studies show that women faculty of color as well as white women faculty “tend to... be disproportionately represented at lower ranks; to get promoted at slower ranks than their male colleagues; and to participate less in governance and administration” (Vargas 2002: 19). As of 2002, the proportions of women employed as a full professor were lower than men in every racial/ethnic category except African American women; Latina and Native American women, on the other hand, have the lowest representation at the full professor level (Vargas 2002: 25). As barriers continue to be broken for women in academia, however, more women are ascending to roles such as president, vice president, and dean. These women can help to disrupt patterns of attrition and gendered management by “suggesting potential strategies for creating non-hierarchical organizations” (Glazer-Raymo 1999: 156). Such suggestions, though, are not easy to sell. In fact, the entire problem of gender inequality in academia is often ignored or brushed aside, further perpetuating issues. This denial comes from both sides:

Those who have not experienced or witnessed gender discrimination and other acts of sexism that are, in fact, commonplace within higher education generally believe that accusations of unfair and inequitable treatment of women in academe is hyperbolic, overstated, unjust, and unwarranted. Even women who have been the target of systemic gender bias and sexist abuse may not think of themselves as such, instead seeing

discriminatory acts as isolated and personal—or even wondering if they have done something to cause the abuse (Meyers 2013: 274-275).

Even the act of speaking out about gender discrimination, then, is not an obvious choice for women in academia, partially because they may not even recognize the systems at fault and partially because such an act is cause for discrimination. This type of discrimination in response to the questioning of sexism is often called “backlash” (Perger 2016: 1386). When one calls out sexism, by doing so problematizing its existence, one “becomes the problem,” especially in a gendered atmosphere such as academia (Perger 2016: 1387). This aspect of self-regulation is a form of “oppression through silencing,” a common tactic of oppressive systems (Edwards 2016: 1). Silencing ensures that those in power remain in power, and is a method of maintaining control of an oppressed group. The sanctions enforced for speaking out can be extreme, and contribute to the lack of women in STEM fields and management. Another effect is women’s self-regulation: a hyper awareness of the need to “play by the rules” in order to avoid backlash for rocking the boat (Glazer-Raymo 1999; Perger 2016). For female faculty of color who occupy “solo status” of being the numeric minority at their predominately white institution, visibility is already heightened and can result in both sexist and racist backlash, as well as being labeled as “other” (Harris 2012: 103). The lack of control over how one is viewed by others in the scenario leads to a hyper-awareness and a sense of being “on-guard” because of inescapable judgment (Harris 2012: 104).

These sanctions against women in academia can even be applied to something as seemingly neutral as receiving a promotion or tenure. Unfortunately, rising in the ranks at an academic institution is often viewed, perhaps even subconsciously, as a breach of gendered norms. Thus, women who attempt to gain managerial positions face great backlash, often

resulting in their inability to attain such promotions. The “sense of loss and purposelessness” experienced as a result, in addition to a lack of support and encouragement, can be enough to cause women to leave the profession (Edwards, 2016: 1). At the very least, these experiences can affect women’s confidence, resulting in her stifling her own goals and achievements. This systemic backlash then becomes cyclical, with both men and women working in tandem to ensure that the subsistent status of women in academia remains.

Women do not only face bias from other colleagues and institutional policies—they often encounter bias from students as well. One venue in particular that scholars have noted as a setting for bias is the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SETs) or course evaluations. Course evaluations are widely used to evaluate professors’ quality and effectiveness. At many institutions, course evaluations are used as “part of consideration for tenure, compensation, and other employment decisions” (Mitchell & Martin 2018). Yet, course evaluations have been proven to be affected by students’ gender bias. For example, a 2016 study found that “SET are affected by gender biases and stereotypes. Male first-year undergraduate students give more *excellent* scores to male instructors, even though there is no difference between the academic performance of male students of male and of female instructors” (Boring et al. 2016). Additionally, other scholars find that “when students think an instructor is female, students rate the instructor lower on every aspect of teaching, including putatively objective measures such as the timeliness with which instructors return assignments” (Boring et al. 2016). Women are also more likely to be evaluated and critiqued based on perceived “intelligence” and personality as opposed to their teaching (Mitchell & Martin 2018). Negative stereotypes deeply influence students’ evaluation of female professors: for example, students expect women to be “warmer” and offer a more caring demeanor and interpersonal support than male professors; if female

professors do not live up to these gendered expectations, they are evaluated more harshly (Mitchell & Martin 2018). It is important to acknowledge that it is not only white women who are affected here: “various studies over the years have also shown the systemic bias against minority faculty members on these evaluations, with minority women penalized the most” (Kelsky 2018).

Some scholars argue that across the board, course evaluations do little to evaluate professors’ effectiveness and that adjusting for bias in studies is difficult to achieve (Kelsky 2018). By design, course evaluations are flawed; many professors note that “it can be difficult to tell whether a student’s frustrations are a natural byproduct of the difficulty of the course or reveal actual teaching issues that impede learning” (Falkoff 2018). In addition, there is evidence that the electronic evaluation causes even more problems, with student comments being more likely to “resemble that of internet message boards, with more abuse and bullying” (Falkoff 2018). Factor in the measurable harassment and bias based on race, gender, or ethnicity, and some scholars argue that using course evaluations in hiring or tenure processes is discriminatory (Mitchell & Martin 2018). Academic institutions across the country must take these studies regarding bias and discrimination in course evaluations seriously; otherwise, professors with non-normative identities in the setting of higher education will be set back even more because of the bias of students.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I discussed theories of ethnography and its application to higher education, feminism in the academy, including gendered epistemologies and their effect on systems of oppression, and the history of women in higher education, including current issues regarding gender and higher education. The academy, traditionally a white, male space, actively

creates and promotes gender-based oppression in a variety of ways. A hierarchy of knowledge, defined by men, prioritizes masculine forms of knowledge; the institution of the academy is actively structured to promote and incentivize the production of this knowledge while devaluing other epistemologies. Combined with the systemic exclusion of women and people of color from the academy, women's achievement in higher education has been statistically limited, with oppression being hegemonically perpetuated through culture, such as the masculinization of leadership roles, and through policy, such as lack of protection from discrimination. Though some policies have been enacted to make education more inclusive, such as Title IX, a culture of oppression still remains and affects women in academia in many ways. Some of these effects include a discrepancy in compensation, role overload, negative course evaluations, high rates of attrition and low rates of women in leadership roles, and a self-regulation to avoid backlash that leads to women actively participating in and continuing their own oppression. Breaking these systems thus requires complex analysis of the ways in which academia uphold systems of oppression and causes even women themselves to reinforce unequal systems.

Chapter Three: Gender at Rollins College

Introduction

To provide context for the setting and population of the ethnographic portion of my research, I will present an overview of the history of the Rollins College. In this chapter, I discuss the history of Rollins, including the history of female students and faculty and their influence at the college. I then discuss the history of policies that have affected female faculty over time, such as the implementation of Title IX and parental leave policies. Finally, I provide an analysis of current issues regarding gender at Rollins.

History of Rollins College

Rollins College was founded in 1885 by Lucy Cross in Winter Park, Florida (Rollins College n.d. e). Lucy Cross, a graduate of Oberlin College and previous instructor at Wellesley College, was conducting a private school in the Daytona area when she saw a need for higher education in the central Florida area (Lane 1980). She brought her idea to the Congregational Association of Florida (the most active denomination in central Florida post Civil War), who agreed that there was a need for a Christian college in the area (Lane 1980: 144). In January of 1885, the Association voted to establish a “Christian college, unsectarian in its purpose” (Lane 1980). From there, a committee of five men was established, including “Dr. Edward P. Hooker and Frederick W. Lyman of Winter Park, the Reverend S. F. Gale of Jacksonville, the Reverend C. M. Bingham of Daytona Beach, and R. C. Terman of Mount Dora” (Lane 1980: 147). An eighteen-person board of trustees, selected by the Congregational Association, accepted the town of Winter Park’s proposal for the location of the school (Lane 1980). On April 28, 1885, Rollins College was officially named (after Alonzo Rollins, a benefactor who assisted the founding of

the college) and incorporated, becoming the first recognized institution for higher education in the state of Florida (Lane 1980).

The college established itself as a liberal arts institution from the beginning, with lofty admission requirements and standards. As there were few preparatory high schools in the area or even in the state at the time, local students with the proper qualifications were few and far between. Thus, enrollment was low. To fix this problem, the college established a preparatory department in addition to the Bachelor degree-granting college (Lane 1980: 155). Despite this hiccup, Rollins College graduated its first class, consisting of two women named Clara Louise Guild and Ida May Missildine, in 1890 (Rollins College n.d. e).

Today, Rollins College is a nonsectarian institution with an undergraduate population of 2,642 students and 553 graduate students (Rollins College n.d. b). Female students outnumber male students, comprising of 58% of the population, and the school is predominantly white, with almost 67% of full-time undergraduate students identifying as white and non-Hispanic (Rollins College n.d. c; Rollins College n.d. b). Rollins is comprised of the College of Liberal Arts, the full-time undergraduate program, the Hamilton Holt School, which is the college's evening undergraduate and graduate program, and the Crummer School of Business, Rollins' MBA program (Rollins College n.d. a). The scope of this thesis focuses primarily on the faculty members of the College of Liberal Arts.

Women at Rollins College

The influence of gender Rollins College can be observed and analyzed as early as the college's founding. One of the most obvious and lasting examples of gender bias at the college is the name of the institution itself: though Lucy Cross is considered as the founder of the college,

the institution is named after a male benefactor, Alonzo Rollins. Lucy Cross, consequently, is not the obvious founder of the college to many and her contributions remain largely unacknowledged to the general school population, while Rollins became the college's namesake. In some historic accounts of college's founding, Lucy Cross' contributions are erased and she is not mentioned at all (Lane 1980). This legacy is perhaps the first, and one of the longest lasting, instances of sexism at Rollins: a man receiving credit for a woman's work.

Unlike many institutions at the time, Rollins was coeducational at its founding, and had female faculty members from the beginning. One such faculty member was Eva J. Roots, a professor of the sciences, who was known for providing hands-on opportunities in the study of "botany, zoology, physiology, and astronomy" (Lane 1980: 159-160). The student population of Rollins was also coeducational from the beginning, with two women, Clara Louise Guild and Ida May Missildine, as the college's first graduates (Rollins College n.d. e). Though Rollins did not have to overcome issues such as becoming coeducational and integrating women into the institution, women at Rollins have still had to face the systemic challenges of academia, and other means of systemic oppression. It is important to note here that Rollins was racially segregated for almost a century after its founding. Florida's Constitution of 1885 mandated racial segregation in schools, and Rollins did not educate black students until the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Smith 1994). Following the mandated integration of schools, Rollins' first black students graduated from Rollins in 1970 (Rollins College n.d. e). Today, black students account for 5.2% of Rollins total population, and 3.1% of the students in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (Rollins College n.d. c; Rollins College n.d. b). The percentage of Rollins faculty who identify as black or African American is similarly low, at 4.3% in 2017, while the

percentage of faculty members who identify as white is 82.8%. The percentage of faculty members who are women, on the other hand, was at parity with men in 2017, at 50%.

Though Rollins has continuously employed female faculty members, their formal protections against discrimination by the college did not appear until 1976. The addition of this policy, which can be found in the Rollins College Faculty Handbook of 1976, was an effect of Title IX legislation and its implementation at the college. The non-discrimination policies listed in the handbook state:

Rollins College prohibits and rejects discrimination based on race, sex, color, creed, national origin, religion and the handicap of individuals in the selection and admission of students or employees. Applicants can be fully assured of admission or hiring solely on the basis of their academic achievement and/or qualifications.

Further, the practice of discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, creed, national origin, religion and handicap is prohibited in all programs and activities at Rollins College (Rollins College Faculty Handbook 1976: 32).

The significance of such a policy being formally listed must be acknowledged. Though it by no means ended discrimination at Rollins, it marks an important first step towards condemnation of discriminatory views and actions.

In keeping with the requirements of the Title IX legislation, the non-discrimination policies also list the name and contact information of the newly appointed Title IX coordinator of the college, as well as a full grievance procedure for students and faculty to either report and/or resolve instances of discrimination. Interestingly, though contact information for reporting such instances to both the Title IX coordinator and the Director of the Office of Civil Rights is listed, a capitalized and underlined statement beneath this information reads: “AN INFORMAL

SETTLEMENT OF THE DISPUTE IS HIGHLY ENCOURAGED” (33). Additionally, following the procedure is a statement that reads, “The entire procedure will be conducted with reconciliation as the highest aim. It does not wish to imitate a court of law” (34). The goal of such statements could potentially aim to encourage reporting instances of discrimination, as victims might be hesitant to come forward for fear of, or simply due to a wish to avoid, involvement of law enforcement. One wonders, however, if reconciliation between the parties is enough to deter these acts from occurring, as potential penalties for perpetrators is not discussed in the policy. The effectiveness of such a Title IX policy at diminishing discrimination, in which “a friendly solution” is the only goal listed, is questionable.

While the Title IX policy formally prohibits discrimination in hiring practices, and explains, “Applicants can be fully assured of admission or hiring solely on the basis of their academic achievement and/or qualifications,” subconscious (or conscious) gender biases by hiring staff most certainly continued to influence hiring decisions. There was no female president of Rollins College, for instance, until Rita Bornstein was inducted in 1990, over 100 years after the college was founded and fourteen years after the Title IX policy was established. Though Dr. Bornstein’s presidency continued until 2004, Rollins College has not seen another female president since.

The “chilly climate” experienced by women academia is also not foreign to female faculty members at Rollins. Upon her retirement, anthropology professor Dr. Carol Lauer remembered that in 1977, when she was hired, the college had no maternity leave policy, stating, “Having a baby was treated the same as any illness ... That was the insurance jargon of the day. There were so few women on the faculty that this notion of maternity leave did not come up much” (Humphreys 2016). With the passage of the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) of

1993, Rollins' only maternity leave policy fell under the stipulations of medical leave prescribed by the act. Under the act, employees "can take up to twelve weeks for the FMLA circumstances ... during any twelve month period or up to twenty-six weeks for the FMLA circumstance below during a single twelve month period" (Rollins College n.d. d). Childbirth and adoption of a child are circumstances listed as potential reasons for taking leave (Rollins College n.d. d). Until 2007, FMLA was the only parental leave policy for faculty members at Rollins. Though the school was complying with national regulations, the policy failed to differentiate parental leave from other types of medical leave. It also failed to specify protocol related to faculty members regarding their teaching schedule or tenure track, resulting in unnecessary setbacks in earning tenure for faculty members who choose to have children, often pushing women further behind.

Nationally, the statistics regarding having children and earning tenure are clear: 77 percent of men who have children within five years of earning a Ph.D. earned tenure within fourteen years after receiving it, while only 56 percent of women who had babies within five years of earning a Ph.D. earned tenure within fourteen years after receiving it (Wilson 2003). A variety of societal expectations and unequal systems in the academy contribute to this inequity. First, the general expectation of women to take on more of the responsibility for raising a family or taking care of a household negatively affects female faculty. A female faculty member who has children is more likely than her male counterparts to assume primary caretaking responsibility for her children, in addition to managing her responsibilities as a faculty member. The overburdening of female faculty members does not combine easily with traditional work expectations of the academy, which were not designed with families in mind. Traditionally, "ideal worker norms are reinforced in academe, and an "ideal" faculty member is often described as being "married to his work" (Ward & Wolf-Wendel 2004). In this often unforgiving

atmosphere, women are likely to feel “fearful of not earning tenure... of having a baby at the wrong time, [of] not being taken seriously by their colleagues if they have a baby, and [of] losing time that cannot be recouped given the finite nature of the tenure clock” (Ward & Wolf-Wendel 2004).

Exacerbating these aspects of combining a career in the academy with motherhood are inequalities on an institutional level. Because of the nature of time-sensitive teaching responsibilities, typical procedures such as taking leave for six weeks after the birth of a baby don't make sense, as it would be disruptive to leave a class in the middle of a semester or come back from leave after the semester has already begun. The result is “individual faculty members presenting plans to their department chairs to avoid missing work or being a burden to the department,” including taking extreme measures such as “teaching one week after giving birth” or planning pregnancies so that the due date is in a month like July (Ward & Wolf-Wendel 2004). In addition, a faculty member might feel pressure to coordinate or receive permission for leave on a departmental level in addition to an institutional level because of the importance of interdepartmental collaboration. Such pressure adds to the hoops parents have to jump through before taking parental leave.

Clearly, a parental leave policy that serves female faculty members' specific needs is imperative. At Rollins, a parental leave policy that only followed federal guidelines was viewed as inadequate by many women and was disruptive to both female faculty members' careers and family plans. The lack of specifications regarding tenure and teaching schedules led to many women experiencing scenarios similar to those stated above, as well as a general feeling of unsupportiveness of women on behalf of the institution. A formal parental leave policy was not created until 2007, and even then was only finalized because of the hard work of female faculty

members who researched, campaigned, and wrote such policies. This lack of regard for needs of proper policy for parents and women in particular is evidence of Rollins being a male-centered space. The new policy, applicable only to parents who identified as the “sole caretaker” of the family (which may be the birth mother, a partner, or an adoptive parent), offers “six (6) consecutive weeks of paid parental leave ... provided immediately following the birth [or adoption] of a child” (Faculty Parental Leave 2016). This means that it is most often mothers who take on the sole caretaking role, with no mention of a leave policy for spouses who are not the sole caretaker, yet another example of the college enforcing gendered expectations on both women and men.

Thanks to new federal guidelines, a more recent Title IX policy has been put into place as well. In 2014, Rollins established an Office of Title IX with a Title IX coordinator specifically for handling issues of sexual assault and harassment on campus. Title IX, passed in 1972 to prohibit discrimination based on gender, applies to all types of discrimination, including sexual assault and harassment (Hamburg 2014). Though often discussed in reference to students, the Office of Title IX serves the faculty and staff of Rollins in matters of harassment and assault as well (Hamburg 2014). In addition to providing faculty with a resource for their own harassment issues, the Office of Title IX’s existence relieves some of the burden of female faculty members who often have to deal with students who report assault to them (more often than male faculty), as they now have a delineated procedure and place to refer students in need.

Current Overview of Gender at Rollins College

Though Rollins made progress with regard to female faculty’s equality over the years, plenty of gender related issues still exist for faculty at Rollins. Each faculty member’s experience is different, but there are some gender related problems that are relatively common. Issues of

discrimination from students are common, for instance, including bias in student evaluations, aggressiveness from students towards female faculty members in various settings, and students relying on female faculty members for emotional support at a far greater rate than male faculty members. All of these issues lead to negative consequences for female faculty, including them having to implement specific actions and techniques to compensate for or combat such problems.

Institutionally, there are specific policy-related problems that lead gender bias. The hotly debated issue of compensation is one of these problems; though the existence of an actual gap in pay is debated, the treatment of female faculty members who dare to bring up the topic at all is questionable. Besides salaried pay, there is also debate about gender equality regarding compensation for extra responsibilities taken on by female faculty members. For a variety of reasons, women are more likely to take on extra responsibilities, but some of these responsibilities constitute emotional labor types of roles for which they are less likely to be compensated, such as dealing with a student's personal problems. Additionally, women are more likely to have familial obligations and for that reason are more likely to be unable to take on extra responsibilities at work due to their obligations at home. These issues lead to a discrepancy in pay that exists but remains a point of controversy and contention.

Certain policies, such as parental leave, still lead to bias due to stigma. While Rollins' parental leave policy now has tenure stipulations, for instance, some faculty members fear judgment over extension of the tenure clock and instead choose to wait until receiving tenure to have children.

Female faculty members of color endure additional strain, including experiencing bias from students and fellow faculty members. Their status can lead to a sense of otherness, both in their departments and on a campus that is predominantly white. Navigating academia, a space

built for white men, comes with its own set of challenges that women of color contend with daily. Women of color at Rollins have created specific spaces and strategies in response to their experiences as minorities on campus. Organizations such as the Lucy Cross Center for women and their allies and the Office of Title IX provide female faculty members with communities and resources during their time at the college.

Conclusion

Since its founding in 1885, Rollins College has been coeducational, and has employed both male and female faculty members and students. The treatment of female faculty members, however, has not always been equal; women have had to endure discriminatory policies and mistreatment by other faculty, with little protection from the college. Conditions have only improved with the passage of federal standards that forced compliance on behalf of the college, such as Title IX, or through the work of female faculty members campaigning for better standards, such as parental leave. In addition, female faculty members of color remain a minority on campus, with only 6% of faculty members identifying as women of color. These faculty members endure the strain of both systemic racism and gendered bias in academia, which exist at Rollins, a predominantly white institution.

The next three chapters of my thesis will be an analysis of interviews of faculty members at Rollins. These chapters each focus on a specific issue regarding gender bias at Rollins: interactions with students, navigating Rollins College as an institution, and compensation issues.

Chapter Four: Gender and Faculty-Student Interactions

Introduction

In this chapter, I discuss and analyze the theme of gender and interactions between faculty and students, using evidence from my ethnographic research at Rollins College. When we think of gender bias in the workplace, the first image that often comes to mind is that of harassment or bias from fellow coworkers. Though this type of sexism certainly affects faculty members of academic institutions, a critical aspect of the gendered experience is student/faculty interactions. Especially at teaching-focused liberal arts colleges like Rollins, students are often at the center of a faculty member's job. From interactions in the classroom to one-on-one advising, students and faculty members interact in a number of ways on a day-to-day basis. Through my research, I have found that gender almost certainly influences the nature of these interactions and thus the experience of being a faculty member.

This chapter will present an overview of gender and student interactions at Rollins, beginning with classroom experiences and gendered teaching styles. I will also discuss gender's effect on student expectations of professors, and finally I will conclude with the problem of gender and student evaluations.

Classroom Experience

For professors at Rollins College, effective teaching is a top priority. Professors often know students personally and are dedicated to their students' success in and out of the classroom. Because of Rollins' small class size, professors know their students' names and lead classes in a more discussion-based or seminar-style fashion. Students have nowhere to hide, and many professors at Rollins note that they have experienced gender bias not from other faculty

members, but from students. In the classroom, this bias can reveal itself in a number of ways, including outward aggression, hostility, or disrespect, most often from male students toward female professors. Throughout my research, female professors often described male students' actions as "aggressive" or "hostile," and many had similar theories as to why this behavior occurred.

Within her first couple years of arriving at Rollins, one Social Science professor experienced multiple instances of student male aggression directed at her. She remembers:

They would be very aggressive if they didn't get the grade they wanted to get ... that was difficult, and it took a while to figure out how to deal with this. On maybe a couple of occasions, they were threatening to report me to the Dean ... One time there was a student who said, "I'm going to make sure you're not going to advance in your career." I had another student who did not show up for classes but then came to the midterm exam. I said, "I'm sorry, I don't know you, I cannot accept you in class at this point in time." Again, that was a very unpleasant experience. He became verbally aggressive, and I had to call Campus Security to have him removed from the class.

Unfortunately, this type of experience is not unique. A professor in the Humanities recalls:

I remember, probably in my first couple years teaching, [I was giving] a midterm exam, and they all were busily writing in blue books ... There was this guy in class who really never said anything and just sort of sat with a scowl on his face ... I remember him flinging the exam onto the desk where I was sitting, kind of Frisbee style, and saying, "fuck this" as he walked by. I just thought, it's one of those things that women, or people, of color, or an openly gay professor—you don't know for sure that that happened because

you're a woman or you have a feminine gender presentation or a combination of the two or because you're young, but it certainly feels that way. You just don't hear your male colleagues with that kind of open disrespect.

She echoes a common refrain: it's not always obvious that this behavior is because of gender or some other unrelated reason, but the question of whether a student would behave this way to a male professor is often brought up. A female professor who teaches quantitative courses explains her experience with student hostility:

When I first came to Rollins, and I noticed this with other female faculty that we hired, who were teaching the same courses, students could be to some extent disrespectful in the classroom [or] disrupt the classroom, just by refusing to do any work or telling you what to do. [It's] because they see that you're young, but it's also because they don't feel comfortable with the material, so they're like "there's this woman telling me how to do math" [and react negatively to that]. So, you get maybe different reactions from students than if, you know, if I was a male professor.

Other female faculty members discuss male students "testing" or "challenging" them, even going so far as to say that there is a particular type of male student "who literally makes it a mission to make you look stupid in front of the class." In response to this, female faculty are forced to develop different teaching styles and strategies either to prevent or cope with these negative student interactions. They also say that age makes a difference; one Social Science professor feels that because she started at Rollins in her mid-thirties and because she doesn't present herself "in a very young sort of way," the classroom hostility she's experienced at Rollins hasn't been too severe. A female professor in the Humanities explains that "being a

female and being younger [compared to the rest of the older male faculty of the department] made it harder” back when she was first hired than it is for her now.

Besides waiting to age, what can a female faculty member do to decrease negative classroom interactions? Professors at Rollins employ many different methods, from behaving in a more masculine way, to strictly enforcing classroom policy, to trying to get to know male students on a more personal level. Some professors feel that they don’t encounter male students who challenge them as often because they present themselves differently, which changes how male students view them. A female professor in the Social Sciences explains,

I come across in a certain way, and I try to be friendly and funny and open but I can also be a hardass when I have to be. I hate to do it, but I can do that too. There are some women who are very calm and peaceful and quiet, and I’m not ... I’m just different. So maybe, in a few cases over the years, some male students have doubted me more ... but I don’t know if it’s gender or not. I know some of my female colleagues have had problems, but they come across differently than I do, and how you come across really matters. They’re being them and there’s nothing wrong with that, but they’ve come across more problems than I’ve had.

For this professor, a gender presentation that is less feminine in certain ways is helpful when commanding respect from students. Her comparison to other female colleagues is telling; perhaps if she were more “peaceful and quiet,” she would have more backlash from male students. Here, we see the self-policing of gendered presentation, a symptom of the dominance of the white, male institution. Another Social Sciences professor takes a similar kind of preventative measure: though male students may be more likely to test her and this “pattern is more likely to occur in a women’s classroom,” she doesn’t let the students “get away with it.”

For her, a more authoritative attitude in the classroom helps to demand respect from students who act inappropriately. A professor in the Sciences has a similar approach: “I need to demand authority. I don’t want to do it in an intimidating way, but I want to do it with a level of seriousness that lets the student know I’m in charge. And I’ve been told that students think of me as strict.” For this professor, policies such as strictly enforcing deadlines help to establish authority in the classroom. This professor also feels that appearing older helps to command respect and that this is especially difficult for women, explaining, “My male colleagues who are younger than me have a beard—they look older! And I can’t grow a beard, what am I going to do? In the beginning at least, I would wear blazers, but Florida in the summer, that’s a horrible idea.” She explains that because of her age and gender, establishing authority comes before building rapport with students:

Males will probably have a very different speed of building a buddy-buddy relationship with students. I can’t do that. I need to have my students respect me first before that happens. Because there is a blurry line, right? I know students have been tempted in the past with [female] colleagues and would [say], “I thought we were on good terms here, how come my grade doesn’t reflect that?” And it’s like “No, I have a good rapport with you, but that’s not fair for a grade to correlate in any way with that.”

While some professors combat male students’ potential aggression in class by being assertive and strict with policies, others “lean in” to traditional feminine expectations. Many professors mentioned that female professors are often expected to play the role of the mother and be “nurturing” or “caring” and female professors who deviate from these expectations are viewed negatively. As I have demonstrated, some women find that taking on more masculine traits helps to command attention and respect. Others, though, find that other strategies work

better for them. A Social Sciences professor, for example, explains how she manages her gender in the classroom, and why utilizing feminine expectations works for her:

I do lean in pretty heavily to a big sister/motherly kind of vibe. Students expect women professors to be caring, nurturing, thoughtful—things that can work against the stereotype of what a professor is. I think in a liberal arts environment, like Rollins, my style works very well... But, I definitely do have a gendered style of teaching in that I try to be “nice.” I work really hard never to embarrass students, to create an environment where they feel comfortable sharing in class, and that is definitely gendered. Men can do all of that, but if a woman doesn’t, if I was just stern, and lectured and was like “this was due today and you don’t have it, therefore there is no story you can give me where you get an exception,” I think my penalty would be much higher.”

An important and all too common catch-22 is brought up here. If a female professor maintains traditionally feminine traits, she risks being taken advantage of and disrespected by students, because those traits are seen as softer and more passive. Similarly, if she adopts more “masculine” traits that are more expected in the field of academia, she is punished for not seeming feminine enough and for going against gendered expectations. As a Social Science professor puts it, female professors must figure out “how to seem authoritative, but not too bitchy.” Interestingly, the setting of Rollins can help to humanize professors and lessen these issues; female professors discuss learning how, as their career progresses, to both reach out to male students in their classes who may be struggling and to better handle hostile situations. A Social Science professor says, “Over time I think I got better at connecting with my students on a more personal level so that hopefully a guy like that, if he came into my class, would be either won over or neutralized ... I’m better at that [now], and I’m also better at handling it. I can’t

remember a recent example of that kind of open disrespect.” A professor in the sciences has had similar experiences. She explains, “I’m perfectly capable of coming right back at [the aggressive male students, but that has been learned over the years. The softer-touch faculty have to learn to develop the crust.”

Classroom management techniques, then, are vital defense mechanisms for female faculty. Whether the strategy is to prevent the behavior by getting to know students individually, developing a strict, unyielding demeanor and policy, or leaning on a motherly vibe, male students can be aggressive, and one must learn how to deal with such situations. Though the difficulty in encountering these students can be partially chalked up to inexperience, that doesn’t account fully for the aggressive behavior. One has to wonder: are such scenarios as common for young, inexperienced male professors? As a professor in the Sciences mused: “would [the students] really pull this if I was male?” When asked about how gender influences a classroom experience, none of the male faculty members I interviewed brought up male students’ aggression toward them in the classroom occurring at any point in their career, while almost all of the female faculty members did. In fact, some male faculty members felt that gender doesn’t influence their classrooms much at all. One male Social Sciences professor responded, when asked if his gender identity influenced interactions with students in a classroom setting, “I don’t think it does. Or at least I’m unaware of it. Gender is not how I primarily think of myself. I think of other values, goals, and expectations. I don’t see a difference among my students.” Another male Social Sciences professor responded simply, “I’m happy to say that for me the kids are all right.”

Though gender clearly impacts the classroom no matter one’s identity, the ability to not consider one’s gender when standing in front of a classroom is a privilege. For female faculty,

their own gender as well as the gender of their students influences many aspects of the classroom experience, including adjusting teaching strategy, demeanor, and policy to avoid negative reactions from students. While in many cases it's not possible to definitively say whether the negative events the female faculty members mentioned occurred because of age, gender, or some combination of the two, the nagging feeling that their gender was to blame remains, even years later.

Emotional Labor

Another aspect of student-faculty interactions that I discovered affects female faculty members at Rollins is the disparity in emotional labor. Defined as “the process by which workers are expected to manage their feelings in accordance with organizationally defined rules and guidelines,” emotional labor can take a couple different forms for a professor (Wharton 2009). Stereotypically, the most prominent example is students “crying in the office”—a phenomenon that female professors at Rollins are familiar with. But what does a student crying in your office have to do with gender? As I previously mentioned, gendered expectations can lead students to consider female faculty to be more caring, nurturing or thoughtful, either consciously or subconsciously. Therefore, students have a tendency to bring their emotional problems and needs—which can be entirely unrelated to courses or academics—to the attention of female professors much more often than male professors. A female faculty member in the Sciences explains her experience with emotional labor:

We are going to be the surrogate moms. We get the crying, the unhappiness, we get all of the personal problems. Sometimes they are shared with the male faculty, but they tend not to be. So, the [male faculty members'] advising sessions are very different. These are

broad strokes observations, but I have to warn my young faculty about students that are going to look to them to help them solve their problems. One of the first things I do is make sure my junior faculty [know] what to do when a student starts crying. You're going to want to be empathetic, and you should be, but there is a limit to how much you can help them; this is not what we are trained for. We have trained professionals on campus. But I wasn't taught that or given that advice, so I had some students that I got really invested with, and who spent a lot of time in my office. And that's not what I should have been spending my time on.

Emotional labor, or care work, is often an invisible aspect of a professor's job, as it goes unrecognized and is not a part of required responsibilities. Though it helps students, care work does not lead to recognition, power or prestige. Further, investing time in emotional labor takes away from the time a professor could be spending working on publications, or taking on leadership roles. Because women are often associated with emotional labor, they tend to be the faculty doing most of this work. A professor in the Humanities explains how emotional labor is often gendered:

I think a lot of times what my female colleagues do in terms of meeting with students, mentoring students, talking with students about things that are not related to their course or academics—those things are not exactly gender discrimination, but it's a gender disparity that I've witnessed again and again and again during my time here. I've also experienced it myself. I mentioned the [crying in the office] to my male colleagues in my first few years here and they were like "What??" And I was like, "Oh yeah. Every single week."

Besides taking up a professor's time, emotional labor can also be emotionally taxing and exhausting. Many female professors noted that they had had rapes reported to them, with one female Humanities professor recalling that she had been "called on the phone on the weekend before we had any kind of system in place" to handle sexual assault on campus. These examples of student interactions are not only time-consuming, but also cause the professor involved to have to handle complex, challenging, and emotional issues as a result. The catch-22 also applies here: if a female professor is not as caring, nurturing, or emotionally available as a student expects, she is seen as cold or uncaring, while male professors have little emotional expectations in comparison.

Student Evaluations

An often-mentioned aspect of gender and professor-student interactions is the student evaluation. As was discussed in the literature review, there has been much research conducted on the bias of student evaluations. Evidence shows that male professors are rated higher than female professors on student evaluations when controlled for gender (Mitchell & Martin 2018). Students discriminate against women in qualitative ways on their evaluations as well; for example, "women are more likely to be viewed as "teachers" whereas men are more likely to be referred to as "professors" (Mitchell & Martin 2018). In addition, women are more likely to be evaluated on their personality than men, as opposed to their effectiveness as an instructor (Boring et al. 2016). The expectation of women needing to seem more nurturing or caring comes into play here: when a female professor does not exhibit those qualities to a student's expectations, her student evaluation suffers. As student evaluations are often used when reviewing a professor's performance or evaluating for tenure, the use of these evaluations could even be argued to be

discriminatory (Mitchell & Martin 2018). At Rollins, student evaluations are taken seriously, and female professors have noticed gendered patterns in their own evaluations.

In addition to being referred to as “teachers” instead of professors, female professors are more likely to be called “Mrs.” instead of “Dr.” in student evaluations. A Social Science professor has noticed this in relation to her male colleagues, who she says “No one would ever call Mr. ... but I am often, still, called Mrs. by students. I know some faculty members do this—I would rather be called by my first name than be called Mrs.”

Other female professors lament the focus on their personality as opposed to their effectiveness, a trend that is well documented in the literature (Boring et al. 2016; Mitchell & Martin 2018). A female Social Sciences professor explains, “There is gendered language that comes up in these evaluations. I got “pleasant” one time; and I am pleasant, right? I am pleasant, but it’s not something that a student would say about a man. And it’s not necessary. What does that have to say at all about whether I’m effective?” Here, we see the institution upholding dominant gendered expectations for professors, through students’ reactions and evaluations. Though this particular example was a student saying something positive about a female professor’s personality, this is not always the case. A female Social Sciences professor who teaches quantitative courses has noticed that evaluations for her quantitative courses tend to have more negative comments. She explains:

You get some negative comments that are not really helpful like in terms of improving the course. Like, [the students] are not engaged with the course, or they find the material hard ... but then they give comments taking it out on me, like “she can’t explain difficult concepts” or “she doesn’t have another way of explaining it,” or “she doesn’t wait for the last person to get it.” Well, I don’t have the luxury to wait for the last person to get it.

Then we would never get anywhere! Sometimes with the female faculty, [the students] look for more of a nurturing environment; they look for us to give extra credit, and then they say [in their evaluations], “She doesn’t give extra credit.”

This professor notes that the negative personal comments are more common on evaluations of her quantitative courses; on evaluations of her qualitative courses, students are less angry and give more constructive comments.

Though the information gleaned from student evaluations can be very useful, we need to remember the gendered aspect of students’ perception of professors, and how this translates into biased evaluations. If a student doesn’t understand material, or if the professor doesn’t act according to their expectations, the female professors’ evaluations suffer. During my interviews, none of the male professors mentioned their gender affecting their student evaluations; this does not mean that their gender doesn’t affect their evaluations, though, as gender is always present, just that female professors are forced to manage their gender in ways that men are not. Additionally, this research from Rollins supports studies that prove that across the country and even internationally, gender negatively affects course evaluations as should not be used for hiring or promotion purposes.

Conclusion

Professors at Rollins interact with students in many different settings daily. Because of the school’s small size, classes are small and lead to professors knowing students personally and often leading discussion based or seminar-style classes. Thus, professors work closely with students, and students’ gender bias can be difficult ignore. Female professors at Rollins note that male students can be more aggressive or hostile in the classroom setting, perhaps as a response to

not understanding material or not respecting a woman in a position of authority. Because female professors are expected to be more nurturing, hostility can also ensue when a professor's personality or teaching style does not match expectations. To cope with students' potential aggression and lack of respect, female professors take many different measures to ensure that they are viewed as figures of authority, including dressing in masculine clothing, strictly enforcing policies, or shutting down aggressive comments as quickly as they occur. On the other hand, some professors prefer to "lean in" to a feminine approach and attempt to get to know male students on a personal level to neutralize behavior. For some professors, the caring/nurturing persona works better than the potential backlash for acting in a more masculine fashion.

Outside of the classroom, female professors often have to take on extra roles, such as helping students with personal problems that are unrelated to academics or coursework. The phenomenon of students crying in the office is common, and female professors are more likely than male professors to have to deal with a student reporting sexual assault to them. Handling students' problems is exhausting for female professors both on an emotional level and a professional level, as it takes time away from other duties.

Course evaluations are yet another gendered aspect of the student/faculty interaction, with female professors being judged more harshly than male professors. Women are more likely to be adjudicated on personality, and more likely to have students use the incorrect honorific in an evaluation.

The lack of male professors' commentary on gender relating to student interactions was perhaps the most telling aspect of my research. When women wonder if something is happening because of gender or some other reason, we can look to the lack of men with these experiences to infer that, yes, gender is the factor making a difference here.

Chapter Five: Gender and the Academic Institution

Introduction

In this chapter, I discuss the theme of gender and the academic institution, specifically focusing on the experience of faculty members at Rollins College. As academia is a traditionally white, male institution, gender's effect on the faculty experience within the institution is omnipresent. Women's recent inclusion in many areas of academia has lingering effects on equality; the current problems this issue causes are varied, ranging from fewer women in positions of power to exclusion from networking opportunities. Even problems that women outside of academia also encounter, such as managing work and family, remain prominent and possibly exaggerated because of the incompatibility of the academic institution's expectations with many women's outside responsibilities. In general, it is clear that the institution was not created by or for women, and in many aspects is loath to change or accommodate different genders. Rollins is no exception, and at Rollins the gendered institution affects many different aspects of the faculty experience.

This chapter will present key aspects of faculty experiences with gender and academia at Rollins, including unwritten gendered practices, women in faculty meetings and positions of power, and institutional policies such as parental leave.

The Old Boys' Club

On the surface, the Rollins College faculty could seem to have achieved parity in terms of gender: 50% of the faculty are female, and 50% are male. But though the numbers are equal, the quality of professors' experience is not. Despite gains made in terms of equality for women at Rollins since the college's founding, aspects of the exclusionary culture of academia still remain.

Often, these aspects do not take the form of the form of blatant discrimination or harassment, but rather are subtle, possibly subconscious perpetuations of a toxic culture. A male professor in the Humanities explains his understanding of this: “I think there might be this remnant of the patriarchal traditions, in which sometimes comments ... maybe come off as sounding biased. But I haven’t seen [discrimination] overtly, at Rollins. I’ve never seen someone, like, choose one person over another based on their gender ... but you can tell we’re the inheritors of this deeply ingrained patriarchal system that’s hard to shake, frankly.” The effects of this “deeply ingrained patriarchal system,” must be analyzed when discussing gender and the experience of faculty at Rollins.

One remnant of the patriarchal system of academia that remains at Rollins is the “Old Boys’ Club” effect, which manifests in unofficial networking, the silencing of voices that differ from the norm, and a general feeling of being unwelcomed or “othered” by fellow faculty members. Especially for female faculty and faculty of color whose departments are majority white and male, coping with the Old Boys’ Club effect can be difficult. A female faculty member in the Humanities explains the environment of her department when she was hired:

At that time, all of my colleagues were white, heterosexual men over the age of 50. And I won’t say that that shaped every aspect of my professional experience; certainly, these were not the most sexist or regressive thinking men that you could come across—in fact it was quite the opposite in a lot of ways. But on top of being the only woman, being significantly younger, I also kind of felt a bit set apart because of the nature of the material I teach.

A female professor in the Social Sciences also had a difficult time with her experience as a woman in her department. She explains, “When I started teaching at Rollins, there was only

one woman in the department. I have to say that that was quite a challenge ... Of course there were biases of all kinds. And people can be biased, and they were. That was one challenge that I faced.”

For faculty of color at Rollins, the effects of bias can just as easily be felt. A male professor of color shared that he has experienced bias because of his race. He says, “When I was here in the 90s, somebody mentioned at that time ... that [the other minority faculty] and I were never going to get tenure. [They] mentioned that to me casually, that they had overheard that from a top administrator. It didn’t make me feel too good, but it also motivated me to prove myself.”

Though many professors report that the culture has changed over the years, the institution can be conservative, and those in power do not cede it easily. Even women in power can uphold hegemony and unequal structures. A male Social Sciences professor explains, “Academia, perhaps one of the most conservative institutions (though we think of ourselves as politically democratic) academia is particularly conservative, loath to adjust, enamored with control. One of the key problems of professors and the system [is that] we’re not willing to give up control.” One manifestation of this conservatism is exclusion in the form of unofficial networking. As a female professor in the Social Sciences describes:

There really is no way for female faculty to link like the male faculty do. By that I mean specifically, they play basketball together. And they have their poker clubs. And I think this can be a disadvantage to the women—the president plays basketball with the male faculty members, right? So, he’s got this buddy-buddy relationship with many of the male faculty members, [and] female faculty are excluded from those opportunities. I think it creates webs of relationships from which we’re automatically excluded.

When these networking opportunities are taking place with male administrators in positions of power, women are disadvantaged. Women might not know what is being said, if it relates to faculty business or not, and are not given the chance to participate. In some ways, the ability to participate in this type of extracurricular activity is a privilege some women just don't have. The female faculty member continues:

I do think that women are more pressed because in general, it's the women who are raising the kids and being the faculty member. So they don't always have that extra time to do something. And it's also a problem of finding extra time to do something where it's a common time for everybody. So, I don't know what people would think if all the women on campus said, "we're not teaching from this hour to this hour because we're going to go do x."

The traditions of an exclusive culture thus continue, though not necessarily consciously or with malicious intent. When administrators are men, informal networking and cycles of inequality are better able to continue. Even something as seemingly benign as intramural sports has the capacity to be exclusive to certain demographics such as women, who might be constrained by other commitments or responsibilities, feel unwelcome to join and disrupt the existing group, and who don't have equal access to administrators in similar capacities.

The effects of the Old Boys' Club of academia on the Rollins campus can be elusive, and therefore harder to confront and change. Nevertheless, we should not discount the pain and isolation that being "othered" can cause, such as the examples of female faculty being the only woman in their department, or the examples of racism experienced by faculty members of color. Though blatant examples of discrimination and exclusion are less common today, subconscious biases and actions still affect female faculty. As one male Social Science professor explains,

“Some male faculty members tend not to realize it as well, and are surprised if I were to say, for instance, this is how you perpetuate an exclusion. It might be unknowing and unintentional, but nonetheless this is how an existing network becomes perpetuated rather than expanded.” It is partially through such an acknowledgement and analysis of the problems that still exist that the college will move forward; in addition, moving forward to a more equal institution requires a commitment on behalf of everyone, particularly those in power, to work against systems of oppression that perpetuate inequity.

Faculty Meetings/Positions of Power

Though Rollins has an equal number of male and female faculty, there is still a disparity in positions of power and management. As I have already stated, a dearth of women in top positions on campuses can serve to exacerbate existing imbalances and subconscious biases. Many professors at Rollins see the lack of diversity in these positions as an issue. A female Humanities professor says, “A lot of the leadership roles, especially ones that are associated with power and prestige, and not so much care work and doing a lot of work that’s invisible—those roles are often taken up by men.” The diversification of the positions of power on campus is thus a way to move forward. A female professor in the Social Sciences explains,

Even though, at this point, women are the majority of students on campus, especially on this campus, women are still not occupying the decision-making positions on college campuses. There should be men who are interested in equity for everyone, but that hasn’t been the case. So, having women in these positions of decision-making capacities—more of that is what’s going to change these trends.

It is important to note that because of women's tendency to have more familial responsibilities and extra "invisible" roles as faculty members, they are often more constrained by time and obligations. But these are not the only constraints that female faculty members feel. Being a woman in academia can lead to frustrating experiences of feeling silenced, invisible or undervalued. Faculty meetings, for example, are a setting where women can be literally silenced. A female faculty member in the Social Sciences explains,

At faculty meetings, we've all heard this and I would say it's true: men can be more assertive. They're being "assertive," and with women, it's often said "bitchy." That's still the perception. Like, "Ugh, she's standing up to speak again." It's just a feminine-masculine type of stereotyping—it's okay if a man speaks that way or is pointed about something, but less so a woman. And maybe it would be ideal if we were all more careful and generous with our speech, but I think people are more critical of women, if they make the hard point or identify the elephant in the room.

A female faculty member in Humanities shares a similar experience, saying, "My female colleagues are sometimes shut down during larger faculty meetings, or they're less likely to speak, or only certain ones of us speak. That's not something that's a rule or anything like that but it's partly gender socialization." This socialization can lead to a sort of self-silencing. A female faculty member in the Social Sciences discusses her experience with faculty meetings: "When you're talking you're sort of ignored ... I've seen this when other women are talking as well. I've seen it recently in our faculty meeting. [Women are] talking about salaries and there's an ignoring, an overwriting of them. I don't speak in faculty meetings, you know, because of years and years of BS that goes on."

For some faculty members, the gender bias can be exacerbated with age, despite rising in rank and seniority. A female professor in the Humanities shares a recent example of being shut down at a faculty meeting and how she tries to combat this behavior:

I've seen it happen to lots of other women [and myself], where you just get blown off by our colleagues, because if you're calling out inequity, you're now the shrill senior woman. A small group of us have made a commitment recently that we're just going to call that out wherever that happens, so we've started doing that; just trying to raise our colleagues' consciousness that what you're doing feels highly gendered and ageist, at the same time. For example, I've worked on a multi-year initiative ... [which] was overwhelmingly put together by senior women. There was a faculty meeting in which we were presenting a couple of resolutions to the faculty. There was a motion to table, which is non-debatable, the motion to table was put forward by a man, it was seconded by a man, no discussion—the motion to table passed, so we didn't get to discuss [the issue] or the resolutions. A couple of my female colleagues said, "I wish you could have seen the optics of the two of you presenting this resolution and then these two men moving to shut down the discussion, and then the faculty voting to shut down the discussion—she said the optics couldn't have been clearer."

Despite the negative reactions that female faculty face as a result of speaking up in faculty meetings, they persevere, and hold the power to set examples for newer faculty. One female faculty member in the Social Sciences recounts her first faculty meeting:

When I went to my first faculty meeting, it was almost a spiritual experience in a way. First of all, there were all these women faculty. So many women! They were so outspoken. They did not hesitate to stand up and argue their point of view. And when

people disagreed with them, particularly men, they stood their ground; they were articulate and forceful ... women faculty in general are generally very outspoken and very strong. And not necessarily because they're women fighting for feminist issues; they're fighting for whatever issues are important to them, it might be curriculum or whatever. That was very empowering to me. It inspired me to be one of those [women], and it wasn't long before I started to speak out.

Though the negative reactions to female professors in faculty meetings may be discouraging, this professor's story provides an optimistic outlook. Thanks to the determination of many female faculty members, more women are being encouraged to speak out and not be deterred. The silencing of women in faculty meetings is a continuing problem, but with more outspoken women and women in decision-making roles, hopefully this trend is beginning to change.

Policies—Parental Leave

Women's experience in the academy is also affected by familial obligations, both on a societal level and on an institutional level. Even though Rollins' parental leave policy has been changed in recent years, there is still inequity surrounding the issue. In general, the mixing of family life, societal expectations, and institutional requirements can be difficult to manage. A female Social Sciences professor explains that, in her discipline, "a lot of [women] don't end up on a career path up to full professor; there are more positions at instructor level. Or they may get up to the associate level and stop there, partially because of childbearing, and there's a burden of taking care of parents and things like that." A female professor in the Humanities agrees that, for female faculty members who have children, familial obligation "adds another

layer or dimension in terms of time constraints and things like that.” This statement is not to say that men don’t have families as well, but oftentimes male faculty members do not encounter the same distribution of familial responsibilities. A female faculty member in the Social Sciences explains the fear factor involved with being a female faculty member and having additional childcare responsibilities: “If a female faculty member says “Hey, I can’t meet from 2:30 to 3:30 because that’s when my kids get out of school,” because that’s the one day of the week [she doesn’t] want to pick her kids up late, she’s looked at [badly].”

Before the work/children balance even begins, parents have to get over the hurdle of having children and navigating parental leave. For faculty members, teaching schedules affect the ability to take leave differently than other employees. As a female faculty member in the Social Sciences explains, “it makes no sense for me to start a course, take six weeks off, and come back and finish a course.” So, the relationship between faculty members having children and receiving a comparable version of parental leave has historically been rocky.

Before an official policy for faculty members was put into place in 2007, faculty members who were planning on having children went to great lengths to navigate their leave and teaching schedule. Thirty years ago, there was no parental leave policy at all. A female faculty member recounts her experience with having a child during this time:

I gave birth to my baby in December, having taught the whole semester, except I was supposed to give a final exam on that day. My husband called and said he had a friend bringing the final exam from our house to the college, could someone please give it. I was in the hospital ... and the Student Records office was calling me and asking me when I could get my final exam grades submitted. The Dean brought [the exam] to me in the hospital the grades so the grades would be turned in ... in the spring semester I worked

part time and only taught two courses rather than being a full-time faculty member, but that meant I was only paid as a part-time faculty member.

As soon as classes started in the spring, this faculty member was there teaching class on the first day, with no semblance of a leave. Eventually, women began to make individual negotiations with their department and the Dean, but still without a formal policy in place. Another female faculty member remembers how this process worked for her, after negotiations with Human Resources and the Dean at the time:

I taught one seminar class one night a week. I started the second week of the semester. [My child] was born in January. Our semesters didn't start until February [back then] because we had a four-week winter term. I actually taught winter term [up until] the day before she was born and finished my class. Then I started the second week of the semester ... teaching one night a week, so I only had to come in one day, and I directed five independent studies, which at least was more flexible. That was the equivalent of two courses in [the Dean's] mind, and I did it all semester, but I wasn't getting six weeks off anywhere.

Individual negotiations such as the scenario described above have drawbacks. A professor in the Sciences explains the outcome of not having a formal policy that applies to faculty members and their teaching schedules:

Individual female faculty members were trying very hard to make sure that they had their babies in July. [People] would always talk about how when one female faculty member got pregnant, well you know, she was teaching, and it was February, and now we have to cover her classes. And that's ridiculous, it's not like it's a surprise that the baby's going to come—maybe she shouldn't have been teaching classes! So, some faculty had started

individual negotiations. Some people are good at negotiations, and some people aren't. And women on average are not that good. So, the few younger women who were having kids timed it so that their babies were born in the summertime, so it didn't interrupt their teaching.

Thanks to the hard work of female faculty members at Rollins, a more understanding parental leave policy was written in 2007, and was informed by policies at other liberal arts colleges across the nation. The six-week paid leave still stands, but now if a professor has a child in the middle of the semester they do not teach at all that semester. Instead, they take the six weeks off, and then work with the Dean and their department chair to decide on an administrative assignment to work on, often from home, for the remainder of the semester, maintaining their full pay for the remainder of the semester. This policy applies to adoption as well. In addition, the tenure clock is extended for one year upon taking parental leave. A female professor in the Sciences explains this policy, "There was a lot of research of, should it be built in as an automatic extension, and they have to ask to not have it extended? Or vice versa? There was a lot of research that indicated that again, women won't ask. So, it is built in, and you have to ask for it to go back." This way, "it's not a conversation that has to be held in your department, it's a straight up this is the way it's going to be."

Though the current parental leave policy is indeed a step forward, not all the issues are solved. A female faculty member in the Social Sciences says, "A lot of women are waiting to have children until they get tenure," possibly so that there will not be repercussions for not coming up for tenure within a certain amount of time. A female professor in the Sciences agrees, "That's a very common experience, for female faculty to not have children, or to have only one, and I would argue that that's the case on this campus. If you were to look at the male faculty and

the number of kids that they have, if they have kids, versus the female faculty and how many they have, and how many don't have kids [at all]—I think that's very telling.”

In addition, the parental leave policy “is really against the father taking leave,” according to a female faculty member in the Sciences. She continues, “There has to be a demonstration as to why [the mother] has to go back [to work]. [The policy] wasn't, and is not, written recognizing the role of the father.” She explains the effect this has on male faculty members whose partners have children:

What's happening is the same sort of negotiation, so the father is negotiating with the college, [saying] “Oh, I'm expecting a baby” and putting a plan into place that they get two or three weeks of paid leave, but that's not codified, so it depends on whether the father knows he can do that ... You have to go to the Dean to do this. The current Dean is very willing to do these kinds of negotiations, but what if the father doesn't feel comfortable asking? What if he's in a department that isn't going to support him? What if he doesn't realize he can even ask for that? It's not codified.

The policy leaves fathers out of the equation entirely, essentially forcing a caregiving role on the parent who gives birth while not providing additional support. This type of informal negotiation to receive leave that's not stated in the policy puts fathers at risk for receiving unequal treatment for a variety of reasons.

Conclusion

Overall, the condition of Rollins' parental leave policy has improved drastically over the years, but work could still be done to improve it. Particularly for fathers, who have little coverage in regard to parental leave, the policy could better represent their needs. In addition,

there is still concern over bias surrounding extending the tenure clock is truly eliminated. For faculty members who have children, women tend to be more negatively affected by caretaking roles. A more equal and forgiving view of parenting and familial responsibilities, both within the academic culture and institutional policy, would help to alleviate the inequality that exists in these areas. The traditionally male culture of academia does not only affect women in terms of familial roles; female faculty members are more likely to feel isolated, unsupported, or silenced. Particularly in venues such as faculty meetings, the silencing of women is literal and visible. Additionally, male faculty members and administrators still participate in unofficial networking practices, disadvantaging women by removing them from the conversation and providing no equal alternative. Having more women in positions of power who advocate for changing these unequal structures could help to ameliorate practices that lend themselves to unequal treatment.

Chapter Six: Gender and Compensation

Introduction

Over the course of my research, a topic relating to gender and inequity that inevitably came up often was the issue of gendered discrepancies in faculty compensation, or salary and related compensation, including stipends. This topic is controversial, with many faculty members having strong, and at times differing, opinions. As a student, I do not have access to specific data and information regarding salary numbers, and in this chapter, I do not attempt to discern or present numerical statistics regarding faculty compensation. Rather, I intend to highlight the themes in faculty opinion discovered through my interviews on salary, covering potential causes, personal experiences with regard to compensation, and reactions to the issue from multiple perspectives.

In this chapter, I provide a brief overview of the issue of gender inequity in compensation at Rollins, including faculty members' explanations of the market-based versus egalitarian pay structure and its effect on gender and pay, changes in negotiation policy, and other factors such as the shortage of women in the full professor rank, that could be a factor contributing to an overall lower salary for female faculty on average. I will then discuss faculty members' experiences with the recent attempts to decrease inequity, including compensation reviews and raises received. Lastly, I will analyze the reaction to female faculty members' discussion of the subject of compensation inequity, some of which occurs in already-discussed settings, such as faculty meetings. Though I am not qualified to determine the extent of salary inequity at Rollins, the strength of opinions on the subject and the experiences of faculty members who speak out are legitimate and worthy of analysis nevertheless.

Controversy about Market Pay

The issue of gender-based salary inequity is currently a hotly debated subject on the Rollins campus. The fervor around the subject is understandable; one could argue that your salary reflects your worth and value, both as an employee and as an individual. It is understandable, then, that the thought of payment inequity causes strong emotions. Throughout my interviews, faculty members often referred to their “belief” that pay is unequal, a terminology I found intriguing. Why is this information so shrouded in secrecy that a potential fact (whether or not there is salary inequity) becomes a belief? At Rollins, many factors could contribute to this phenomenon.

First of all, it is necessary to note that as a private institution, Rollins’ pay is not public information, as it would be at a state institution. As a female Social Science professor explains, One of the things you don’t have at a private school that protects women but also people of color, trans folks, etc., is that [at a public institution] you have complete transparency in how everybody’s paid, because they’re state workers. You can look it up. I think for women, that’s a much safer environment to work in, just because the transparency is there. Everything that I know about my pay and what other people are getting paid I’ve had to really dig for on my own.

The lack of available information, combined with a cultural taboo around discussing salary and related information, provides a foundation for potential inequity to go by unnoticed and for a distrust of the people who actually see and report those numbers. A member of the administration concedes, “the faculty don’t know each others salaries, and I think that’s a real issue, because there are a lot of beliefs about gender bias in the salaries and there is very little that I can say to convince folks that we’ve looked carefully.”

Unfortunately, simply being able to see the numbers might not even clarify the issue; even though men and women's salaries may be different, some still argue that there are justifiable reasons this occurs. One such example is a gendered difference in negotiations. Literature on the subject shows that when faced with a starting salary, women are less likely to negotiate and therefore more likely to receive a lower starting salary (Cooper 2011; Barbezat et al. 2005). In past decades at Rollins, some faculty members have encountered this scenario. A male faculty member in the Social Sciences explains how this issue affected him: "In many ways I think I behave in what is considered in Western society as a woman, or feminine. I don't know how to negotiate or haggle for pay so I started way under. I know that it happened. And that path of course continues." He references the issue that many faculty members pointed out: when you start at a lower salary, it affects the trajectory of your pay for your entire career, potentially causing you to earn substantially less over the course of your career than your peers.

Currently, Rollins has a different type of negotiation structure for determining faculty's salaries, in an attempt to mitigate gendered discrepancies in pay based on negotiations. A female faculty member in the Sciences discusses her view on this change:

With past administrators, I am well aware about salary discriminations ... I don't believe those currently exist. They are from the time that I was hired, where female faculty were told (I know this personally), that they did not negotiate, but that male faculty hired at the same time, in the sciences, did negotiate, and were negotiated with, and consequently held higher salaries. We don't have those administrators anymore. I'm one of the few people, perhaps, that believes that our current Provost has worked very hard to make sure there is no gender bias. But it certainly has existed in the past.

A member of the administrations explains the reasoning behind these changes, and how the negotiation system currently works:

[For] the base salary, we start all faculty except three disciplines, business, computer science, and economics, at the same base, and we give x amount of dollars for prior teaching and related experience. I love, when we make offers to faculty now and they want to push or negotiate, we say we want to treat our faculty as fairly as possible and for the majority of disciplines we start here, and we do these increments, and this is where your salary comes out. And most people say, "oh, okay." And we're done. So, it's much cleaner for negotiating for me [and other administrators]. At a lot of places, you make an offer, and there's this game that goes on, which can often favor men over women. And when you can instead say, hey, we set this base for first year faculty, we calculated in an extra x hundred, x thousand, because we want to give credit for the experience you've had doing this, this is what we can offer, it goes well.

Certainly, Rollins has taken steps to eliminate the gender bias that salary negotiations can cause. But is that the only factor behind discrepancies in faculty pay? Many faculty members do not think so. As the above quote mentioned, not all disciplines start at the same rate, and this discrepancy is a point of deep contention among the faculty at the college. This type of pay structure is referred to as a market-based salary. Rollins has not always had a market based pay structure, though, and for those who do not benefit, there are tangible consequences. A female professor in the Humanities explains recounts a particularly painful experience regarding the transition to market-based pay:

One way that discrimination has made its way into my professional life is that when I was hired at Rollins, we had an egalitarian salary structure, which means that faculty who

have the same degree and had the same rank and same years of experience were paid roughly the same, whether you were in the art history department or the math department. Well, when Lewis Duncan created the College of Professional Studies, one of the other things that was done around that time was to institute these discipline based disparities, where now you have a situation where a person ... in the Department of Business ... one rank below me [with] no years of service at Rollins, although experience in higher ed. ... was hired at 50% higher than my [current] salary. I've been working here for eighteen years ... It's no surprise that the disciplines that are gendered feminine are paid less and the disciplines that are gendered masculine are paid more. I mean, it's Computer Science, Economics, and especially Business who are paid way more than we are. So, for people who were hired under the egalitarian structure, this has been a really bitter pill to swallow because one of the results of this is it's held down wage growth for us, because certain disciplines are taking up bigger pieces of the pie.

It is important to note that, according to this professor, the egalitarian structure, which began to shift to market ten year ago, was "pretty unusual" among higher education institutions, and that the integration of market "is one area in which corporate values have really made their way into academic life." Notably, this shift is occurring nationally, which the neoliberalization of academia essentially causing institutions to conform to market-based trends in pay; while at Rollins there is contention surrounding the business department, at other institutions there might be argument over the higher pay of engineering faculty. Although it is clear that market-based pay causes contention, changing this structure is not an easy task. One administrator explains the bind that they are in in regard to salary and market-based pay:

We live in a capitalist society, and I'd like to have high-quality faculty in all our departments for all our students, and if I offered a Business faculty member what I was offering a Mathematics faculty member, a Physicist, or an Art Historian... they say no thank you and they take jobs elsewhere, and we end up with nobody to teach the students. So, it's a reality. For me, I'm not making any kind of ethical or moral statement other than I want good quality faculty to teach our students. Do I find it frustrating? Of course! Because you could have more faculty, or higher salaries for everybody if this wasn't the case.

Some faculty members, though, still argue that accepting the market-based salary structure is not only unjust, it is biased against women: the three disciplines paid at higher rates, economics, computer science and business, are overwhelmingly male. A female faculty member in the Social Sciences shares her views on the subject:

[The administration] says [market-based pay] is because the external market dictates certain salaries in certain disciplines. But, what bothers us is it seems to be the disciplines that are male-dominated get the high salaries, and the ones that are dominated by women are paid low. And that's a reflection of the market, but we know ... that historically, in the country, men's salaries are higher than women's, but then it's further exacerbated by the fact that then there are these attitudes that for certain fields, the external world pays more for these salaries, so now Rollins has to pay more for these fields. I get it to an extent, and to an extent maybe someone from business has to come in a little higher than someone from another field. But I think that the question becomes, how much more? ... Our argument would be, we're all doing the same job. We're all teaching three classes a semester, we're all advising students, we're all doing service by either being an advisor to

clubs, we're all publishing and researching—so in this job, we're doing the same work. So, shouldn't our numbers be more comparable?

Clearly, there exists the possibility that market-based pay could lead to a higher average salary for men, because more men are employed in the higher-paid fields. Even though such ratios may be more of a reflection of larger gender-based societal structures than discriminatory policies at Rollins, the tension surrounding the gendered aspect of the market-based structure remains. As a female professor in the Social Sciences explains, “You can have gender equity, which we say we support, you can have discipline-based disparities, but you can't have both; when you have discipline-based disparities you also import gender inequity.” A possible solution to this, according to the professor, is “an institutional commitment to equity” and “in perpetuity, a commitment to fundraise for faculty salaries.” While she acknowledges that some may view this solution as unrealistic, the gender discrepancy will remain unless an institution-wide reform occurs.

Perhaps a factor of women's long-oppressed role in academia, another cause for gender-based discrepancies is the imbalance of women in higher ranked positions. A female faculty member in the Humanities explains, “The ratio of women to men goes down the higher up rank you go ... there are fewer women than men full professors. And that's true at almost every institution.” An administrator agrees: “We have not had as many women in the full professor ranks for as long, so each year your salary goes up, so if you take full professors and you average the men and you average the women, the women's salaries on average may be a little lower because the majority of the women have had fewer years at that rank.”

With all of these issues combined, gender-based pay discrepancy seems provable, even if the cause is more complex than consciously sexist practices or blatantly discriminatory policies.

Nevertheless, some faculty members are not on board. A male professor in the Humanities says, “Stuff lately, about faculty pay, I think a lot of that ended up evaporating... the people who were complaining about it didn’t actually have all the information. And the stuff about people, like men, getting paid more than women, the data just didn’t back it up. The real problem is that the business people get paid more than everybody else.” Despite the connection between lower-paid disciplines higher ratios of women, not everyone agrees that this is a “real problem” or relates to gender-based pay inequity.

Attempted Improvements/Reparations

Because the issue of compensation has been so contested, Rollins has carried out studies of faculty salaries to evaluate gender and compensation among faculty members. A female faculty member in the Social Sciences recalls the various salary reviews over her career:

I also know in fact that across time, at least when I’ve been here, four times [the administration] has done reviews to raise female faculty members’ salaries, because for some reason female faculty members fall behind male faculty members in their salaries. I’ve had mine raised, and like other faculty members, sometimes they were raised substantially, as much as \$10,000. At first, you’re real happy that they raised your salary, and maybe it’s where your male peers were—but then you think, how many years was I underpaid, before? And you want not only the raise to be equal, but what about the wages forgone in the past? I think that’s an issue, that It always seems to be, every decade or so, women have fallen behind ... This past spring, there were women who got substantial increases between five and ten thousand dollars, because [the administration] reviewed. Now thankfully they’re reviewing, but you know... [the administration] must have a

sense, without reviewing, that certain women's salaries are low. And indeed those women have been complaining, and complaining ... for years, and then suddenly maybe for whatever reason, you decide to increase their salaries.

An issue raised here is the lack of reparations paid for faculty members whose salaries were found to be lower. As noted at the beginning of this chapter, the salary at the beginning dictates raises over the course of a career; starting with a lower salary means that one can earn significantly less than colleagues as years pass. Another female Social Sciences faculty member shares her frustration with the lack of reparations in regard to the recent compensation review:

There's been a whole salary inequity study, and so many meetings and reviews, and I got a \$4,500 bump to my pay, which is great, but \$3,000 of that was "equity" disparity.

Basically, they did a study and [found] I was getting paid \$3,000 less than I should have been if I was a man. So it doesn't pay me for the five years where I didn't get that \$3,000! And there's no formal apology either.

Despite the recent compensation review, which according to an administrator "closed the gap" in disciplines where there had been a "salary differential" by "adjusting assisted and associate professors' salaries," not everyone is happy. However, during these salary studies, gender was only one aspect that the administration reviewed; there were other factors, including inversion or other types of inequities, which were adjusted in addition to gender inequities. This means that because of the salary reviews, men's salaries could be raised as well, to adjust for a variety of inequities noticed. Though such salary reviews are no doubt a first step to solving the problem of gendered pay, the question of lost wages and the lack of reparations remains.

Silencing

Whether or not a faculty member “believes” that gender-based pay inequity exists, many women who speak up about this issue report feeling dismissed or disregarded whenever the issue is brought up, which can be a matter of gendered discrimination in itself. A female faculty member in the Social Sciences explains:

To be outspoken as a feminist on our campus puts you in a group of women, who are amazing women, who are seen as “less than.” There’s a lot of eye rolling at faculty meetings when any of these women speak to fight for equality. I see that happening, and as a newer faculty member, I’m slower to participate than I actually want to. Which isn’t to say that I don’t, right, I’ll stand up at a faculty meeting and say something, but I’ll pick and choose various battles.

Some female faculty members choose not to engage with the possibility of pay inequity, at faculty meetings or otherwise, because of the potential stress or pain. A female professor in the Sciences says,

The whole gendered disparity of payment for salaries, that definitely came up this year as a big point of contention. And I agree that it should be equal. At the same time, I think my personality is that I don’t want to dwell on that either. I don’t want that to affect how I teach. It’s something to be addressed for sure. But I guess it didn’t come up so quickly [for me] because I choose not to think about it actively, because it does influence how you perceive your work, and the hours you put in, and I enjoy it regardless of my salary, you know? I think we all do. But yes, at the end of the day when you look back on it, you do want fairness.

Although there are outspoken women on campus who are not afraid to bring up their concerns regarding unequal pay, they are likely to be met with eye-rolling or be stereotyped as the angry feminist by men on campus. This sort of denigration only further stratifies the compensation issue, causing those who bring up the issue at all to alienate themselves in the process. In doing so, women who would be affected by unequal pay might be less likely to speak out as a consequence.

Conclusion

The issue of gender bias and compensation at Rollins is complex, and many factors must be taken into account. Average salaries for women may be lower because there are fewer women at the highest ranks, and more women in lower-paid fields because of market-based pay. The question we must then ask is are these justifiable reasons for the average female salary to be less, and if so, what can be done to alleviate the inequality in these factors to make the average salary for men and women more equal? Lastly, the silencing of women who speak out about this issue affects the effectiveness of any analysis, and ultimately hurts women no matter the problem being addressed, as it promotes the message that women's opinions, voices, and problems do not matter.

Chapter Seven: Conclusion

This thesis has discussed gender bias in higher education, beginning with a literature review to provide background on the existence of gender bias. A historically white, male institution, women's inclusion in academia is relatively recent. The effects of this are numerous and lasting, though at the same time often disregarded or unrecognized. Through interviews with faculty members at Rollins, I have found that faculty members' experiences are tarnished by gender inequities, despite the façade of academia, and Rollins specifically, being a liberal, progressive institution. Though gender affects all aspects of life for both women and men, female faculty members' gender negatively affects many areas of their experience and career, especially when those women are vocal about systems of inequality that exist at Rollins, and those in power who work to maintain them. The negative effects of this include, but are not limited to, negative faculty-student interactions, including aggression from students, an inevitably heightened awareness of classroom demeanor, expected but unappreciated emotional labor, and bias in class evaluations. Additionally, female faculty members report feeling ignored, invisible, or unappreciated by both colleagues and the institution, resulting in silencing of issues and biased institutional policy. Lastly, many female faculty members are concerned about equality of compensation, which is exacerbated by a lack of transparency and a dismissal of complaints and suggestions.

Overall, women at Rollins have a very different experience as faculty members than their male colleagues, and these differences are not discussed or appreciated enough; such censorship only serves to increase the severity of bias that already exists. Through my research, I hope to bring attention to the important stories, experiences, and opinions of people at Rollins College who are advocates for change, women or otherwise. Oppression is perpetuated hegemonically by

both men and women, and there are both men and women at Rollins who are vocal about evaluating unequal systems and implementing radical changes. On the other hand, there are both women and men who are doing little to address systemic inequality, and by doing so are essentially actively working to maintain these systems. This thesis thus attempts not simply to promote the voices of women, but all faculty members who are advocates and activists for institutional change. Importantly, this thesis did not cover every aspect of this topic. Ways to expand on this project in the future could include a focus on female faculty members of color, LGBTQ+ faculty members, or provide an analysis of socioeconomic status in relation to faculty members' relationship with the academic institution. Data from my research suggested faculty members of color in particular have different experiences from white faculty members: this would be an excellent and important area for this research to be expanded upon in the future.

Though many women at Rollins have been speaking up on their own behalf, institutional change requires the attention and commitment of all involved. Feigned progressivity does little to help decrease inequity, and can actually negatively affect faculty member's experiences and perceptions of the college. There remains the possibility for change, however. Increasing diversity, both among faculty members and those in leadership positions, could help to positively impact faculty members. Additionally, the college must take seriously the inequalities that are perpetuated and commit to employing the opinions and suggestions of faculty members who are advocates for their removal.

Though many faculty members mentioned that Rollins is by no means the most conservative institution at which they have worked, Rollins continues to perpetuate and ignore many problems that are both mentioned by faculty throughout my research and reflected in literature on the topic. The flippancy of administrators in regard to issues of compensation, for

example, (“We live in a capitalist society”), merely provides an acknowledgment, a justification, and even a perpetuation of oppressive systems that exist within Rollins as an institution. Though the transition to market pay, for example, is indeed an increasing trend in higher education nationally, Rollins (as an institution) should not be so quick to acquiesce to outside societal values, especially when they promote and perpetuate inequalities within the academic institution. In many other ways, Rollins exemplifies documented concerns regarding gender bias and systemic oppression in academia. For example, studies have proven course evaluations to be settings for bias, gendered criticisms, and discrimination, and Rollins faculty members experience this as well. Yet, Rollins continues to utilize them with little regard to their discriminatory outcome for female faculty members and faculty members of color. Additionally, gendered responsibilities of faculty members, such as emotional labor, are experienced by professors at Rollins with little acknowledgement or compensation, despite this being a noticeable inequity in literature as well. According to comparable literature, I have found that on many ways Rollins remains on par with other institutions in regard to gender bias and its effect on faculty experience. While some professors are vocal about Rollins’ perpetuation of systemic injustices, it is these professors who are punished by the institutions most harshly, resulting in a cyclical continuation of normative structures and oppressive systems at the college.

Recommendations

Based on my data and corresponding literature, I have some recommendations for potential solutions or improvements that could help to improve the experience of faculty at Rollins, especially those who are most impacted by existing systems of inequality. Perhaps most alarming to me was the justification of and attempts to explain away potential injustices at the

college. It might be beneficial here to note that educational institutions, ideally, are supposed to promote and exemplify alternative visions for society and its values. Why, then, would an institution recoil to the possibility of better enacting such a vision, to the benefit of its esteemed faculty and students? The influence of capitalism here has indeed taken its toll: those in power remain in power by disregarding, ignoring, and perpetuating systems of inequality that serve to benefit them. I propose, then, a move to a system of shared governance in which faculty and administrators have equal say in decision making and policy. Otherwise, faculty members will remain casualties of an increasingly corporate-like system in which the bottom line is more important than their experiences, opinions, and overall humanity.

Along these lines, I recommend that Rollins fully commit to providing equal pay to faculty members regardless of discipline. Though as one of my interviewees suggested, this would take a sustained effort from the college to fundraise on behalf of faculty salaries, it is a necessary measure to mitigate discrepancies in pay that perpetuate a value system wholly incompatible with academia and the liberal arts in particular. Similarly, the college should consider formally apologizing to faculty who have been underpaid in the past, and potentially providing reparations to make up for unequal treatment as a byproduct of prior unjust systems.

The silencing of faculty members who discuss such systems, as is reflected in literature, remains an issue at Rollins. To combat this, I recommend instituting some sort of training for faculty members regarding gender bias in academia and how faculty members' actions can continue to perpetuate it. A similar type of training could attempt to address the problems of unequal treatment of professors by students; perhaps students who are unaware of their biases or sexist behavior could benefit from education on the subject that would help them to address their own biases and actions. Particularly at a liberal arts college where a well-rounded education is

encouraged, education on systems of oppression and how they are perpetuated in academia (aspects of which are touched upon through Title IX training during orientation) would be beneficial for all aspects of a student's education.

Also relating to students and their treatment of professors is the course evaluation. While aspects of course evaluations are beneficial for professors, they should not be used to evaluate a professor's performance. Additionally, the course evaluation could be redesigned or administered in such a way that attempts to control for, or at least address in some way, the bias that some professors face.

Finally, recognition for underappreciated labor performed on behalf of largely female faculty, namely emotional labor, should be acknowledged with comparable prestige to any other faculty award for exemplary or outstanding performance and achievement. An award for emotional labor could be a way to acknowledge professors for their work, as could be an award for mentoring or advising students informally on issues unrelated to academics, as many professors do. A shift in awards could help to at least nominally shift value systems, as the institution currently does little to show its value or appreciation for this important work performed by faculty members.

Overall, I recommend that Rollins listen to and take seriously the concerns of its faculty members who experience bias and who wish to change the systems through which bias occurs. Without taking action in this directions, Rollins will continue to promote values and ideals that perpetuate systems of inequality, further maintaining systemic oppression at its institution and the greater society in the process.

References

- Barbezat, D. A., & Hughes, J. W. "Salary Structure Effects and the Gender Pay Gap in Academia," *Research In Higher Education* 46, no. 6 (2005): 621-640.
doi:10.1007/s11162-004-4137-1
- Bornstein, Rita, Myra Sadker, and David Miller Sadker. *Sexism in American education*. United States: Women's Educational Equity Act Program (U.S.); Non-Sexist Teacher Education Project (U.S.), 1980.
- Broido, E. M. & Brown, K. R. & Stygles, K. N. & Bronkema, R. H. (2015). "Responding to Gendered Dynamics: Experiences of Women Working Over 25 Years at One University," *The Journal of Higher Education* 86, no. 4 (2015): 595-627.
- Boring, Anne, Kellie Ottoboni, and Philip Stark. "Student Evaluations of Teaching (Mostly) Do Not Measure Teaching Effectiveness." *ScienceOpen Research*, 2016.
doi:10.14293/s2199-1006.1.sor-edu.aetbzc.v1.
- Brooks, Ann, and Alison Mackinnon. *Gender and the restructured university: changing management and culture in higher education*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education, 2001.
- Cohen, Jeffrey H. *Eating soup without a spoon: anthropological theory and method in the real world*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2015.
- Cooper, M. A. "Salary inequity in higher ed: Pay gap persists for women," *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education* 21, (2011, Jan 03): 14-16.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé Williams. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color". In: Martha Albertson Fineman, Roxanne Mykitiuk, Eds. *The Public Nature of Private Violence*. (New York: Routledge, 1994), p. 93-118.
- Edwards, J. "Narrating experiences of sexism in higher education: a critical feminist autoethnography to make meaning of the past, challenge the status quo and consider the future," *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 30 no. 7 (2017).
- Falkoff, Michelle. "Why We Must Stop Relying on Student Ratings of Teaching." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 25, 2018. Accessed May 1, 2018.
- Frye, Marilyn. *The politics of reality: essays in feminist theory*. Freedom (California): The Crossing Press, 1983.
- Glazer-Raymo, Judith. *Shattering the Myths: Women in Academe*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

- Harris, Tina M. "Flying Solo: Negotiating the Matrix of Racism and Sexism in Higher Education," *Women & Language* 35, no. 2 (2012): 103-107.
- Humphreys, Rob. "Friend to Female Faculty." Rollins360. May 27, 2016.
- Kelsky, Karen. "The Semester's Ending. Time to Worry About Our Flawed Course Evaluations." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. April 25, 2018. Accessed May 01, 2018.
- Lane, Jack C. "Liberal Arts on the Florida Frontier: The Founding of Rollins College, 1885-1890." *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 59, no. 2 (1980): 144-64.
- Meyers, M. "The War on Academic Women: Reflections on Postfeminism in the Neoliberal Academy," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 37, no. 4 (2013): 274-283.
- Mitchell, Kristina M. W., and Jonathan Martin. 2018. "Gender Bias in Student Evaluations." *PS: Political Science & Politics*. Cambridge University Press, 1-5.
- Monroe, Kristen Renwick. "Gender Inequality Within the Ivory Tower." *Sex Roles* 74, no. 5-6 (2016): 268-70. doi:10.1007/s11199-016-0578-1.
- O'Connor, S. "Hope Jahren: Plants, Manicures and Science's Woman Problem," (2016, March 30). Retrieved <http://time.com/4276980/hope-jahren-lab-girl-interview/>
- Perger, N. "SEXISM: NAMING A PROBLEM, BECOMING A PROBLEM," *Teorija in Praksa* 53, no. 6 (2016): 1386-1400, 1511.
- Seidler, V.J. (1994) *Unreasonable Men: Masculinity and Social Theory*. London and New York: Routledge
- Smith, Walter L. *The Magnificent Twelve: Florida's Black Junior Colleges*. Winter Park, Fla. FOUR-G Publishers, 1994.
- Rollins College. n.d. "At a Glance." Accessed March 19, 2018. <http://www.rollins.edu/about-rollins/at-a-glance/index.html>.
- Rollins College. n.d. "Facts & Figures." Accessed March 19, 2018. <http://www.rollins.edu/about-rollins/at-a-glance/facts-figures.html>.
- Rollins College. n.d. "Fast Facts." Accessed March 19, 2018. <http://www.rollins.edu/admission/fast-facts/index.html>.
- Rollins College. n.d. "Leaves of Absence." Accessed March 19, 2018. <http://www.rollins.edu/human-resources/benefits/leaves-of-absence.html#fm1a>.
- Rollins College. n.d. "Traditions and History." Rollins. Accessed November 18, 2017. <http://www.rollins.edu/about-rollins/traditions-and-history/index.html>

“Rollins College Faculty Handbook: Edited Content Effective September, 1976.” Handbook, Rollins College, 1976.

Vargas, Lucila. *Women faculty of color in the white classroom: narratives on the pedagogical implications of teacher diversity*. New York: P. Lang, 2002

Ward, Kelly (Kelly Anne), and Lisa Wolf-Wendel. "Academic Motherhood: Managing Complex Roles in Research Universities." *The Review of Higher Education* 27, no. 2 (2004): 233-57.

West, L. M. “‘Something’s Gotta Give:’ Advanced-Degree Seeking Women’s Experiences of Sexism, Role Overload, and Psychological Distress,” *NASPA Journal about Women in Higher Education* 7, no. 2 (2014)

Wharton, Amy S. "The Sociology of Emotional Labor." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35, no. 1 (2009): 147-65.

Wilson, R. (2003, December 5). How Babies Alter Careers for Academics. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Wisniewski, R. (2000). “The Averted Gaze,” *Anthropology Education Quarterly* 31, no. 1 (2000): 5-23.

Appendix

Interview Guide

- Tell me about yourself/your academic background
- Why did you become a professor a higher education institution?
- How has your gender identity influenced your experience as a faculty member?
- Have you observed any incidence of gender discrimination during your time in higher education? If so, please explain.
- In your opinion, what role does gender play in determining experience of faculty members?
- How does your gender identity influence interactions with students in a classroom setting?
- Does gender influence your perception and treatment of students?
 - How does it influence your syllabi/class structure?
- How you think that gender influences students' perceptions/treatments of you?
- In your opinion, where does gender based discrimination come from?
- What do you see as obstacles to equity becoming a reality?

Executive Summary of Gender Bias in Higher Education: A Case Study of Rollins College by Zoe Mitchell

While I was a student at Rollins College, I experienced gender bias on behalf of a faculty member. As painful as this experience was, it prompted me to question the impact of gender on other faculty members and how gender influences various aspects of their experience at Rollins. In my thesis, I use ethnographic methods to examine gendered experiences of faculty on college campuses, using Rollins College as a case study. Specifically, I consider how gendered biases, norms, and identities influence the development of one's career and one's experiences working in academia and higher education. I examine if experiences of male and female faculty vary, and to what these differences in experience can be attributed. Subcategories I investigate are gender's influence on interactions with students; gendered experiences in the academic institution; and gender's impact on the issue of compensation. Though the topic of gender bias in academia has been investigated in past literature, my research provides an investigation into the experiences of Rollins faculty specifically. Through my research, I argue that though academia is often considered a liberal environment, there are nevertheless serious problems relating to gender inequity that plague the experience of faculty members, and the denial of such problems only reinforces existing issues.

To complete this research I conducted semi-structured, ethnographic interviews with 19 faculty members (from Social Sciences, Sciences, and Humanities, due to response,) and an undisclosed (for anonymity purposes) number of administrators for supplemental data. I analyzed my interviews by holistically determining major themes in my transcriptions and color-coding the transcriptions to group thematically similar content. I then situated my findings within a larger context of Rollins College and higher education and provided recommendations for

future research and potential solutions. My positionality as a white female student of Rollins; could have affected participants' responses, and I was limited by time and scope of the project.

Through my research I discerned three major themes regarding gender and its influence on faculty member experience. These themes are classroom gender and faculty/student interactions; gender and the academic institution; and gender and compensation.

Gender bias from students greatly affects the experience of faculty members at Rollins. In the classroom, this bias can manifest in aggressive or hostile behavior from male students towards female faculty, requiring the faculty member to have to demand respect, especially if one is both young and female. As a result, professors develop their own strategies to combat this: some say they cannot as easily develop buddy-buddy relationships with students; some strictly enforce policy; and some lean in to a motherly, nurturing role.

Another gendered aspect of faculty/student interactions is emotional labor, meaning that female professors are much more likely to mentor students on issues outside of academics, be involved in sexual assault discussions, and generally be asked to perform more caring and nurturing tasks. This labor can take a toll on professors, as performing emotional labor can be exhausting, and can take time away from other necessary tasks, such as working on publications. Furthermore, there is little recognition of emotional labor performed, and many (mostly male) professors are unlikely to know the extent that their colleagues deal with such matters.

Lastly, student/faculty interactions and gender influence course evaluations. My research shows that at Rollins, women are more likely to be evaluated on their personality as opposed to their effectiveness and viewed negatively if they do not comply with traditional gendered expectations. Professors who teach quantitative courses are viewed especially harshly.

Gendered aspects of the academic institution at Rollins specifically also affect faculty members' experiences. Notably, exclusion reminiscent of "Old Boys' Club" type networking still occurs at Rollins (in the forms of basketball and poker, specifically). Many faculty members feel that this excludes them from becoming friendly with administrators or networking, and works to prioritize male faculty members' obligations and time.

Gender bias is often noticeable in faculty meetings and positions of power. Professors lament a lack of women (specifically women who will advocate for the dissolution of unequal systems) in positions of power. Additionally, faculty meetings often serve as setting for silencing and discrimination, with professors noting instances of eye rolling, stereotyping as "angry feminists," and the belittling of views, ideas, and suggestions from other colleagues.

Policies such as parental leave also influence faculty members' experiences. I found that though Rollins now has a parental leave policy that specifically acknowledges the needs of faculty members, some still believe that the fear of judgment or retribution for extending the tenure clock influences professors' decisions to have children. Furthermore, there is currently a lack of a codified parental leave policy for fathers/spouses, relegating them to informal negotiations that may have unequal outcomes.

The last major theme I analyze is gender and compensation. At Rollins, there is controversy over market-based pay, with professors noting lack of transparency an issue. Some faculty members also point out that business, economics, and computer science faculty being paid more as a consequence of market-based pay also prioritizes male-dominated fields and further subjugates fields that are majority female. Faculty members also note the lack of women in the full professor role, which causes lower average salary for female faculty members overall.

Though many faculty members at Rollins mentioned the recent compensation review, there is still debate over its effectiveness. Lastly, the silencing of faculty members' who continually bring up these issues and whose ideas challenge the norm is a problem at Rollins that is often perpetuated by other faculty members.

Through interviews with faculty members at Rollins, I have found that faculty members' experiences are tarnished by gender inequities, despite the façade of academia, and Rollins specifically, being a liberal, progressive institution. These differences in experience are not discussed or appreciated enough; such censorship only serves to increase the severity of bias that already exists. Through my research, I hope to bring attention to the important stories, experiences, and opinions of people at Rollins College who are advocates for change, women or otherwise. There are both men and women at Rollins who are vocal about evaluating unequal systems and implementing radical changes. On the other hand, there are both women and men who are doing little to address systemic inequality, and by doing so are essentially actively working to maintain these systems.

Recommendations

Based on my data and corresponding literature, I have some recommendations for potential solutions or improvements that could help to improve the experience of faculty at Rollins, especially those who are most impacted by existing systems of inequality.

- Move to a system of shared governance in which faculty and administrators have equal say in decision-making and policy. Currently, administrators attempt to justify or explain away discrepancies in pay from the market-based system. As educational institutions, ideally, are supposed to promote and exemplify

alternative visions for society and its values, the solution here must include a dissolution of the power imbalances that subject faculty members to an increasingly corporate-like system in which the bottom line is more important than their experiences, opinions, and overall humanity.

- Fully commit to providing equal pay to faculty members regardless of discipline. As one of my interviewees suggested, this would take a sustained effort from the college to fundraise on behalf of faculty salaries, but this a necessary measure to mitigate discrepancies in pay that perpetuate a value system wholly incompatible with academia and the liberal arts in particular.
- Formally apologize to faculty who have been underpaid in the past, and potentially provide reparations to make up for unequal treatment as a byproduct of prior unjust systems. This action would be an attempt to ameliorate past injustices that continue to affect both faculty members' views of the college and its priorities as well as their pay over the trajectory of their career
- Institute training for faculty members regarding gender bias in academia and how faculty members' actions can continue to perpetuate it. This would be an attempt to mitigate the harm of professors silencing of faculty members who attempt to change oppressive systems through education and awareness. A similar type of training could attempt to address the problems of unequal treatment of professors by students; students who are unaware of their biases or sexist behavior could benefit from education on the subject that would help them to address their own biases and actions.

- Redesign or change the administering of course evaluations in such a way that attempts to control for, or at least address, the bias that some professors face. Course evaluations should also only be used to help professors gain feedback, and should not be used to evaluate performance, as bias in many forms negatively affects professors' evaluations.
- Provide recognition for underappreciated labor performed on behalf of largely female faculty, namely emotional labor, such as advising or mentoring students on issues unrelated to academics, as many professors do. This award should be comparably prestigious to any other faculty award for exemplary or outstanding performance and achievement. A shift in awards could help to at least nominally shift value systems, as the institution currently does little to show its value or appreciation for this important work performed by faculty members.
- Listen to and take seriously the concerns of its faculty members who experience bias and who wish to change the systems through which bias occurs; otherwise, Rollins will continue to promote values and ideals that perpetuate systems of inequality, further maintaining systemic oppression at its institution and the greater society in the process.