The Male Professor's Attire and Student Perceptions of Instructional Quality

Angeline M. Lavin
The University of South Dakota

David L. Carr
The University of South Dakota

Thomas L. Davies
The University of South Dakota

ABSTRACT

This paper reports the results of a study conducted by the authors designed to address the question of whether the attire of male professors impacts the perceptions of male and female students differently as to the quality of instruction and their overall satisfaction with the academic program. Specifically, male and female students were surveyed using two different versions of a questionnaire which depicted a male model wearing casual, business casual, and professional clothing. Overall, in most cases the male instructor who was dressed more professionally was held in higher esteem by students of both genders. However, opposite results were found with respect to the male instructor's ability to relate course information to the real world as well as his willingness to answer questions and listen to student opinions. Further, female students did rate the instructor more positively in all cases, although in some cases the difference was not statistically significant.

Keywords: faculty attire, instructional quality, student perceptions, and gender perceptions

Introduction

Annual performance appraisals of employees are commonplace today no matter one's line of work, and academia is no exception. Whether white-collar or blue, workers typically are subject to review by their supervisors. Depending on the particular situation, much can be riding on obtaining a favorable evaluation – raises, promotions and especially in today's economy, even job retention. There are perhaps two twists that are present in the process where professors are involved. One, the ultimate awarding of tenure can be at stake, a factor that most faculty view as very significant. Two, a third party component, in this case student evaluations of the instructor's teaching prowess, often plays a substantial role in the faculty evaluation process.

The practice of using student evaluations to measure the quality or performance of teaching faculty raises a number of concerns and has been the subject of many research studies. Depending upon which particular study is being cited, opposite conclusions have been reached as to whether the evaluative tool being used is statistically reliable. No matter the findings, however, apprehension remains at least among many of those being reviewed, that student opinions may be biased or the process may be flawed. One concern is that student ratings are at best only slightly related to student learning (Marchese, 1997), which many instructors believe should be their primary objective. In addition, academicians may be worried that too much significance is being placed on the answer to perhaps as few as one question on the evaluation form (Whitworth et al., 2002). In any event, studies have found that student ratings are frequently influenced by factors that have very little to do with teaching effectiveness (Bowling, 2008).

Despite the concerns, student evaluations continue to be used by most colleges and universities when evaluating the performance of faculty. Researchers have looked at how a number of factors impact student evaluations. These dynamics, to name just a few, include the ease of a class, the extent of technology usage, the professor's physical attractiveness, and gender – both instructor and student.

Various stereotypes have also been identified in academia that may impact the evaluation process. In general, stereotypes are beliefs about behavioral and other characteristics of individuals based upon some feature or trait such as gender, age or race. Obviously stereotypes are not limited to those engaged in the teaching profession, as they tend to exist in all aspects of life. For instance, Bokek-Cohen and Davidowitz highlight how beauty influences marriage, interpersonal relationships, legal matters, customer service, politics and employment (2008). In business, prior studies have shown that there is a perception that males make better managers than women, although there is some evidence to suggest that this opinion is changing (Duehr and Bono, 2006).

With respect to gender, Duehr and Bono (2006) cite studies that suggest men are stereotyped as being more agentic, while women are viewed as being more communal. Agentic traits are often associated with those found in leadership positions (Eagly and Karau, 2002), and include more ambitious, assertive and dominant tendencies. Individuals possessing communal characteristics tend to be more compassionate, kind, and helpful. Similarly, gender stereotyping also classifies certain traits as being more masculine or feminine (Bachen, et al., 1999). Masculine attributes, which are more frequently tied to males, include greater rationality, decisiveness, deliberation and control. In contrast, feminine traits, typically more closely aligned with women, include warmth, gentleness, understanding and sensitivity.

Freeman (1994) notes that college teaching has been viewed traditionally as a male-dominated occupation. Because of the growth in the number of female college professors and administrators, however, the impact of the gender of the instructor as well as the student has become the focus of considerably more research in recent years. Much of this effort has concentrated on the influence of female instructors and how they are perceived by students. However, as a natural byproduct of these studies, the issue of how male professors are perceived and evaluated by students of both genders has also gained attention. This paper reports the results of a study conducted by the authors designed to address the question of whether the attire of male professors impacts the perceptions of male and female students differently as to the overall quality of instruction and other program issues.

Prior Research

As mentioned, there have been a number of studies that have looked at student evaluations of male and female instructors. However, the results of these studies have been mixed. Basow and Silberg (1987) suggest that two variables are important in explaining the bias found when investigating faculty evaluations, including professor gender and gender typing. In his 1995 article, Tatro summarizes the findings of a number of now older studies. He reported that several studies (Doyle, 1975; Feldman, 1977; Centra, 1979) found that gender had little effect on faculty evaluations. In contrast, however, other researchers (Bray and Howard, 1980; Harris, 1975) have found that female instructors receive higher ratings in general. Taynor and Deaux (1973) suggested that female faculty were more deserving than male faculty for the same level of performance because of the male-dominated environment in which they work. Other studies have found that female instructors are rated higher because they (1) are friendlier, have a more positive interpersonal style, and possess great charisma (Bennett, 1982); (2) create classroom environments that invite participation (Crawford and MacLeod, 1990), and (3) possess traits stereotypically attributed to women – warmth, support and concern (Bern, 1974).

A number of studies have also looked at whether the gender of the student biases faculty ratings, but again the results have generally been mixed. Basow and Howe (1982) as well as Ferber and Huber (1975) found that in general female students gave higher ratings then did male students. Basow and Silberg found that male students generally gave female instructors lower ratings as compared to male faculty (1987). In contrast, Bachen et al. (1999) found that male student evaluations did not vary according to the gender of the instructor, but female students gave instructors of their own gender higher ratings as compared to male teachers. Of interest, Basow (1995) found that certain questions resulted in more bias in the responses than did others. Specifically, male professors were perceived to be more knowledgeable and females were perceived as more sensitive and respectful of student ideas. Further, Basow found that overall ratings of male instructors appeared to be unaffected by student gender, while female professors typically received their lowest ratings from male students.

Many aspects of attire and its impact or influence have been examined in both educational and nonacademic settings. In general, studies of the effects of attire on the perceptions of observers have shown that formal or professional dress is the most positively perceived (e.g., Harris et al., 1983; Bassett, 1979). In academia, attire has been found to have different impacts on certain perceived educator traits. In some of these studies, photographs of instructors have been used to collect and measure observations while in others live models have been used. An earlier study by the authors added to the mix by analyzing differences in student

perceptions of instructors and their own behavior resulting from connotations simply arising from the descriptive terms "professional" and "unprofessional" dress (Carr et al, 2009, 2009).

For professors, formal clothing tends to improve student perceptions of their credibility, intelligence and competence, but hurts observed perceptions of likeability and approachability (e.g., Leathers, 1992). In another study, teachers who dressed formally were viewed as being more organized, knowledgeable, and better prepared (i.e., having enhanced "cool" perceptions), while those wearing less formal clothing were seen as friendlier, flexible, sympathetic, fair and enthusiastic (i.e., better "warm" perceptions) (Rollman,1980).

Prior research reported in psychology literature shows that in general, men do not exhibit a preference for their own gender while women do. Of interest to academicians is the question of whether female and male students exhibit behavior that is consistent with these general findings regarding gender attitude, and whether the attire of the instructor influences student perceptions of the quality of instruction. In particular, this study examined whether the clothing choice of a male professor would impact male and female student perceptions of various aspects of his teaching prowess and overall program quality.

Present Study

Students taking select classes in a mid-sized Midwestern university were invited to participate in a research study by completing a questionnaire, the purpose of which was to assess how a male professor's clothing choice in a classroom setting might impact student perceptions of the quality of instruction and related matters. The first page of the survey was a cover sheet that included three high quality color photos of the same male instructor wearing three different outfits representing professional, business casual and casual attire. The individual depicted was not an actual faculty member to prevent any bias based on familiarity with the model. Two different variations of the survey were used so as to change the order in which the attire was presented. In one case the instructor was depicted wearing casual, business casual and professional dress (Version 1) respectively, while in the second version the same instructor was depicted wearing professional, business casual and casual clothing (Version 2). Both variations of the survey were randomly administered in each class section to obtain a cross section of responses.

Students in the chosen classes were asked their opinion of how the professor's clothing impacted their perceptions in general with respect to several instructor and instruction-related questions. Survey questions were patterned after several different student evaluation forms previously or currently being used at the authors' institution. As part of the survey, it was stipulated that the instructor's attire was a matter of personal preference since the school had no prescribed dress code for faculty or students. Thus one's clothing choice could depend upon a number of factors including classroom conditions (e.g., heating, cooling and ventilation), the class setting (e.g., evening class, length of class session), delivery mode (e.g., face to face versus distance) and his individual preferences and comfort.

The survey instrument consisted of several parts including multiple substantive and demographic questions. Students were asked how the professor's various styles of dress would influence their perceptions of the instructor's qualifications and ability to teach, as well as the overall quality of the course, program and institution. Specific questions were as follows:
Q1.   The level of the instructors' preparation for class.
Q2.   The instructor's knowledge of the material (i.e., subject matter).

Q3. The instructor's ability to present information clearly and in an understandable manner.
Q4. The ability of the instructor to relate course material to the real world.
Q5. The instructor's ability to stimulate students to intellectual effort beyond what is typically required.
Q6. The instructor's concern for student learning.
Q7. The willingness of the instructor to answer questions and listen to student opinions.
Q8. The ability of the instructor to prepare students for a career.
Q9. The instructor's professionalism.
Q10. The instructor's credibility.
Q11. The student's overall evaluation of the course.
Q12. The student's overall evaluation of the instructor.
Q13. The reputation of the institution.
Q14. The value of the educational experience.
Q15. The student's level of preparedness for finding a job.
Q16. The student's ability to land the job of his/her choice.
Q17. The student's overall impression of the quality of his or her education.

In addition, students were asked a number of demographic questions, including whether they were graduate or undergraduate students, their program of study or major, and their year in school (e.g., freshman, sophomore, etc.) as well as their grade point average, gender, age, and personality type.

In all, 21 instructors, including 12 male and nine female faculty members administered the survey in their classes. Classes chosen included several at the 100 (first year), 200 (second year), 300 (junior level), 400 (senior level) and graduate (700) level. In addition, courses were selected from almost all majors offered by the business school including accounting, economics, finance, and management at the undergraduate level as well as from the MBA and MPA (Master of Professional Accountancy) programs. The survey was also administered in several undergraduate mass communication, political science, and psychology classes, as well as two first year law school courses. In total, the survey was administered in 21 different courses, including multiple sections of several of the classes offered on the university's main campus and in a satellite location, resulting in 32 sections being studied.

The survey was administered near the midpoint of the fall 2008 semester. Since it was probable that there was some overlap in enrollment for these classes, students were asked to complete the same version of the survey only once as it was not designed to be course dependent. However it was possible for the same student to answer different versions of the same questionnaire (i.e., variation in order of presentation of the male model). Faculty members were asked to devote class time to allow students to complete the survey due to the expected positive impact on response rate. In total, 506 usable responses were obtained and the results, along with the statistical analysis, are discussed below.

Results

A summary of the demographic information is presented in Appendix A at the end of the article. The survey responses were fairly evenly split between male and female, with 265 (52.4%) female respondents and 241 (47.6%) male respondents. About 55% of the survey respondents were in the 19-21 year old age group, with 55.6% of the males and 54.3% of the

females falling in that age range. Approximately 78% of the respondents in total and across gender characterized themselves as traditional students. Roughly 21% of the male respondents and 15% of the female respondents were graduate students. The majority of students from both genders had grade point averages above 3.0.

Table 1 below shows the overall mean responses for each of the substantive questions found in the two versions of the surveys. To aid in comparison, the results that are shown are based on casual ("C"), business casual ("BC") and professional ("P") dress for both versions, even though the actual ordering of the photos were reversed in the second version (i.e. the model was depicted wearing profession attire first, followed by business casual and then casual). For each question, students were asked to indicate how the professor's attire would impact their perception of the instructor, course or program, where 1 = significantly positive, 2 = somewhat positive, 3 = no difference, 4 = somewhat negative, and 5 = significantly negative. Thus, a lower mean would be reflective of a more positive perception of an attribute given a specific type of attire.

An examination of the results indicates that in many cases, students had a higher opinion of the model male instructor when he was depicted in professional attire. In two cases (questions 4 and 7) however, which dealt with the instructor's ability to relate material to the real world and instructor willingness to answer questions and listen to student opinions, the means suggest that students perceive business casual and casual dress more favorably than professional dress. For these traits, more formal dress was viewed as somewhat of a negative indication of the instructor's ability, although the means were still positive (i.e., less than the "no difference" response of "3"). There was a slight difference in response for version 1 vs. version 2 with respect to question 6, which asks about concern for student learning. Both versions indicated that a male instructor dressed in business casual attire is most concerned with student learning, but the professional and casual attire averages were different for the two versions. Respondents were indifferent with respect to business casual and professional dress for question 3, which deals with the instructor's ability to present information clearly and in an understandable manner, as well as for question 5 in version 1, which asks about the instructor's ability to stimulate students to intellectual effort beyond what is typically required. The means were also identical for question 11, the student's overall evaluation of the course, except for version 1 which indicated that business casual and professional dress were associated with a slightly lower mean (more favorable) than the mean for casual attire or the means for version 2 for all three styles of dress.

A review of the results in Table 1 suggests that the order in which the photos were presented did not have a significant impact on the results; in many cases the means were almost identical irrespective of the survey version being reported. In only two cases (questions 4 and 11) did the means deviate in how they compared across the two versions of the survey.

In order to compare male and female perceptions of the attire worn by a male instructor, the 500 plus responses to the two versions of the survey were aggregated, and then the data was divided by gender of the respondent. Table 2 shows the overall mean responses for male students versus female students for each of the substantive questions in the surveys. Again, the results are shown based on casual, business casual and professional dress. For each question, male and female students were asked to indicate how the male professor's attire would impact their perception of the instructor or the course, using the same response schematic as previously identified   Hence, a lower mean would again be reflective of a more positive perception of an attribute given a specific type of attire.

Table 1: Means for the Survey Questions by Version

Question	Version 1 (ordered casual, business causal and professional)			Version 2 (ordered professional, business casual, and casual)		
	Casual (C)	Business Casual (BC)	Professional (P)	Casual (C)	Business Casual (BC)	Professional (P)
1	3.0	2.2	1.9	2.9	2.1	1.9
2	2.9	2.4	2.2	2.8	2.3	2.1
3	2.8	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.4	2.4
4	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.3	2.4	2.6
5	2.8	2.4	2.4	2.7	2.4	2.3
6	2.7	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.6
7	2.4	2.5	2.9	2.2	2.4	2.8
8	3.1	2.3	1.9	3.0	2.1	1.8
9	3.2	2.1	1.6	3.2	1.9	1.5
10	3.0	2.3	2.0	3.0	2.2	1.9
11	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.8
12	2.9	2.5	2.4	2.9	2.5	2.4
13	3.1	2.3	2.1	3.0	2.2	1.9
14	3.0	2.5	2.4	3.0	2.4	2.2
15	3.0	2.4	2.2	2.9	2.4	2.2
16	2.9	2.5	2.3	3.0	2.5	2.2
17	2.9	2.4	2.2	3.0	2.4	2.1

An examination of the Table 2 results shows that most of the male and female responses are consistent with each other and consistent with the version 1 and 2 survey results shown in Table 1. Specifically, both male and female students tended to have a higher opinion of the male instructor (lower mean) when he was depicted wearing professional attire. However, opposite results were found for questions 4 and 7 which asked about the male instructor's ability to relate course information to the real world as well as his willingness to answer questions and listen to student opinions. Both male and female students perceive that more casually dressed male instructors are better at relating information to the real world and are more willing to answer questions and listen to student opinions.

It is also interesting to note that both male and female students perceive that instructors dressed in business casual attire are most concerned for student learning (question 6). However, the distinction between businesscasual and professional dress did not seem to matter to male students when evaluating the course or the instructor (questions 11 and 12) or to their female counterparts when evaluating the course (question 11). Male students also appear to be indifferent between business casual and professional dress when asked about the instructor's ability to present information clearly and in an understandable manner (question 3).

The t-statistic for the difference in means was used to determine whether the means of the two types of dress being compared (casual vs. business casual, casual vs. professional, and business casual vs. professional) were the same. The null hypothesis for each t-test is that the means of the two types of dress being compared are the same. The alternative hypotheses are that business casual is preferred to casual, professional is preferred to casual and professional is preferred to business casual.

Table 2: Means for Both Versions of the Survey Grouped by Gender of the Respondent

	Male Respondents (Versions 1 & 2)			Female Respondents (Versions 1 & 2)		
Question	Casual (C)	Business Casual (BC)	Professional (P)	Casual (C)	Business Casual (BC)	Professional (P)
1	3.0	2.3	2.1	2.9	2.0	1.7
2	2.9	2.4	2.3	2.8	2.2	2.1
3	2.8	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.3	2.4
4	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.3	2.3	2.6
5	2.8	2.5	2.4	2.7	2.3	2.2
6	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.3	2.4
7	2.5	2.6	2.9	2.2	2.3	2.8
8	3.1	2.4	2.0	3.0	2.0	1.7
9	3.2	2.2	1.6	3.2	1.9	1.5
10	3.0	2.3	2.1	2.9	2.1	1.9
11	2.9	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.5	2.5
12	2.9	2.5	2.5	2.8	2.4	2.3
13	3.1	2.3	2.0	3.0	2.2	2.0
14	3.0	2.5	2.3	2.9	2.4	2.3
15	3.0	2.5	2.2	2.9	2.4	2.2
16	3.0	2.6	2.3	2.9	2.4	2.2
17	3.0	2.5	2.2	2.9	2.4	2.2

An examination of the t-statistics reported in Table 3 shows that many of the male and female responses are largely consistent with each other (i.e., all questions except 6 and 7), and provide evidence that male and female students share similar perceptions of male instructors with respect to those questions. Indeed, for 10 of the 17 questions (1, 2, 8-10, 13-17), male and female students agree that more "formal" or professional attire creates more favorable perceptions.

The two questions (6 and 7) where male and female responses seemed to differ slightly involved the instructor's concern for student learning and the instructor's willingness of the instructor to answer questions and listen to student opinions. The positive t-statistics for most of the questions suggest that both male and female students generally had a higher opinion of the model male instructor when he was depicted in more "formal" or professional attire.

It is important to note, however, that there were several questions that produced t-statistics that were not significant or were significant with a negative sign, which would suggest that casual attire is preferred to professional or business casual attire. For example, both male and female students perceive that male instructors who are dressed in business casual or professional attire are better able to present information clearly and in an understandable manner (question 3) and are better able to stimulate students to intellectual effort beyond what is typically required (question 5). However, neither male nor female students perceived a difference between the ability of a male instructor dressed in business casual or professional attire to present information clearly or stimulate intellectual effort.

As suggested earlier in the discussion of Table 2, the responses to question 6 for male versus female respondents were interesting. Male students believe that male instructors dressed in business casual attire versus casual attire are more concerned for student learning. However, male students perceived no difference between male instructors dressed in casual versus

professional or business casual versus professional attire with respect to a male instructor's concern for student learning. Female students agreed with their male counterparts that male instructors dressed in business casual attire versus casual attire are more concerned for student learning. But in contrast, female students perceived significant differences in all three comparisons, indicating that professional was preferred to casual attire but also that business casual was preferred to professional attire. In summary, it appears that female students view male instructors dressed in business casual attire as being most concerned for student learning.

Table 3: T-Statistics for Differences in Means Based on Male and Female Student Perceptions of Type of Dress

Question	Male Respondents (Versions 1 & 2)			Female Respondents (Versions 1 & 2)		
	Casual vs. Business Casual (C vs. BC)	Casual vs. Professional (C vs. P)	Business Casual vs. Professional (BC vs. P)	Casual vs. Business Casual (C vs. BC)	Casual vs. Professional (C vs. P)	Business Casual vs. Professional (BC vs. P)
1	9.39***	10.39***	2.24**	11.56***	13.72***	3.53***
2	6.69***	8.12***	2.03**	7.55***	9.01***	2.03**
3	3.15***	3.05***	0.22	4.48***	3.46***	-0.70
4	0.08	-1.47*	-1.67**	-0.53	-3.23***	-2.93***
5	3.84***	4.56***	1.10	5.48***	5.92***	1.03
6	1.92**	0.70	-1.09	3.58***	1.38*	-2.00**
7	-1.17	-4.56***	-3.84***	-1.60*	-7.03***	-5.95***
8	9.89***	13.11***	4.58***	12.77***	16.92***	5.00***
9	12.40***	17.05***	5.92***	17.10***	21.44***	5.98***
10	8.79***	10.73***	2.95***	10.64***	12.49***	3.03***
11	3.45***	3.79***	0.62	4.39***	3.94***	-0.19
12	5.71***	5.89***	0.60	6.14***	6.89***	1.10
13	9.63***	11.94***	3.65***	11.79**	12.87***	2.42***
14	6.89***	8.76***	2.53***	6.83***	8.33***	2.09**
15	7.79***	9.79***	2.93***	8.10***	9.83***	2.66***
16	6.78**	9.11***	3.20***	7.87***	9.71***	2.57***
17	7.42***	10.01***	3.57***	8.02***	10.12***	2.65***

*Significant at the 10% level
**Significant at the 5% level
***Significant at the 1% level

The means reported previously in Table 2 suggested that both male and female students perceive that male instructors dressed in casual or business casual attire are better able to relate course material to real life situations than male instructors dressed in professional attire (question 4). That result is supported by the t-tests reported in Table 3 which suggest that male and female students perceive no difference (t-statistics were not significant) between male instructors dressed in casual or business casual attire with respect to the ability to relate course material to the real world. In addition, male and female students perceive that male instructors dressed in casual and business casual attire are better able to relate material to the real world than a professionally dressed instructor as evidenced by the negative, significant t-statistics.

Question 7, which asked about the instructor's willingness to answer questions and listen to student opinions, also produced significant negative t-statistics and slight differences between

the male and female respondents. Male students did not perceive a difference in a male instructor's willingness to answer questions or listen when the instructor was dressed in casual vs. business casual attire. Female students, on the other hand, perceive that male instructors dressed casually are more willing to answer questions or listen as suggested by the negative t-statistic significant at the 10% level. However, the t-tests for business casual vs. professional and casual vs. professional were significant at the 1% level, and the coefficients had a negative sign for both the male and female students. This suggests that both male and female students perceive that male instructors dressed in casual and business casual attire are more willing to answer questions and listen than a male instructor dressed professionally.

The t-statistics for questions 11 and 12 are consistent with the means for those questions presented in Table 2. Question 11 asks about the student's overall evaluation of the course and Question 12 was concerned with the overall evaluation of the instructor. The results suggest that both male and female students believe that male instructors dressed in business casual or professional attire offer better courses and are better instructors. Neither male nor female students perceive a difference between business casual and professional attire for either question.

Table 4: T-Statistics for Differences in Means between Male and Female Respondents for Both Versions of the Survey

Ho: Mean (female) - Mean (male) = 0, Ha: Mean (female) - Mean (male) < 0

Question	Male versus Female Respondents		
	Casual (C)	Business Casual (BC)	Professional (P)
1	-2.1510**	-4.2329***	-4.1255***
2	-1.9746**	-2.7413***	-2.2421**
3	-1.7158**	-2.9061***	-1.6046*
4	-2.8204***	-2.7060***	-1.2638
5	-1.7063**	-3.0955***	-2.4519***
6	-2.1700**	-4.0564***	-2.6145***
7	-3.0144***	-3.2979***	-1.1645
8	-1.6156*	-4.4789***	-3.2729***
9	-0.8487	-3.8910***	-2.0101**
10	-1.3722*	-2.7692***	-1.9928**
11	-1.4186*	-1.9697**	-0.9570
12	-1.1938	-1.2822	-1.5605*
13	-0.7757	-2.1698**	-0.3294
14	-1.4539*	-1.0888	-0.4348
15	-1.4685*	-1.5703*	-0.8490
16	-1.5451*	-2.3092**	-1.1187
17	-1.6199*	-1.8447**	-0.5606

*Significant at the 10% level
**Significant at the 5% level
***Significant at the 1% level

The t-statistic for the difference in means in Table 4 was used to test whether the male and female student perceptions of male faculty are statistically different. Specifically, the alternative hypothesis suggests that male students would perceive male faculty more negatively

than female students; a negative coefficient suggests that female students had a more positive perception of the male instructor than did the male students. The results indicate that there were many significant differences between male and female student perceptions of male instructors dressed in casual and business casual attire and fewer significant differences between male and female students with respect to male instructors dressed in professional attire.

These findings (i.e., the negative coefficients) suggest that male students perceive male faculty more negatively than female students perceive male faculty. The fact that there were fewer significant t-statistics for professional dress suggests that male and female students are more similar in their perceptions of male faculty dressed in professional attire than male faculty dressed in casual or business casual attire. In addition, female and male students tended to be more consistent in their responses with respect to program-oriented questions 12, 13 and 14.

Summary

The results presented in this paper suggest that both male and female students generally had a higher opinion of the model male instructor when he was depicted in professional attire versus casual or business casual attire. However, there were a few cases where the opposite results were true. Specifically, professional dress was viewed as somewhat of a negative indication of the instructor's willingness to answer questions and listen to student opinions, as well as his ability to relate material to the real world. When the sample was split based on the gender of the respondents, there were significant differences in male and female student perceptions of male instructors dressed in casual and business casual attire. In contrast, the professional attire responses showed fewer significant differences between male and female respondents. These findings suggest that male students perceive male faculty more negatively than female students perceive male faculty. As a result, this study provides some support for previous research findings which suggest that female students to rate faculty more highly than male students do, even when the instructor is not of their own gender.

References

Bachen, C., McLoughlin, M. and Garcia, S. (1999). Assessing the role of gender in college students' evaluations of faculty. *Communication Education*, 48, 193-210.

Basow, S. (1995). Student evaluations of college professors: When gender matters. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87, 4, 656-665.

Basow. S. and Howe, K. (1982) Sex Bias in evaluations of college professors. Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association. Baltimore, MD.

Basow, S. and Silberg, N. (1987). Student evaluations of college professors: Are female and male professors rated differently? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79, 3, 308-314.

Bassett, R. (1979). Effects of source attire on judgments of credibility. *Central States Speech Journal*, 30, 282-285.

Bennett, S. (1982). Student perceptions of and expectations for male and female instructors: evidence relating to the question of gender bias in teaching evaluation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74 , 170--179.

Bern, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155-162.

Bokek-Cohen, Y. and Davidowitz, N. (2008). Beauty and teaching evaluation: A comparison between female and male college professors, 7, 15-30.

Bowling, N. (2008). Does the relationship between student ratings of course easiness and course quality vary across schools? The role of school academic rankings. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education,* 33, 4, 455-464.

Bray, J. and Howard, G. (1980). Interaction of teacher and student sex and sex role orientations and student evaluation of college instruction. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 5, 241-248.

Carr, D., Lavin, A. and Davies, T. (2009). The impact of business faculty attire on student perceptions and engagement. *Journal of College Teaching and Learning*, 6, 1, 41-49.

Carr, D, Davies, T. and Lavin, A. (2009). The effect of business faculty attire on student perceptions of the quality of instruction and program quality. *College Student Journal*, 43, 45-55.

Centra, J. (1979). Determining faculty effectiveness. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Crawford, M. and McLoed, M. (1990). Gender in the college classroom: An assessment of the "chilly climate" for women. *Sex Roles*, 23, 101-122.

Dowling, W. (2008). The impact of faculty apparel in the classroom. *College Teaching Methods and Styles Journal*, 4, 1, 1-10.

Doyle, K. (1975) *Student evaluation of instruction*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Duehr, E. and Bono, J. (2006). Men, women and managers: Are stereotypes finally changing? *Personal Psychology*, 59, 815-846.

Eagly, A., and Karau, S. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109, 573-598.

Feldman, K. (1977) Consistency and variability among college students in rating their teachers and courses: A review and analysis. *Research in Higher Education*, 6, 223-274.

Ferber, M. and Huber, J. (1975). Sex of student and instructor: A study of student bias. *American Journal of Sociology*, 80, 949 – 963.

Freeman, H. (1994). Student evaluations of college instructors: Effects of type of course taught, instructor gender and gender role, and student gender. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86, 4, 627-630.

Harris, M. (1975). Sex role stereotypes and teacher evaluations. *Journal of Educational Pyschology*, 67, 751-756.

Harris, M., James, J., Chavez, J., Fuller, M., Kent, S., Massanari, C., Moor, C. and Walsh, F. (1983). Clothing: Communication, compliance and choice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 13, 88-97.

Leathers, D. (1992). *Successful nonverbal communication*. New York: Macmillan.

Lukavsky, J., Butler, S. and Harden, A. (1995). Perceptions of an instructor: Dress and students' characteristics. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 81, 231-240.

Marchese, T. (1997) Student evaluations of teaching. *Change*, September/October, 4.

Rollman, S. (1980). Some effects of teachers' styles of dress. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Speech Communication Association, Birmingham, Alabama. Retrieved from the ERIC Database ED 184 191, Microfiche Edition, in November 2007.

Tatro, C. (1995). Gender effects on student evaluations of faculty. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 28, 3, 169-173.

Taynor, J. and Deaux, K. (1973). When women are more deserving than men: Equity, attribution, and perceived sex differences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 28, 360-367.

Whitworth, J., Price, B., and Randall, C. (2002)   Factors That Affect College of Business Student Opinion of Teaching and Learning. *Journal of Education for Business,* May/June, 282-289.

Appendix A: Demographic Information

	FEMALE		MALE	

Question: If you are a graduate student, which program are you in?

	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
MBA	11	4.2%	17	7.1%
MPA	16	6.0%	13	5.4%
MBA-HSAD	2	0.8%	1	0.4%
OTHER	11	4.2%	20	8.3%
BLANKS	225	84.9%	190	78.8%
Total	**265**	**100.0%**	**241**	**100.0%**

Question: If you are an undergraduate student, what is your major?

ACCOUNTING	27	10.2%	19	7.9%
ECONOMICS	3	1.1%	9	3.7%
FINANCE	14	5.3%	27	11.2%
HEALTH SERVICES	28	10.6%	8	3.3%
MANAGEMENT	26	9.8%	38	15.8%
MARKETING	15	5.7%	14	5.8%
BUSINESS				
UNDECLARED	19	7.2%	14	5.8%
NON-BUSINESS	97	36.6%	53	22.0%
BLANKS	36	13.6%	59	24.5%
Total	**265**	**100.0%**	**241**	**100.0%**

Question: If you are an undergraduate student, are you classified as a

SENIOR	43	20.3%	40	16.6%
JUNIOR	59	21.1%	69	28.6%
SOPHOMORE	64	21.9%	54	22.4%
FRESHMEN	62	17.5%	29	12.0%
BLANKS	37	19.1%	49	20.3%
Total	**265**	**100.0%**	**241**	**100.0%**

Question: What is your overall grade point average?

3.51-4.00	77	29.1%	75	31.1%
3.01-3.50	102	38.5%	89	36.9%
2.51-3.00	61	23.0%	51	21.2%
2.01-2.50	11	4.2%	14	5.8%
2.00 OR LOWER	1	0.4%	1	0.4%
BLANKS	13	4.9%	11	4.6%
Total	**265**	**100.0%**	**241**	**100.0%**

Question: What is your age?

OVER 24	38	14.3%	37	15.4%
22-24	50	18.9%	60	24.9%
19-21	144	54.3%	134	55.6%
18 OR YOUNGER	33	12.5%	9	3.7%
BLANKS	0	0.0%	1	0.4%
Total	**265**	**100.0%**	**241**	**100.0%**

Question: Would you be considered a

TRADITIONAL STUDENT	206	77.7%	190	78.8%
NON-TRADITIONAL STUDENT	56	21.1%	47	19.5%
BLANKS	3	1.1%	4	1.7%
Total	**265**	**100.0%**	**241**	**100.0%**

Question: Which of the following best describes your personality?

COMPETITIVE	99	37.4%	85	35.3%
EASYGOING	154	58.1%	147	61.0%
BLANKS	12	4.5%	9	3.7%
Total	**265**	**100.0%**	**241**	**100.0%**