



UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN-GREEN BAY

Institutional Review Board (IRB) Application: Research Involving Human Subjects

INSTRUCTIONS

All submissions ***must be electronic*** unless pre-approved by the IRB chair. If you are having difficulties with the electronic form, please contact the IRB chair. Once complete, email the entire proposal as a PDF file to irb@uwgb.edu and the IRB Chair. The PI must submit this protocol and all correspondence will take place with the PI. The proposal must be sent as **one** complete document. Please include all relevant forms as well as the IRB certifications and signatures of all investigators involved.

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Research Project Information

Study Title: Biased Evaluations of Female University Professors' Job Performance: The Influence of Rater, Ratee, and Job Characteristics

Date Submitted: November 5, 2017

Estimated Start Date: November 26, 2017

Note: Please allow at least 14 days for exempt or expedited review. Protocols requiring approval from the full board will be reviewed at the next scheduled meeting.

Estimated Completion Date: November 25, 2018

Note: Projects continuing for longer than one year will require an Extension Form and Annual Progress Report.

B. Principal Investigator (PI)*

**please note this cannot be a student*

Name: Dr. Heather M. Clarke
clarkeh@uwgb.edu

Email:

Program/Unit: Business

Phone: (920) 465 - 2353

Status: Full-time Faculty Member

Administrator/Staff Member

Full-time Lecturer

Other, please explain:

Was this proposal primarily prepared by a student-investigator(s)? Yes No

If so, did you (as PI), review and/or edit the document to assure that it contains the required information as requested by the IRB? N/A Yes No

C. Determination of Risk/Review Status

For a description of these categories, please review the IRB Policies and Procedures Manual on the IRB website.

Full Board Review – requires full IRB approval – requires a progress report.




UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN-GREEN BAY

Expedited Review – can be reviewed by any member of the IRB – requires a progress report.

Exempt - can be reviewed by any member of the IRB – does NOT require a progress report.

Exempt status means that once approved the proposal is exempt from any further IRB review.

D. Signatures

NAME	SIGNATURE	EMAIL
(PI): Heather M. Clarke	 <input type="checkbox"/> Electronic Signature	clarkeh@uwgb.edu
	<input type="checkbox"/> Electronic Signature	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Electronic Signature	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Electronic Signature	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Electronic Signature	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Electronic Signature	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Electronic Signature	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Electronic Signature	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Electronic Signature	

Please check “Electronic Signature” box if you are submitting an electronic signature.



PART II: PROJECT NARRATIVE

A. Purpose and Significance of the Project

Provide a brief background statement and describe the purpose of the research project and the importance of the knowledge to be gained from it. Include several citations from literature to establish a research history (please provide citations/references).

Research has demonstrated the bias that individuals face when employed in gender-inconsistent jobs (e.g. Heilman, Wallen, Fuchs, & Tamkins, 2004). For instance, women engaged in male-typed work are assumed to be less competent than their male-counterparts (Heilman et al., 2004). The proposed research will examine the effects of gender stereotypes on the appraisal of the performance of female university professors.

Gender stereotypes ascribe certain physical attributes, personality traits, behaviors, and even occupations, to women and others to men (e.g. Eagly, 1987). Women are stereotyped as possessing communal traits, such as being caring, compassionate, and nurturing, and as engaging in activities (e.g. baking) and occupations (e.g. secretary) traditionally associated with women. Men are assumed to have agentic traits like assertiveness, strength, and confidence and as engaging in normatively male behaviors (e.g. leadership) and occupations (e.g. engineer).

Female-typed jobs are those that have traditionally been held by women (such as teacher, nurse, or secretary), while male-typed jobs are those that historically have been occupied exclusively or almost exclusively by men (such as engineer, manager, or doctor; Blau et al., 2013; Eagly, 1987; Eagly and Karau, 2002; Heilman, 1983). Association of one gender with a given occupation gives rise to the assumption that one must possess characteristics consistent with the job's gender-type to be successful in that job. Female-typed jobs are presumed to require feminine, communal traits, while male-typed work is believed to require masculine, agentic traits (Eagly, 1987; Eagly and Karau, 2002; Heilman, 1983). Although there has been some decrease in occupational segregation by gender over time, it continues to persist and the rate of decrease of segregation has been falling over the past few decades (Blau et al., 2013).

Individuals employed in occupations that are viewed as inconsistent with their gender face bias or prejudice. Researchers have developed theories to explain how this bias arises. The lack of fit model explains how women are presumed not to possess the masculine characteristics necessary to be successful in a male-typed job and are therefore viewed as unsuitable for such work (Heilman, 1983). Expectations about how well a person will perform a given job are influenced by the perceived fit of the individual's gender and the gender-type of the job. Perceived fit then impacts evaluation of performance and reward allocation decisions (Heilman, 1983). Similarly, role congruity theory was developed to explain the prejudice faced by female leaders. Because the traits believed to be necessary to be a successful leader, a male-typed role, are inconsistent with the traits women are believed to possess, women are presumed to be less capable leaders than men (Eagly and Karau, 2002).

As discussed above, both the lack of fit model and role congruity theory suggest that a perceived lack of person-job fit negatively impacts perceptions of competence (Heilman, 1983; Eagly and Karau, 2002). Heilman and colleagues' (2004) experimental study found support for these theories. Heilman et al. (2004) compared how an identically described male and female job incumbent were evaluated when



UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN-GREEN BAY

employed in a male-typed job (assistant vice president for sales in an aircraft company). The results indicated that when performance success was ambiguous, the female job incumbent was perceived to be less competent than the male job incumbent. Further, when unequivocal evidence was given of the woman's competence in the male-typed job, she was now rated competent but also rated interpersonally hostile and unlikable. This is due to being viewed as violating the feminine 'niceness' norm.

Earlier research conceptualized college instructor as male-typed (e.g. Maurer & Taylor, 1994). A recent large-scale study using ratings on RateMyProfessors.com suggests that the stereotype of a university professor as a white male may be alive and well (Storage, Horne, Cimpian, & Leslie, 2016). Storage et al. (2016) found gender differences in the words used to describe university instructors. Words like "smart" or "brilliant" were more likely to be used in description of male instructors than female instructors, and words like "stylish" more likely to be used in descriptions of female instructors.

The purpose of the proposed studies is threefold:

1. To investigate the effect of gender stereotypes on the performance appraisal of female university professors;
2. To identify the boundary conditions within which gender stereotypes will cause female professors to be unfairly negatively rated; and
3. To determine the effect of a female university professor's demonstration of competence on performance appraisal ratings.

This project will involve four studies. All will require participants to view a brief video of a female university professor giving a lecture (on whistle-blowing in organizations). (Note that the professor in the video is the Principal Investigator.) The first, described below, will be the pilot study designed to check manipulations and test reliability of the measures. All three main studies will examine the gender-type of the job (female-typed: human resource management professor versus male-typed: accounting professor), and characteristics of the student raters (ambivalent sexism, social dominance orientation, political ideology, and demographic characteristics). Main Study 1 will also investigate the effect of the professor's sexual orientation. Main Study 2 will investigate the role of the perceived femininity and masculinity of the professor. Finally, Main Study 3 will examine the effect of evidence of the professor's performance success. Dependant variables for all studies will be competence, overall performance, and likability.

The Pilot Study will have seven conditions:

1. Control Condition: No additional information about the female professor is given. This condition will be used to ascertain that the professor in the video is perceived as being female and assumed to be heterosexual. It will also provide baseline data for perceived competence and masculinity and femininity. [The link to this instrument and the video is provided below.]
2. Lesbian Condition: Additional information is given in the instructions that appear before the video that the professor is commonly known by students to be a lesbian. The purpose of this condition is to assess the effectiveness of the lesbian manipulation. The statement will read as follows:

Lesbian manipulation: The professor you are about to view in the video is involved with the university's Pride Center and is commonly known by students to be lesbian.



UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN-GREEN BAY

3. Human Resource Management Professor Condition: Additional information will be given in the instructions that the professor is a professor of human resource management. The purpose of this condition is to assess the effectiveness of the human resource management professor (female-typed job) manipulation as well as confirm that participants perceive the job of Human Resource Management Professor to be a female-typed job. The statement will read as follows:

Female-typed job manipulation: The professor you are about to view in the video is a professor of human resource management.

4. Accounting Professor Condition: Additional information will be given in the instructions that the professor is a professor of accounting. The purpose of this condition is to assess the effectiveness of the accounting professor (male-typed job) manipulation as well as confirm that participants perceive the job of Accounting Professor to be a male-typed job. The statement will read as follows:

Male-typed job manipulation: The professor you are about to view in the video is a professor of accounting.

5. High Femininity Condition: Additional information will be given in the instructions that the professor is high in femininity. The purpose of this condition is to assess the effectiveness of the high femininity manipulation. The statement will read as follows:

High Femininity Manipulation: The professor you are about to view in the video is well known by students to be warm and nice, and helpful to students. She is very understanding when students miss deadlines because they are having personal problems.

6. High Masculinity Condition: Additional information will be given in the instructions that the professor is high in masculinity. The purpose of this condition is to assess the effectiveness of the high masculinity manipulation. The statement will read as follows:

High Masculinity Manipulation: The professor you are about to view in the video is well known by students to be confident and decisive. She has a competitive edge and stands up well under pressure.

7. Successful Performance Condition: Additional information will be given in the instructions that the professor is highly competent and successful as a professor. The purpose of this condition is to assess the effectiveness of the successful performance manipulation. The statement will read as follows:

Successful Performance Manipulation: The professor you are about to view in the video is well known by students to be an excellent professor. She receives very high evaluations from her students and has a perfect 5 out of 5 rating on Ratemyprofessors.com.

This research has important implications for identifying possible bias against female university professors and the conditions under which it arises. An understanding of these boundary conditions can equip researchers to examine interventions to reduce the occurrence of manifestations of this bias and reduce the impact of gender stereotypes on performance appraisal. This will ultimately contribute to improving the well-being, job satisfaction, and career progression of female professors as well as the ability of academic institutions to attract and retain talented female faculty.



References:

- Blau, F. D., Brummund, P., & Liu, Y. -H. (2013). Trends in occupational segregation by gender 1970-2009: Adjusting for the impact of changes in the occupational coding system. *Demography*, 50, 471-492.
- Eagly, A.H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behaviour: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A.H., & Karau, S.J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109, 573-598.
- Heilman, M.E. (1983), "Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model", *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, Vol. 5, pp. 269-298.
- Heilman, M.E., Wallen, A.S., Fuchs, D., & Tamkins, M.M. (2004). Penalties for success: Reactions to women who succeed at male gender-typed tasks. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 416-427.
- Maurer, T. J., & Taylor, M. A. (1994). Is sex by itself enough - An exploration of gender bias issues in performance-appraisal. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 60, 231-251.
- Storage, D., Horne, Z., Cimpian, A., & Leslie, S.-J. (2016). The frequency of "brilliant" and "genius" in teaching evaluations predicts the representation of women and African Americans across fields. *PLoS ONE*, 11(3): e0150194.

B. Participants in the Project

1. Identify all participant groups (e.g. teacher, elementary school students, administrators, patients, etc.).

For each of the four studies, participants will be university and/or college students who are also Amazon Mechanical Turk Workers. (MTurk Workers. Discussed further in Section C.)

2. Describe the basic characteristics of potential participants, (e.g. college students, administrators, clients, etc. and the anticipated number of participants, age range, gender, racial/ethnic background).

All participants will be university or college students at least 18 years of age who resident in the United States. I will recruit approximately equal numbers of male and female participants. Participants may be of any racial or ethnic background. Anticipated number of participants per study:

Pilot study 1: seven conditions x 40 participants per condition = 280 participants

Main study 1: four conditions (Human Resources Professor vs Accounting Professor; Heterosexual vs Lesbian) x 40 participants per condition = 160

Main study 2: four conditions (Human Resources Professor vs Accounting Professor; Feminine vs. Masculine) x 40 participants per condition = 160

Main Study 3: four conditions (Human Resources Professor vs Accounting Professor; Successful Performance vs. Ambiguous Performance) x 40 participants per condition = 160

Total across studies: Approximately 760 participants

3. Describe any special criteria for including or excluding individuals from participation and justify those criteria; example: including only individuals with hypertension as that is pertinent to the intervention to address hypertension.

The only participants that would be excluded are minors. Most university or college students are at least 18 years of age.



UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN-GREEN BAY

4. If a requirement of the research is that the participants are to be in good mental or physical health, indicate who will determine and how.

n/a

5. If the participants are minors, mentally incompetent, or legally restricted groups, give an explanation as to the necessity for using these particular groups (please note that the research with any of these groups requires Full Board Review).

n/a

6. Indicate the total amount time required of each participant. If you will be using multiple instruments/procedures, state the amount of time required for each instrument/procedure.

Each participant will watch a brief video of a female university professor (the Principal Investigator) giving a lecture (approx. 3.5 minutes long) and then complete a questionnaire. The anticipated amount of time required of each participant is 10 to 15 minutes for each of the four studies.

7. If you will reward (e.g., provide money, extra credit, gift, etc.) participants, indicate the type of reward, when participants will receive the payment, and whether or not your participants will receive the payment if they drop out of the study. In case of course credit(s), indicate how students who do not participate will be able to earn equal credit.

Each participant will be paid 1USD. Participants will not be paid if they do not complete the questionnaire. If they substantially complete the questionnaire (skipping some questions is permissible) they will be paid. The total amount to be paid to participants plus a fee (paid to MTurk) is paid in advance to MTurk. Then as Workers complete the HITs and I verify this completion and the remuneration is transferred from Mturk to the Workers. (The funds are essentially held in escrow by MTurk.)

C. Methodology

1. Describe all the procedures used to identify, recruit subjects. Include who will make contact, how the contract will be made, and how subjects will be enrolled in the study.

I will recruit participants through Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk), a crowdsourcing internet marketplace, where 'Requesters' post tasks that they need completed and 'Workers' voluntarily complete those tasks, called 'Human Intelligence Tasks' or 'HITS', for payment by the Requesters. Today many academics use MTurk to recruit participants for online studies and published research has employed MTurk workers as participants for survey and experimental study designs (e.g. Jenkins & Skowronsk, 2016; Karim, Kaminsky, & Behrend, 2014; Lucas & Nordgren, 2015). Numerous scholars have extolled the use of MTurk in academic research because samples recruited through MTurk are more representative of the U.S. population than in-person convenience samples (Berinsky, Huber, & Lenz, 2012; Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011) and provide more reliable data (Behrend, Sharek, Meade, & Wiebe, 2011).

I will post a HIT on MTurk providing basic information about the study, what will be required of participants, and a link to the survey on Qualtrics. The recruitment posting (Attached as Appendix A) will advise prospective participants that the study is about student perceptions of university professors. MTurk workers interested in participating in the study click the link to the study materials on Qualtrics. They read the letter of information/informed consent (Attached as Appendix B) and, if they consent to participate in the study, they view a brief video and complete a questionnaire containing the measures listed below. Participants are paid once I confirm completion of the study measures.



UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN-GREEN BAY

2. Describe what constitutes data (quantitative or qualitative) for this research.

Data comprises the participants' responses to the measures, which is downloaded and analyzed in quantitative form.

3. Describe what participants will be asked to do, e.g., interventions, educational programs, testing, observation, interviews, or laboratory procedures.

Participants will be asked to view a video of a female university professor, ostensibly giving a lecture in front of a class. The lecture is about whistleblowing and is about 3.5 minutes long. During the lecture a student (not seen on the video) asks a question and the professor answers the question. After viewing the video, the participants will complete a questionnaire.

4. Indicate any personnel who will be involved in the research process, e.g., those who will be present during a participants' participation, those involved in analyzing the data. State the qualifications (must be IRB certified) and roles of all personnel.

I am the only person who will be involved in this project.

5. If the project involves invasive medical procedures and/or stress testing, please indicate the qualifications of the person(s) performing the procedure.

n/a

6. Indicate the location(s) where the research will take place, e.g., UWGB, in participants' homes, the Brown County Library, etc.

Online. Where the participants are when they complete the study is unknown to me.

7. If you are using an online survey (such as Qualtrics) you must provide a pdf of the survey. Please append to the end of this document. Additionally, please provide the link here.

Link to online survey: http://uwgreenbay.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_b1b7Go3E6yZy3TT

A PDF of the survey is attached as Appendix B.

D. Risks to Participants

1. Describe, in detail, any risks you foresee (physical, emotional, psychological, social, legal, economic, etc.).

I foresee no risks.

2. If more than minimal risk, provide the rationale for the necessity of such risks, i.e., why the value of the information to be gained outweighs the risk involved.

n/a

3. If more than minimal risk, describe what actions that will be taken to minimize the risk(s).

n/a

4. If you will utilize deception (of any kind) in gathering your data, justify and support the use of deception AND provide a detailed description of the debriefing process used to explain the deception and the rationale for using it.



UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN-GREEN BAY

I will not utilize deception, however I will provide an intentionally vague description of the study's purpose in the recruitment and informed consent materials, in order to avoid hypothesis guessing and demand effects. A more detailed explanation of the purpose of the study will be provided on the debriefing webpage, attached as Appendix C.

E. Safeguarding the Participants

1. Collection of information can identify or potentially identify individual participants through surveys, interviews, or tests (including demographic data)? If YES, please explain & justify.

No Yes, Explain:

2. Will archival data containing identifying information or codes that could be linked to individuals be used? If YES, please explain and justify.

No Yes, Explain:

3. Will information be gathered or recorded in such a manner that participants can be identified, either directly or through identifiers linked to them? If YES, please explain and justify.

No Yes, Explain:

4. Explain how and where you will store the data and who will have access to it. FYI – it is not necessary to destroy data. Note that electronic storage **MUST** be password protected.

Qualtric's secure server and on my password protected computer. Only I will have access to the data.

5. Describe specific procedures you will use to safeguard participants' data from unauthorized access.
See 4 above.

6. If applicable, explain how you will link the data to participants during your study.

Each MTurk Worker has a worker ID that I will be able to view once a Worker submits my HIT as completed. At the end of my questionnaires on Qualtrics, I ask each participant to make up and enter a 5-digit study code and to enter this code both on Qualtrics and on MTurk. This 5-digit code enables me to verify that each worker has completed the study so that I can approve their payment. This 5-digit code is also the code the participant needs to provide if they choose later to have their data withdrawn from the study. The MTurk Worker IDs are not stored with the data. They appear on the MTurk site to enable me to approve payment. I have no way to discover any Worker/participant's identity unless they send me an email that contains identifying information.

7. State what you will do with the information obtained from the study (participants), e.g., use aggregate data to publish in a scientific journal, present at a conference.

Data will be reported only in the aggregate and will be presented at peer-reviewed academic conferences and published in peer-reviewed scholarly journals.

8. Describe which elements of your project might be openly accessible to other agencies or appear in publications.

I will be reporting how students ratings of the female university professor vary depending on: (i) job gender-type; (ii) sexual orientation of the professor; (iii) masculinity/femininity of the professor; (iv) performance success of the professor; and (v) the students' ambivalent sexism, social dominance orientation, and political ideology. Data will be reported in the aggregate (e.g. means) using ANOVAs, planned contrasts, mixed model regressions, conditional process analyses, and/or bootstrapping.



UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN-GREEN BAY

F. Benefits to Participants

Describe any potential benefits of participation (to participants, to society, and/or to a particular field of study) and evaluate the risk-benefit ratio of participation in the project, e.g., ERLP credit, gift card, etc.

Participants are MTurk Workers who joined MTurk to complete tasks for pay and/or amusement. MTurk Workers view available tasks (HITS), what they involve, how much they pay, and how long they will take before voluntarily choosing which tasks to complete. The pay and amusement participants receive outweigh the minimal risk associated with participation. Further, participants learn something about academic research through participation.

As stated above, this research will help identify possible bias against female university professors and the conditions under which it arises. It improves our understanding of the continuing social and economic inequality faced by women in the United States, even at high levels of education and socio-economic status.

G. Cooperating Institutions

If applicable, please provide information about any cooperating institutions (hospitals, prisons, social welfare agencies, etc.) that are involved in the project. Include information about the subjects and/or researchers' affiliation with the institution(s). Provide a copy of the affiliation (agreement) letter. The affiliation letter(s) should be written by a supervisor at the particular agency and serve as evidence that the primary investigator has been given permission to conduct research at the institution. You may NOT begin participant recruitment or data collection until you have submitted the signed affiliation letter(s) to the IRB.

n/a

If applicable, signed affiliation letter(s) are attached.



UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN-GREEN BAY

H. Special Considerations

Does your research involve:

YES NO

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Use of instructional strategies that are NOT commonly used and well accepted, or the addition of assessment procedures that are NOT routinely used in established or commonly accepted educational settings? If YES, please explain and justify. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Inclusion of questions about topics that the participant might consider sensitive or personal (e.g., questions about ethical or religious beliefs, questions about (intimate) relationships, questions about health status, health practices, or medical history, etc.). If YES, please explain and justify. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Placing the participants at risk of criminal or civil liability or damaging the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation if their responses were to be were to be disclosed outside of the research project? If YES, please explain and justify. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Any procedures that could impose stress or expose participants to risks beyond what they encounter in everyday life? If YES, please explain and justify. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Use or presentation of materials that might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading? If YES, please explain and justify. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Risk of physical injury or discomfort to participants, including physical exertion beyond normal activity? If YES, please explain and justify. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Manipulation of physiological requirements (nutrition, sleep, etc.) or of ethically sensitive psychological and social variables (sensory deprivation, isolation, stress, self-esteem)? If YES, please explain and justify. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Participants taking internally, or having applied externally, any substances, drugs, or other controlled substances? If YES, please explain and justify. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Collection and/or removal of any fluids or tissue from participants? If YES, please explain and justify. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. Use of participants with whom the researcher has another relationship (e.g. administrator-teacher, teacher-student, psychotherapist-client, supervisor-employee, nurse-patient, professional-client, parole officer-parolee, etc.)? If YES, please explain and justify. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. Access to health care records, legal records, or educational records. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 12. Photographing, videotaping, or audiotaping participants and/or individuals | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |



UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN-GREEN BAY

who will serve as **models** (actors) in the research?

13. A Quality Improvement Project?

PART III: DOCUMENTATION

A. Documentation Needed for ALL Proposals

Check if attached

- 1. Copy of informed consent.
- 2. Copy of all data collection instruments (instructions to participants, observational coding sheets, data sheets, etc.).
- 3. Copy of Certification of Human Subjects Training for PI (current within past 5 years).
- 4. Copy of Certification of Human Subjects Training for ALL co-investigators (current within the past 5 years).
- 5. A copy of any documents or verbal scripts used in recruiting subjects, e.g., email, Facebook, posting, posters, announcements, or script of verbal invitation to participate.
- 6. Signature page with signatures of ALL researchers.

B. Informed Consent

1. Describe the process involved in obtaining informed consent, e.g., when, where, and by whom consent will be obtained.

The first page that the participants will see on Qualtrics will be the Informed Consent page (Attached as Appendix B).

After reading the page each participant is asked whether they consent to participate in the study and must click yes or no. If the participant clicks yes, they proceed to the next page and begin the study. If the participant clicks no, they do not proceed to the study but are directed to an end of survey page that thanks them for their time.

2. Describe the procedures used to ensure that the consent is informed and voluntary (particularly if the student involves the use of vulnerable populations or the use of deception).

All of the necessary information describing the purpose of the study and what will be required of participants is provided on the Informed Consent page. Participation is solely voluntary. MTurk workers see my Recruitment page (Appendix A) and voluntarily decide whether they want to participate. After reading the Informed Consent page (Appendix B) each participant again voluntarily chooses whether to proceed with the study or not. Further, participants are advised on the Informed Consent page, and in the instructions, that precede the study materials, that they can refuse to answer any question they do not feel comfortable answering.



UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN-GREEN BAY

3. If research involves “in class” consent/participation, describe how you will protect subjects from being identified as non-participants (or participants) to you, other faculty, and other students. Additionally, describe how you will ensure that student do not feel compelled (via authority or peer pressure) to participate, e.g., PI leaving the room, having staff or other faculty participate.

n/a

4. If not obtaining “signed informed consent” (obtaining the signature of the subject on the informed consent document), explain why that is not necessary, e.g., it compromises anonymity because it is the only way that a subject might be identified as having participated as a subject.

Not obtaining signature but participants click yes or no and cannot proceed to the study unless they click yes.

Does your informed consent....	YES	NO
1. Indicate the NAME of the researchers, including the PI?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. State the PURPOSE of the research?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Include a PROCEDURES section that explains (in some detail) what is expected of the subject, including the time commitment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Explain the RISKS of the research – even if only minimal?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Explain the BENEFITS of the research – even if only contributing to knowledge of the discipline?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Include a SAFEGAURDS section that:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6a. explains how anonymity and/or privacy will be preserved?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6b. indicates that the subject has the option of discontinuing participation at any time?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6c. (if a survey or interview is involved), indicates that the subject has the option of NOT answering questions?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Provide contact information for the investigator (PI)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Include a statement as to how the participant can access the results of the study?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Provide contact information for the chair of the IRB?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

C. Documentation that MIGHT be Needed

Does your research involve:	YES	NO	Check if attached
1. A (simple) survey instrument; if yes, please provide a hard copy of the survey. Online surveys should also include the link.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Gaining access to health care records, legal records, or educational records? Please include a copy of letter of authorization.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Photographing, videotaping, or audiotaping individuals who will serve as live models and/or participants in the research? Please provide copy of authorization to photograph.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN-GREEN BAY

- 4. Using ERLP (Experiential Research Learning Program), please provide a copy of the recruitment text to be posted on ERLP website.
- 5. Any VERBAL scripts used as a part of the research, including verbal recruiting scripts or verbal directions used in carrying out the study.
- 6. A copy of the transcript of any oral presentation used in the place of a written consent statement, accompanied by the statement which participants or legal representatives, and an auditor-witness sign indicating their agreement to participate in the study described orally.
- 7. A request for waiver or modification of the typical consent procedures outlined above, with appropriate rationale and justification, because typical consent procedures would adversely affect the experimental design or procurement of data.
- 8. Use of archival data, and if not publically available, please provide documentation of your authorization to access and use this data.
- 9. Other relevant materials that will be used in the study.

PART IV: EXEMPT, EXPEDITED, OR FULL-BOARD?

Proposals will be reviewed by a member or all members (*Full Board*) of the IRB. However, some categories of research *may*, under certain circumstances, be exempt from the need for further review once approval is granted. *Note: majority of proposals will be reviewed and approved as Expedited.* Rarely will proposals be approved as *Exempt*. Please review the IRB manual for further descriptions of each designation. If your research can be categorized below, it may be eligible for review as *Exempt*.

- 1. Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal education practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.
- 2. Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior.
- 3. Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior wherein (i) the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or (ii) Federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.
- 4. Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, either directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.
- 5. Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of Department or Agency heads which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (i) Public benefit of service programs; (ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under these programs; (iii) possible



UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN-GREEN BAY

changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (iv) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.

6. Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (i) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (ii) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical, or environmental containment at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

NOTE: Research projects characterized by *use of vulnerable populations, threats to participants' anonymity, confidentiality, or privacy, by exposure of participants to more than minimal risk, and/or research NOT falling into the categories listed above, may require review by the full IRB.*

APPENDIX A: RECRUITMENT POSTING

Invitation to Participate in Research Study

Dr. Heather M. Clarke, with the University of Wisconsin – Green Bay, would like to invite you to participate in an online research study. The purpose of this study is to learn more about student evaluations of university professors.

What would be required of you:

If you wish to participate please click the link below. First you will read a letter of information and be asked whether you consent to participate in my study. If you consent to participate in my study, you will view a brief video and complete a questionnaire. After you complete the questionnaire you will view a debriefing webpage. The entire process should take you no longer than 15 minutes to complete.

Anonymity and Confidentiality:

Your participation in this study will be both anonymous and confidential. You will not be asked to provide your name, the name of your employer, or any other identifying information. All data will be stored on secure servers and will be accessed only by the researcher.

Research Ethics:

The proposal for this research has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Wisconsin – Green Bay. If you have ethical concerns about the research (such as the way you have been treated or your rights as a participant), you may contact the Chairperson of the IRB, Dr. Illene Cupit, at cupiti@uwgb.edu.

Appendix B

Default Question Block

Letter of Information/Informed Consent Form

Title: Student Evaluations of University Professors

Researcher: Dr. Heather M. Clarke
clarkeh@uwgb.edu
Austin E. Cofrin School of Business
University of Wisconsin – Green Bay
Green Bay, WI 54311
Phone: (920) 465-2353

You are invited to take part in a research project entitled “Student Evaluations of University Professors”.

This form is part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. It also describes how and when you can withdraw from the study. In order to decide whether you wish to participate in this research study, you should understand enough about its risks and benefits to be able to make an informed decision. Take time to read this carefully and to understand the information given to you. Please contact the researcher, Dr. Heather M. Clarke, if you have any questions about the study or for more information not included here before you consent.

It is entirely up to you to decide whether to take part in this research. If you choose not to take part in this research or if you decide to withdraw from the research once it has started, there will be no negative consequences for you, now or in the future.

Purpose of Study:

The purpose of this study is to learn more about how students evaluate university professors.

Study Procedure:

I am seeking university and college students who are at least 18 years of age or older, in the United States, to participate in my study. If you choose to participate, you will watch a brief video and complete a questionnaire. Participation should take approximately 10 to 15 minutes.

Possible benefits:

You will receive 1 USD for participation in this study. Further you will have the opportunity to view an executive summary of the findings of this study, should you wish to do so, by emailing clarkeh@uwgb.edu. Please note that the executive summary will not be available until March 1, 2018. You may also benefit by deriving a sense of satisfaction or enjoyment for contributing to academic research. Because our experiences at work have a significant impact on our well-being, it is important to learn more about these experiences and the effects they have.

Possible risks:

The only risk associated with this research is that the questionnaire may include questions that you consider to be of a sensitive nature. However, all information gathered will be kept completely confidential, anonymous, and aggregated so your answers cannot be attributed to you. All data will be stored on a secure server, to which only the researcher will have access. No IP addresses or any identifying information will be collected with the data. Further you are not obliged to answer any questions that you feel are objectionable or that make you uncomfortable. Your participation is completely voluntary.

Withdrawal from the study:

You can choose not to answer any specific question that you are not comfortable with. You can also choose to withdraw from the study at any point before submitting the completed questionnaire. If you decide to withdraw after completion of the study, you can email the researcher with the 5-digit code you enter at the end of the survey and request withdrawal of your data by December 31, 2017. Your data will then be deleted/destroyed. After December 31, 2017 it will not be possible to remove your data from the study analyses. There will be no consequences to you should you choose to withdraw from the study.

Confidentiality and Storage of Data:

All information gathered will be kept completely confidential and no answer can be directly attributed to you. All information will be aggregated (collected together) so no one individual's answers or comments will be identifiable. All results will be reported in the aggregate in both the executive summary and all future presentations and publications. Data will be stored electronically on password-protected servers and computers. No identifying information will be stored with the data or will be linked to the data files in anyway. The data will be kept for a minimum of five years. The data will not be used for archival purposes; rather it will be maintained in case the research is "audited" by another researcher or future analyses are required for revision purposes in the publication process.

The on-line survey company, Qualtrics, hosting this survey is located in the United States and as such is subject to U.S. laws. The US Patriot Act allows authorities access to the records of internet service providers. Therefore, anonymity and confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. If you choose to participate in this survey, you understand that your responses to the survey questions will be stored and may be accessed in the USA. However, you will not be able to be personally identified even if a request was made to see the data. The security policy and privacy policy for the web survey company can be found at the following links:

<https://www.qualtrics.com/privacy-statement/>

<https://www.qualtrics.com/security-statement/>

Please note that this is unlikely to occur but full and informed consent requires that this information be communicated to the participants.

Anonymity:

Apart from your 5-digit study code, which the researchers or anyone accessing the data under the Patriot Act cannot tie to your identity, there are no other identifiers that will allow your data to be linked to you. We assure you that every reasonable effort will be made to assure your anonymity and that you will not be identified in any reports, presentations, or publications.

Questions:

You are welcome to ask questions at any time during your participation in this research. If you would like more information about this study, please contact Dr. Heather M. Clarke (contact information provided above).

The proposal for this research has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Wisconsin – Green Bay. If you have ethical concerns about the

research (such as the way you have been treated or your rights as a participant), you may contact the Chairperson of the IRB, Dr. Illene Cupit, at cupiti@uwgb.edu.

Consent:

Providing your consent to participate in this study means that:

- You have read the information about the research.
- You have been able to ask questions about this study.
- You are satisfied with the answers to all your questions.
- You understand what the study is about and what you will be doing.
- You understand that you are free to withdraw subject to the limitations explained above, without having to give a reason, and that doing so will not affect you now or in the future.
- You understand that any data collected from you up to the point of your withdrawal will be destroyed.

Providing consent does not mean that you give up your legal rights or that you release the researchers from their professional responsibilities.

I have read what this study is about and understood the risks and benefits. I have had adequate time to think about this and had the opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered.

Please print a copy of this form for your records.

Do you consent to participate in this study?

Yes

No

Please watch this brief video of a university professor giving a lecture and then proceed to the next page to answer questions about the professor in the video.

Please be aware that there is a timer embedded in this page. Participants who complete the questionnaire without viewing the full video will be considered to not have completed the study and will not be compensated.

Remember that all of your responses are anonymous and confidential. Further, you can refuse to answer any question that you do not feel comfortable answering.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following adjectives describe the university professor in the video you just watched.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Competent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Productive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Effective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Efficient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Confident	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Skillful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Capable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly agree	Agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Likable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Successful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Experienced	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Qualified	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about the university professor in the video you just watched.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
The professor was female.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The professor was assertive.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The professor was heterosexual.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The professor was feminine.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The professor was warm.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The professor teaches accounting.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Select strongly disagree.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The professor was masculine.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The professor was nice.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The professor was male.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The professor teaches human resource management.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The professor was lesbian.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The professor was hostile.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about the university professor in the video you just watched.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
The professor responded to students' questions effectively.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The professor treated students respectfully.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The professor stimulated my interest in learning the subject matter of the course.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The professor communicated course concepts effectively.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The lecture was well organized.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The overall quality of instruction was excellent.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please indicate the extent to which you agree that the professor in the video possesses the following attributes.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Independent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Emotional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Passive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Able to devote self completely to others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Rough	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Helpful to others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Competitive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Kind	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Aware of others' feelings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly agree	Agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Select strongly agree.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Can make decisions easily	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gives up easily	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-confident	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feels very inferior	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Understanding of others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Warm in relations with others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Stands up well under pressure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please rate the overall quality of instruction from 1 to 10 (where 1 = poor and 10 = excellent).

Please rate the professor's overall performance from 1 to 10 (where 1 = poor and 10 = excellent).

Who do you usually find in the position of Human Resource Management Professor?

- Only females
- Mostly females
- More females than males
- Equal numbers of males and females
- More males than females
- Mostly males
- Only males

Who do you usually find in the position of Accounting Professor?

- Only females
- Mostly females
- More females than males
- Equal numbers of males and females
- More males than females
- Mostly males
- Only males

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Women are too easily offended.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Select strongly disagree.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Women should be cherished and protected by men.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Women exaggerate problems they have at work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Women, compared to men, tend to have superior moral sensibility.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feminists are making entirely unreasonable demands of men.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Some groups are just more worthy than others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Winning is more important than how the game is played.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Getting ahead in life by almost any means necessary.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
This country would be better off if we cared less about how equal all people are.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If people are treated more equally we would have fewer problems in this country.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It is really not a big problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Select strongly agree.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This country would be better off if inferior groups stayed in their place.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Being on top is the only place to be.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It is important that our country continue to be the best in the world.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sometimes war is necessary to to put other countries in their place.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In an ideal world, all nations would be equal.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This country must continue to lead the Free World.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
We should do anything necessary to increase the power of our country, even if it means war with smaller countries.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Increased social equality.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Equality.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Competition.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Nice guys finish last.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please indicate how strongly positive or negative you feel about each of the following issues.

	Extremely positive	Moderately positive	Slightly positive	Neither positive nor negative	Slightly negative	Moderately negative	Extremely negative				
	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
Abortion.											
Welfare benefits.											
Limited government.											
Military and national security.											
Religion.											
Gun ownership.											
Traditional marriage.											
Traditional values.											
Fiscal responsibility.											
Business.											
The family unit.											
Patriotism.											

What is your gender?

Male

Female

Other

What is your sexual orientation?

Homosexual (gay or lesbian)

Heterosexual (straight)

Other

What is your age in years?

What is your race/ethnicity?

African American or Black

Asian

Caucasian

Hispanic

Other

Are you in university or college?

University

College

Who is in your program?

Only females

Mostly females

More females than males

Equal numbers of males and females

More males than females

Mostly males

Only males

Appending C: Debriefing Webpage

We would like to thank you for your time and effort for this study. It is greatly appreciated!

The purpose of this study is to examine the factors that influence how students perceive and rate the performance of female university professors. Specifically, this study examines whether the professor's sexual orientation and perceived femininity and masculinity influence perceptions of her competence. Also examined are whether certain attitudes of the student rater, such as political ideology, influence how competent the performance ratings they give female professors.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study please feel free to contact:

Dr. Heather M. Clarke
clarkeh@uwgb.edu
Austin E. Cofrin School of Business
University of Wisconsin – Green Bay
Green Bay, WI 54311
Phone: (920) 465-2353

If you wish to view a summary of the results of this study you may do so by emailing clarkeh@uwgb.edu. Please note the summary will not be available until March 1, 2018.

Should you decide that you wish to withdraw your participation in this study, you must email clarkeh@uwgb.edu with your 5-digit study ID code by December 31, 2017. After December 31, 2017 it will be impossible to remove your data from the study.

The proposal for this research has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Wisconsin – Green Bay. If you have ethical concerns about the research (such as the way you have been treated or your rights as a participant), you may contact the Chairperson of the IRB, Dr. Illene Cupit, at cupiti@uwgb.edu.

Finally, if you experienced distress in completing this questionnaire, I encourage you to look into whether or not your organization has an employee assistance program to give you counseling, or contact an appropriate professional to discuss your experiences further (e.g., psychologist, counselor).

Again, thank you for your time and help!

Sincerely,
Dr. Heather M. Clarke



Certificate of Completion

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research certifies that **Heather Clarke** successfully completed the NIH Web-based training course "Protecting Human Research Participants".

Date of completion: 09/03/2016.

Certification Number: 2148449.