

# Challenging the Gendered Academic Hierarchy: The Artificial Separation of Research, Teaching, and Feminist Activism

Psychology of Women Quarterly  
2018, Vol. 42(2) 127-135  
© The Author(s) 2018  
Reprints and permission:  
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/0361684318762695  
journals.sagepub.com/home/pwq



Janice D. Yoder<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

In my 2017 Sherif Award address, I pay tribute to Carolyn Wood Sherif for her insightful exposure of an academic hierarchy in psychology and her call to be skeptical not only of our research choices but also of our career choices. I contend that the artificial separation of research/scholarship and teaching/mentoring, along with the masculinization and privileging of the former over the latter, contributes to perpetuating this gendered academic hierarchy. I suggest three possibilities for integrating teaching and research, embedded within one's commitment to feminist activism, by (a) publishing about one's own teaching, (b) researching one's teaching effectiveness, and (c) using one's classes to do research that contributes to feminist scholarship (as well as, in a fourth example, challenging the academic hierarchy itself). My immodest goal is to inspire junior and senior academic feminists to practice a "subversive" feminism that challenges the gendered, hierarchical academic institutions in which we are immersed as feminists "doing" (i.e., socially constructing) both teaching and research.

## Keywords

academe, research, teaching, feminism

For me personally (Yoder, 1998), as well as many others (Shields & Signorella, 2014), Carolyn Wood Sherif served as an invaluable mentor and inspirational role model. As a tribute to Carolyn, I decided to focus my address on what I hope may be some useful career advice for junior academic women as well as a clarion call for senior academic feminists. I will argue that although we typically construct teaching and research as separate categories of academic activities, they can be fruitfully combined, so that we can publish about our teaching, do research on the effectiveness of our teaching, and use our classes to do scholarship, as well as embed all our work in our commitment to feminist activism. In doing so, we may take one more step toward transforming academe, which continues to be a gendered, hierarchical system of power, privilege, and oppression (also see Meyers, 2012; Moradi & Grzanka, 2017).

Although Carolyn's seminal paper, "Bias in Psychology," is largely remembered for its incisive critique of positivism, she also challenged the academic hierarchy in psychology (Sherif, 1979/1998). She described this hierarchy at the University of Iowa in 1943 as privileging experimentalists at the top, followed (in descending order) by "mental testers and statistical buffs" (p. 61), by developmental psychologists, and by social and personality psychologists along with clinicians at the bottom. She went on to insightfully note that "the way to 'respectability' in

this scheme has been the appearance of rigor and scientific inquiry, bolstered by highly restrictive notions of what science is about" (p. 63).

Certainly, the specifics of this hierarchy have changed over the years, but Carolyn's central insight that psychology, as an academic institution, is hierarchical remains (see Shields, 1998). When I step back to consider this hierarchy more broadly by considering the two major foci of academic activities, research trumps teaching. Power and privilege reside in doing research over teaching, a point that is driven home by the gender distribution of psychologists at the "top" (research heavy and male-dominated) compared to the "bottom" (teaching heavy and female-dominated) levels of the academic hierarchy (American Psychological Association, Committee on Women in Psychology [APA-CWP], 2017). Research is central to being on the tenure track, earning promotion, and garnering professional visibility (e.g., representation in the governance of professional societies, being a fellow or an editor, and winning prestigious senior-level awards; cf. Vaid & Geraci, 2016). Furthermore, the climate of research-intensive universities pervades academe

<sup>1</sup> College of Public Health, Kent State University, Kent, OH, USA

## Corresponding Author:

Janice D. Yoder, College of Public Health, Kent State University, P.O. Box 5190, Kent, OH 44242, USA.

Email: jyoder34@kent.edu

at all levels in that graduates of the top doctoral programs (in computer science, business, and history—and likely psychology) dominate hiring through “prestige networks” (Clauset, Arbesman, & Larremore, 2015, p. 1), thus perpetuating an academic culture embedded in this hierarchy of privilege and status.

One of my additional take-aways from reading “Bias in Psychology” is that Carolyn was calling on us to be skeptics (Yoder, 1998), that is, to recognize the biases that are inherent in the “choices” we make, not only in how we do research but also in academic opportunities and how we pursue our academic careers. An academic hierarchy that privileges research over teaching necessitates that time spent on teaching is time *not* spent on research. And, not surprisingly, time allocation matters; faculty who spend more time on research are more productive authors (Manchester & Barbezat, 2013). The bottom line is that teaching and research are regarded as separate, independent, and competing endeavors; and this separation, I believe, works to support and perpetuate an academic hierarchy in which research is more prestigious and valued than teaching is.

Furthermore, I contend that this academic hierarchy is bolstered by gender inequality in which the work of doing research is relegated more to men and is stereotyped as masculine/agentive, whereas teaching is allotted to women and is stereotyped as feminine/communal. Despite the influx of women into psychology, men are disproportionately represented in our top ranks and institutions (APA-CWP, 2017). Prestige networks in academic hiring benefit men over women (Clauset et al., 2015), and faculty men’s time allocation favors doing research more so than does women’s (Manchester & Barbezat, 2013). Indeed, women themselves inadvertently may perpetuate this hierarchy by avoiding being in male-dominated domains because they (realistically) anticipate having less interpersonal power in them than men do (Chen & Moons, 2015). Furthermore, academic conference meetings that are numerically dominated by men are perceived by women attendees as more sexist and silencing, and the more women report these views, the more likely they are to express intentions to exit academe (Biggs, Hawley, & Biernat, 2017). Even students may contribute to the status quo by persisting in penalizing women instructors for not being expectedly communal (e.g., granting their work-intensive special requests), hence adding extra time demands to women faculty’s workloads (El-Alayli, Hansen-Brown, & Ceynar, 2017).

Obviously, the structures, processes, and people who maintain this gendered academic hierarchy are complex and many, but my argument is that one additional contributor is the barrier that is assumed to exist between doing research and doing teaching. When women are disproportionately marginalized in teaching-intensive positions and expected to work harder and longer at teaching and mentoring, they can be systematically shut out of being productive researchers, further insuring their lower status in

the academic hierarchy. Although formal bans on including women in graduate education and nepotism rules no longer openly discriminate against women, as they did for Carolyn (Unger & Kahn, 1998), the existing academic hierarchy can work to more subtly keep women in their place.

I certainly do not mean to demean the importance of teaching; I am exceedingly proud that my efforts in teaching and mentoring students have been recognized by one college, two universities, and two professional teaching/mentoring awards. I also deeply value the many students who I taught and from whom I learned across my 40 years in the classroom. But when I look at my vita and think about how I was regarded, judged, and promoted, very little of it had to do with teaching. Thus, the remainder of my Sherif address focuses on three ideas for pulling down the wall between doing teaching/mentoring and doing research/scholarship by drawing on examples from my own record. These examples illustrate how an instructor/researcher might (a) publish about her own teaching, (b) research her own teaching effectiveness, and (c) use her own classes to do research that contributes to feminist scholarship.

### **Publishing About Teaching**

My first example grew from my activities as an editor of *Psychology of Women Quarterly (PWQ)* and as an instructor of an advanced Psychology of Women course enrolling 35–50 students. It is also consistent with my feminist commitment to give research away to students for their everyday lives (Yoder, 2016). As an editor, I was reading fascinating research articles at the cutting edge of our field, and as an instructor, I wanted to share this wealth of well-documented evidence with my students. However, like most instructors of upper-level courses in psychology, I knew that most students often found reading research articles dry and intimidating (Varnhagen & Digdon, 2002). I thus set out to make students more enthusiastic and effective readers of primary sources and to share my feminist conviction that research can be personally relevant and can inform the public discourse. I designed a series of assignments that entailed having students first complete a pre-reading activity to personalize an article, then read the assigned article, then write a pseudo-blog, and finally share the assignment in class along with lecture and class-wide discussion.

For example, one paper was Fahs’s (2013) clever series of two studies in which she first had undergraduates imagine how they would feel, and how they projected others would react, if they chose not to remove visible body hair. In a follow-up data collection, she had other female and male student volunteers follow through by actually growing typically unwanted, visible body hair. My pre-reading activity repeated some of the questions from Fahs’s first study, confirming that most of my students (like Fahs’) regarded

body-hair removal as a cost-free choice for both women and men. When my students went on then to read the research article, they initially affirmed their own convictions in the first study but then had those convictions challenged for and about women in the second study. In our classroom discussions, students' beliefs about women's body hair removal were shaken as they grappled with the costs of violating sexist social norms. Their pseudo-blogs (i.e., short research summaries that were formatted like blog postings but that were not actually posted online), which targeted a wide public lay audience, helped bridge this academic reading with their personalized understandings and insights. The blogs also required students to translate academic research into everyday language and experiences similar to previous exercises in which students wrote letters to their parents about the research that they read in class (Chamberlain & Burrough, 1985).

I published this article in *PWQ* as a teaching brief (Yoder, 2016). The Teaching Brief section of *PWQ* is an addition to the journal that Margaret Matlin and I developed together as a way to expand the journal to inclusively capture feminist pedagogy in the field of the Psychology of Women (Yoder, 2010). From the start, these briefs generally fell into one of the three categories: (a) those describing ideas for teaching Psychology of Women and/or gender courses as a whole (e.g., Gergen, 2010), (b) those sharing ideas for classes (e.g., Gibbons, 2010) or projects (e.g., Rothblum, 2010; Yoder, 2016) within these courses, and (c) those spreading feminist approaches throughout the curriculum by reporting on innovations for general use (e.g., Katz, 2010). My guess is that many creative and effective teaching ideas are being implemented by feminist instructors whom I hope will be inspired to share them through this peer-reviewed forum, thus using ideas developed through teaching to contribute to published scholarship.

## Researching Teaching Effectiveness

In the first example I described here, I simply disseminated a teaching idea that I used in my Psychology of Women course. My second example brings together my endeavors as a textbook author (Yoder, 2013) and as an instructor (again, of Psychology of Women), embedded in my feminist activism. I wanted to share with my undergraduate students the benefits (e.g., enhanced well-being and a sense of personal empowerment; Yoder, Snell, & Tobias, 2012) of endorsing feminist beliefs. I also wanted to test a core assumption that I used in my teaching of the Psychology of Women and that I used in my textbook—that is, how students *think* about gender matters (specifically moving away from essentialism toward the understanding that gendered social contexts can shape attitudes and behaviors). The research questions my colleagues and I asked are: Do students' (a) feminist beliefs and (b) beliefs about the origins of gender differences change across the time they are taking a Psychology of Women class and,

most importantly, (c) are the two changes related? (Yoder, Fischer, Kahn, & Groden, 2007).

We collected data from undergraduates across five different Psychology of Women courses taught by three different instructors at three different universities using different textbooks. We surveyed 120 students both at the start and at the end of the semester, asking them at both times about their feminist beliefs (measured by the Feminist Identity Composite; Fischer et al., 2000), their endorsement of different explanations for presumed gender differences, and their beliefs in the feasibility of achieving social change toward gender equality. Like other studies looking at the impact of women's studies classes (e.g., Bargad & Hyde, 1991; Worell, Stilwell, Oakley, & Robinson, 1999), we found that students' feminist attitudes strengthened across the semester.

To assess students' endorsement of different explanations for gender differences, we created a four-part measure that drew from meta-analytic findings that then established small-to-large gender differences in cognitive abilities (math and spatial skills favoring boys and men; verbal and memory skills favoring girls and women), social skills (male-associated aggression and activity; female-associated empathy and smiling), and motor skills (throwing velocity favoring boys; flexibility favoring girls). We crossed these 10 abilities (e.g., "Men are better at math than women because...") with four types of explanations: biological (e.g., "...men's and boys' brains are better suited to doing math"), personality (e.g., "...men's and boys' personalities are more logical and analytical"), socialization (e.g., "...more parents and teachers encourage boys in math"), and social context (e.g., "...people don't expect women to do well in math"). Note that the difference between the last two explanations rests in timing, with socialization occurring in an adult's past whereas social (and cultural) context relates to situations occurring in the present. For each of the 40 resulting items, students reported their opinion about how likely it was that the explanation was correct. Their ratings were collapsed across abilities to yield each student's endorsement of each of the four possible explanations for gender differences: biological (rooting differences in the physical), personality (in traits), socialization (in past child rearing), and social context (in present stereotyping, norms, status differences, etc.).

We found that students' endorsement of biological and personality explanations, both of which root the cause for gender differences within individuals and thus essentialize differences, declined across the semester. In contrast, their endorsement of socialization and social context explanations (i.e., social constructionist explanations wherein gender is conceptualized and performed in interaction with others; West & Zimmerman, 1987) strengthened. Furthermore, endorsement of essentializing explanations was associated with beliefs that eliminating cognitive and social differences would be unlikely, whereas endorsement of social

constructionist explanations correlated positively with beliefs that cognitive, social, and motor gender gaps could be closed. Finally, and most central to our core research question, changes in students' endorsement of social contextual explanations were related to their changes in feminist beliefs. In other words, the more students endorsed explanations of gender differences that drew on stereotyping, status and power, and other gendered pressures that are part of the immediate social context, the more strongly they espoused feminist beliefs. In sum, these findings verified that targeting students' thinking about the causes of gender differences also changed their feminist beliefs.

But, the implications of these findings do not stop here. Other research on essentialist thinking has further refined its definition and explored its implications. For example, Gowaty (2018) offers a much better and broader operationalization of essentialism as a perception bias or frame, wherein entities within a category (e.g., women and men) are fundamentally, intrinsically, necessarily, and determinately regarded as different. Researchers have implicated endorsement of essentializing beliefs with stereotype endorsement (Bastian & Haslam, 2006), with acceptance of gender inequality and stronger support for sexist practices among men (Morton, Postmes, Haslam, & Hornsey, 2009), with partially explaining occupation segregation (Levanon & Grusky, 2016), with children's gender-typed preferences and parents' prescriptive stereotyping (Meyer & Gelman, 2016), with system-justifying attitudes (Kray, Howland, Russell, & Jackman, 2017), and with negative stereotyping of individuals who identify as transgender as well as transphobia (Ching & Xu, 2017). Essentialist thinking reifies a gender binary that itself is inevitability hierarchical, privileging men over women in patriarchal cultures (see Johnson, 2017; Ridgeway, 2014; Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Phelan, & Nauts, 2012) and setting up androcentric bias (Hegarty, Lemieux, & McQueen, 2010). In sum, there is even more compelling evidence, beyond strengthening feminist beliefs, for working to reduce essentialist thinking by our students (and ourselves).

### Using Classes to Do Scholarship

Whereas my second example focused on teaching and learning-based research, my third and final example looks at doing scholarly research but in the context of a ready-made participant pool, that is, the college classroom. My central goal with this study was to test an intervention designed to reduce hostile and benevolent sexism (Yoder, Mills, & Raffa, 2016), building on prior studies that have targeted students' sexist beliefs by using daily dairies (Becker & Swim, 2011), an in-class exercise (WAGES-Academic; Zawadzki, Shields, Danube, & Swim, 2014), an online experiment (Becker & Swim, 2012), and feminist courses (Case, 2007). This example combines my interests as a scholar/researcher, teacher, and feminist activist.

Our intervention targeted three 35-student undergraduate Research Methods classes, and it was grounded in the Elaboration Likelihood Model, which argues that persistent attitude change requires thoughtful central-route processing that is motivated by the personal relevance of the persuasive message and the merits of its supporting arguments (see Petty & Briñol, 2010, for a review). I settled on using ambivalent sexism as my targeted belief because the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996) is a widely used, contemporary measure of sexism, ambivalent sexism theory has been well articulated (Glick & Fiske, 2001), and both the theory and measure have sparked a large and methodologically diverse literature (Lee, Fiske, & Glick, 2010). Students in each course completed the ASI during the first week of the semester, and then the ensuing classes drew on this measure and its theory to guide students' team-designed research projects as well as class assignments (e.g., critiquing published research articles) and lecture examples (e.g., the development and psychometric properties of the ASI). Although I complied with the recommendations of best practices for teaching this course (Landrum & Smith, 2007), students and I spent much of the semester reading about, discussing, and even analyzing original data touching on ambivalent sexism. (Of note, over the next few years, more and more individual students' honors projects included the ASI, so that my colleagues were also drawn into this intervention.)

After all three of my classes had ended, we contacted the psychology majors who had completed one of these classes, and of these 101 students, 31 again completed the ASI during the Fall 2012 semester. In addition, we recruited a comparison group of 55 psychology majors taking Research Methods or Statistics with my colleagues in Fall 2012, all of whom completed the ASI at the start of the semester and 29 of whom also completed it at the end. At the core of our findings, we showed that our responding intervention students scored significantly lower on both hostile and benevolent sexism on the post-course testing, compared to their initial testing during the first week of my class, thus supporting the effectiveness (and durability) of our intervention. We strengthened this contention by further showing that responding students did not differ from their non-responding classmates at the start of my Methods classes, that students who elected to take my classes scored similar to other psychology majors, and that other majors who took the ASI at the start and end of their semester (Fall 2012) did not change their scores (hostile sexism) or actually increased them (benevolent sexism). Thus, we offered some evidence to rule out potential selection biases in responding, selection bias in enrollment, and testing effects, respectively. Although, as with any quasi-experimental design, there are limitations to our study, we made a suitably compelling case for the effectiveness of our intervention for reducing students' sexism.

There are other examples in recent issues of *PWQ* that provide ideas for researchers to draw on their teaching resources to conduct scholarly research. For example,

I already noted Fahs's (2014) Study 2 on body hair removal, which drew on volunteer participation among students in her undergraduate women's studies course. In her first study, she recruited a community sample to explore impressions of women who grew their body hair, and her second study involved 62 women and 17 men who grew their body hair for an optional class assignment and wrote response papers describing their experiences and reactions, which Fahs then analyzed. The combination of studies is striking because it underscores stark differences between imagined and realized experiences and thus exposes implicit (and sexist) social pressures toward body hair removal that undermine the discourse of free choice (specifically for women).

Moradi, Martin, and Brewster (2012) explored the role that threat played in not identifying as a feminist. In their Study 2, 52 students taking a Psychology of Women course were exposed to a diverse panel of six participants, all of whom identified as feminists. However, students were not informed about the panelists' feminist identification and instead played "20 questions" to try to ferret out who on the panel were feminists. After students shared their guesses and were informed that all guesses were correct, the class discussed the students' reactions, as well as their implicit assumptions, and the panelists talked about their own identities as feminists. Thus, students were exposed to their own and others' assumptions about feminists as well as a diverse array of espoused feminists. Looking at both pre- and post-intervention scores, students' feminist threat scores declined whereas their feminist self-identification increased and, across both testings, threat and identification scores were consistently negatively correlated.

Rios, Stewart, and Winter (2010) took advantage of having access to nine break-out sections of a large upper-level Political Psychology course in which three sections were organized around a gender-inclusive curriculum. By introducing students in the targeted three sections to exemplars of women leaders, Rios and colleagues explored whether exposure to these exemplars might lead students to write about female leaders as good leaders in their final exam (a clever unobtrusive measure). They also wondered if a woman leader could positively influence leadership development among women and girls and could lead students to express their own, or report others', positive attitudes about women leaders. The first two outcomes were evidenced among both female and male students, whereas the enhanced expression of positive attitudes was (not unimportantly) confined to women.

### **Drawing on Your Own Overlapping Activities**

My ultimate goal in sharing the present ideas for combining teaching and research, all embedded in one's commitment to feminist activism, is to spark your interest in publishing some of your own work—whether it shares teaching ideas, researches teaching effectiveness, or uses your classes to do

scholarship. Beyond these three types of publishing possibilities, in the following, I home in on three general take-away messages to be gleaned from these examples, as well as introduce a fourth possibility for linking teaching with research.

First, bringing students into your research is an additional way to link teaching with research. In two of the three examples from my own work that I presented here, the second (Yoder et al., 2007) included co-author Jessica Groden and the third (Yoder et al., 2016) included co-authors Aerial Mills and Emily Raffa, all of whom were undergraduate students who worked on these projects as their senior honors projects. Similarly, co-authors Annelise Martin, an undergraduate, and Melanie Brewster, a graduate student, were students during data collection for Moradi and colleagues' (2012) study with the feminist panel of speakers.

Second, thinking across your own course load and making research connections with colleagues can expand your data collection efforts and enhance the generalizability of your findings. For example, co-authors Anne Fischer and Arnie Kahn included the courses they taught in our data collection for the second example I discussed (Yoder et al., 2007), and I enlisted my colleagues at the University of Akron to recruit psychology majors who did not take Research Methods with me for Yoder, Mills, and Raffa (2016). Rios and colleagues (2010) involved co-author David Winter, the instructor of the mass-lecture course on Political Psychology, in their data collection, as well as the two other graduate student instructors for the remaining six discussion sections. I looked beyond my own Psychology of Women course to my required Research Methods course to develop an intervention with a more typical sample of students beyond those enrolling in women's studies courses. Similarly, Moradi et al. (2012) included students in Moradi's course on Psychology of Personality in their data collection to serve as a comparison group.

Third, these research designs are necessarily quasi-experimental because these designs commonly rely on intact classes. Although certainly more challenging than conducting true experiments, they simply call for greater creativity in patching in viable comparisons groups. The findings from my intervention in my Research Methods classes were made all the more compelling because I added a comparison group of psychology majors. Moradi et al. (2012) showed, not only that changes occurred among students in Moradi's intervention class, but also that these students did not differ from comparison students in her Personality course before the invention was enacted but did differ afterward. Rios et al. (2010) dealt effectively with concerns that having a discussion section led by a woman itself might have influenced students' final exam writing focused on women's leadership by comparing the patterns they found in the three sections exposed to a women-inclusive curriculum (taught by Rios) to a standard curriculum taught by one male (for three different sections) and one female (for another three sections) graduate student instructors.

A fourth possibility for bridging research with teaching within a feminist agenda, beyond the three examples from my own work that I described, can be gleaned from the work of Zawadzki, Shields, Danube, and Swim (2014), along with some behind-the-scenes information (S. Shields, personal communication, November 1, 2017). In their study, they combined their roles as feminist researchers interested in attitude change with teaching and practice, ultimately planning to design an exercise, not only for both graduate and undergraduate students, but also for influential academic administrators. Zawadzki and colleagues sought to break down barriers among research, teaching, and practice, ultimately targeting major gatekeepers of the gendered academic hierarchy.

Their wider project entailed the creation and testing of an intervention (Workshop Activity for Gender Equity Simulation [WAGES]-Academic) for reducing endorsement of sexist beliefs among those who experienced it. Starting with an informal prototype of the WAGES game in Stephanie Shield's undergraduate classes, she and her students developed it into its tested form to apply for funding. That empirical testing, reported in Zawadzki et al. (2014), followed standard research protocol by randomly assigning undergraduates recruited through the departmental participant pool to test the effectiveness of WAGES. The study included groups given both information about sexist treatment and an experiential group activity, compared against two control groups: an information-only control and an experiential activity-only control.

Zawadzki and colleagues' (2014) project made connections between research and teaching beyond my own examples. The general idea for their research began in the undergraduate classroom and then morphed into a research project. The research project itself moved outside the classroom into the conventional realm of data collection for psychology scholars, included two graduate student co-authors (Matthew Zawadzki and Cinnamon Danube), and resulted in a scholarly publication (Zawadzki et al., 2014). From there, some of its implications came back to undergraduate and graduate classrooms where the authors, along with a network of colleagues, are continuing to work with and modify WAGES-Academic for classroom use. Unlike my own narrower, single-study examples, their project illustrates a reciprocal interplay between the authors' activities as researchers, as teachers, and as practitioners, embedded within a feminist agenda to reduce sexism that is ongoing and dynamic. Their project more directly challenges the gendered academic hierarchy by ultimately aiming to educate and change the attitudes of high-status academic gatekeepers and policymakers.

### Challenging the Academic Hierarchy

I concede that my examples may do little, if anything, to directly challenge the existing academic hierarchy. Although the domains for doing research are expanded, the privileging

of research over teaching remains intact. What might change, however, is the gender composition of who is on top as well as an appreciation of what it took to get there (including teaching). In the 20 years I spent as a tenured full professor, I tried to undertake some minor, but potentially subversive, actions. For example, as editor of *PWQ*, I worked with Margaret Matlin to create a way for thoughtful and creative teachers to publish peer-review papers about their teaching as part of a more holistic Psychology of Women (*PWQ*'s Teaching Briefs). In both local and in other (as an external reviewer) tenure and promotion cases, I tried to acknowledge and accentuate the (often unsung) work and importance of the candidate's mentoring of students as co-authors and co-reviewers of journal articles. Even more effective is the work of researchers who turn their skills to collaborate on Status of Women reports within their institution (see Gaughan & Su, 2012, for a review), to document inequities (e.g., MIT Status of Women Report, 1999), and to systematically examine the attitudes and behaviors of gatekeepers such as academic administrators (like Shield's project; also see McClelland & Holland, 2015).

Again, Carolyn chimes in with a lesson from her own experiences. She related how, despite her demonstrated prowess as a published researcher and textbook author, she struggled to secure a tenure-track position and, even then, how it took the resurgence of the women's movement in the early 1970s to advance her academic rank (reported in Unger & Kahn, 1998). Her insights underscore for all of us why an important part of my examples here is their embeddedness in the feminist challenge to take collective action, to make the personal, political (Hanisch, 1969/2009), and to frame our ways of doing research and teaching that lead to social transformations (see Moradi & Grzanka, 2017). I further believe that it will be critically important to look beyond gender and sexism to explore intersections among our many personal identities as well as recognize the value inherent in being both unified and diverse as feminists (see Apfelbaum, 1999; Greenwood, 2008).

### Practice Implications

I have argued that the separation of research/scholarship and teaching/mentoring, although commonly singled out in academe in (e.g., in tenure-and-promotion cases and in merit reviews), is artificial. Instead, these professional activities can be intertwined, and for those of us doing psychology of women and gender, they can be embedded in our feminism. My immodest goal here is to encourage you to link these activities in your own professional endeavors, finding support in feminist organizations like the Society for the Psychology of Women and the Association for Women in Psychology, among others, and ultimately being empowered by collective action.

Doing so is not always easy or well supported. Looking back, I personally understand that being liberated to carve my

own paths came largely with having developed the conventionally valued academic credentials (e.g., tenured full professor) to do so. Indeed, even what will likely be my capstone academic pursuit (i.e., editing *Sex Roles*) came with costs (and, thankfully, plenty of offsetting benefits). Here then is where my remarks call on senior feminist faculty who can help to move the academic scholars doing the work I describe here from the margins to the academic center. We can take steps in this direction through the work we do as mentors, as reviewers, as editors and board members, as letter writers, as members and chairs of hiring and tenure/promotion committees, as academic administrators, and so on—in sum, as practitioners of academics. Ultimately, how successful we are at challenging the gendered academic hierarchy will rest in changing organizational structures. In my own career, I did my own small part locally in Faculty Senates and the American Association of University Professors. My own sense (albeit limited) is that doing so not only has been professionally fulfilling but also has made some modest contributions to our field and my work-life, modeling as best I can the example lived and shared by Carolyn Wood Sherif.

### Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### References

- American Psychological Association, Committee on Women in Psychology. (2017). *The changing gender composition of psychology: Update and expansion of the 1995 task force report*. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/women/programs/gender-composition/index.aspx>
- Apfelbaum, E. (1999). Relations of domination and movements for liberation: An analysis of power between groups (abridged version). *Feminism & Psychology, 9*, 267–272. doi:10.1177/0959353599009003003
- Bargad, A., & Hyde, J. S. (1991). Women's studies: A study of feminist identity development in women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15*, 181–201. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1991.tb00791.x
- Bastian, B., & Haslam, N. (2006). Psychological essentialism and stereotype endorsement. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 42*, 228–235. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2005.03.003
- Becker, J. C., & Swim, J. K. (2011). Seeing the unseen: Attention to daily encounters with sexism as a way to reduce sexist beliefs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35*, 227–242. doi:10.1177/0361684310397509
- Becker, J. C., & Swim, J. K. (2012). Reducing endorsement of benevolent and modern sexist beliefs: Differential effects of addressing harm versus pervasiveness of benevolent sexism. *Social Psychology, 43*, 127–137. doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000091
- Biggs, J., Hawley, P. H., & Biernat, M. (2017). The academic conference as a chilly climate for women: Effects of gender representation on experiences of sexism, coping responses, and career intentions. *Sex Roles*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1007/s11199-017-0800-9
- Case, K. A. (2007). Raising male privilege awareness and reducing sexism: An evaluation of diversity courses. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 426–435. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00391.x
- Chamberlain, K., & Burrough, S. (1985). Techniques for teaching critical reading. *Teaching of Psychology, 12*, 213–215.
- Chen, J. M., & Moons, W. G. (2015). They won't listen to me: Anticipated power and women's disinterest in male-dominated domains. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 18*, 116–128. doi:10.1177/1368430214550340
- Ching, B. H., & Xu, J. T. (2017). The effects of gender neuroessentialism on transprejudice: An experimental study. *Sex Roles*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1007/s11199-017-0786-3
- Clauset, A., Arbesman, S., & Larremore, D. B. (2015). Systematic inequality and hierarchy in faculty hiring networks. *Science Advances, 1*, 1–7. doi:10.1126/sciadv.1400005
- El-Alayli, A., Hansen-Brown, A. A., & Ceynar, M. (2017). Dancing backwards in high heels: Female professors experience more work demands and special favor requests, particularly from academically entitled students. *Sex Roles*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1007/s11199-017-0872-6
- Fahs, B. (2013). Perilous patches and pitstaches: Imagined versus lived experiences of women's body hair growth. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 38*, 167–180. doi:10.1177/0361684313497924
- Fischer, A. R., Tokar, D. M., Mergl, M. M., Good, G. E., Hill, M. S., & Blum, S. A. (2000). Assessing women's feminist identity development: Studies of convergent, discriminant, and structural validity. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24*, 15–29. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2000.tb01018.x
- Gaughan, M., & Su, X. (2012). The status of faculty women reports: Documenting gender health in American universities. In M. Meyers (Ed.), *Women in higher education: The fight for equity* (pp. 233–252). New York, NY: Hampton Press.
- Gergen, M. (2010). Teaching Psychology of Gender from a social constructionist standpoint. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 34*, 261–264. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2010.01567.x/abstract
- Gibbons, J. L. (2010). The power of resources: An exercise in inequality for teaching Psychology of Women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 34*, 127–130. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2009.01549.x/abstract
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 491–512. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender

- inequality. *American Psychologist*, 56, 109–118. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.56.2.109
- Gowaty, P. A. (2018). Biological essentialism, gender, true belief, confirmation biases, and skepticism. In C. B. Travis, J. W. White, A. Rutherford, W. S. Williams, S. L. Cook, & K. F. Wyche (Eds.), *APA handbook of the psychology of women: History, theory, and backgrounds* (pp. 145–164). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Greenwood, R. M. (2008). Intersectional political consciousness: Appreciation for intragroup difference and solidarity in diverse groups. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 32, 36–47. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00405.x
- Hanisch, C. (1969/2009). *The personal is political: The women's Liberation Movement classic with a new explanatory introduction*. Retrieved from <http://www.carolhanisch.org/CHwritings/PIP.html>
- Hegarty, P., Lemieux, A. F., & McQueen, G. (2010). Graphing the order of the sexes: Constructing, recalling, interpreting, and putting the self in gender difference graphs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 375–391. doi:10.1037/a0018590
- Johnson, A. G. (2017). *Privilege, power, and difference* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Katz, J. (2010). Teaching psychology majors to study women's sexual victimization: A feminist approach. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 34, 121–124. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2009.01547.x
- Kray, L. J., Howland, L., Russell, A. G., & Jackman, L. M. (2017). The effects of implicit gender role theories on gender system justification: Fixed beliefs strengthen masculinity to preserve the status quo. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 112, 98–115. doi:10.1037/pspp0000124
- Landrum, R. E., & Smith, R. A. (2007). Creating syllabi for statistics and research methods courses. In D. S. Dunn, R. A. Smith, & B. Beins (Eds.), *Best practices for teaching statistics and research methods in the behavioral sciences* (pp. 45–57). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lee, T. L., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2010). Next gen ambivalent sexism: Converging correlates, causality in context, and converse causality, an introduction to the special issue. *Sex Roles*, 62, 395–404. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9747-9
- Levanon, A., & Grusky, D. B. (2016). The persistence of extreme gender segregation in the twenty-first century. *American Journal of Sociology*, 122, 573–619. doi:10.1086/688628
- Manchester, C., & Barbezat, D. (2013). The effect of time use in explaining male-female productivity differences among economists. *Industrial Relations*, 52, 53–77. doi:10.1111/irel.12011
- McClelland, S. I., & Holland, K. J. (2015). You, me, or her: Leaders' perceptions of responsibility for increasing gender diversity in STEM departments. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 39, 210–225. doi:10.1177/0361684314537997
- Meyer, M., & Gelman, S. (2016). Gender essentialism in children and parents: Implications for the development of gender stereotyping and gender-typed preferences. *Sex Roles*, 75, 409–421. doi:10.1007/s11199-016-0646-6
- Meyers, M. (Ed.). (2012). *Women in higher education: The fight for equity*. New York, NY: Hampton Press.
- MIT Status of Women Report. (1999). *A study of the status of women faculty in science at MIT*. Retrieved from <http://web.mit.edu/fnl/women/women.html#TheStudy>
- Moradi, B., & Grzanka, P. R. (2017). Using intersectionality responsibly: Toward critical epistemology, structural analysis, and social justice activism. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 64, 500–513. doi:10.1037/cou0000203
- Moradi, B., Martin, A., & Brewster, M. (2012). Disarming the threat to feminist identification: An application of personal construct theory to measurement and intervention. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 36, 197–209. doi:10.1177/0361684312440959
- Morton, T. A., Postmes, T., Haslam, S. A., & Hornsey, M. J. (2009). Theorizing gender in the face of social change: Is there anything essential about essentialism? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 653–664. doi:10.1037/a0012966
- Petty, R. E., & Briñol, P. (2010). Attitude change. In R. F. Baumeister & E. J. Finkel (Eds.), *Advanced social psychology: The state of the science* (pp. 217–259). New York, NY: Oxford.
- Ridgeway, C. L. (2014). Why status matters for inequality. *American Sociological Review*, 79, 1–16. doi:10.1177/0003122413515997
- Rios, D., Stewart, A., & Winter, D. G. (2010). “Thinking she could be the next president”: Why identifying with the curriculum matters. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 34, 328–338. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2010.01578.x
- Rothblum, E. (2010). Use of online surveys for undergraduate Psychology of Women courses. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 34, 124–127. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2009.01548.x/full
- Rudman, L. A., Moss-Racusin, C. A., Phelan, J. E., & Nauts, S. (2012). Status incongruity and backlash effects: Defending the gender hierarchy motivates prejudice against female leaders. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 165–179. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.10.008
- Sherif, C. W. (1979). Bias in psychology. *Feminism & Psychology*, 8, 58–75. doi:10.1177/0959353598081005. Reprinted from J. Sherman & E. T. Beck (Eds.), *The prism of sex: Essays in the sociology of knowledge* (pp. 117–135). Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press. (Original work published 1998)
- Shields, S. A. (1998). Illusions of progress and “insurgent science”: An imagined conversation. *Feminism & Psychology*, 8, 99–104. doi:10.1177/0959353598081010
- Shields, S. A., & Signorella, M. L. (2014). Carolyn Wood Sherif (1922-1982): Feminist social psychology in the service of equality for all peoples. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 38, 443–446. doi:10.1177/0361684314552193
- Unger, R. K., & Kahn, A. S. (1998). “Bias in psychology”: A reappraisal. *Feminism & Psychology*, 8, 51–57. doi:10.1177/0959353598081004
- Vaid, J., & Geraci, L. (2016). An examination of women's professional visibility in cognitive psychology. *Feminism & Psychology*, 26, 292–319. doi:10.1177/0959353516641139

- Varnhagen, C. K., & Digdon, N. (2002). Helping students read reports of empirical research. *Teaching of Psychology, 29*, 160–164. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2009.01547.x/full
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society, 1*, 125–151.
- Worell, J., Stilwell, D., Oakley, D., & Robinson, D. (1999). Educating about women and gender: Cognitive, personal and professional outcomes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 23*, 797–811. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1999.tb00398.x/full
- Yoder, J. D. (1998). The reproduction of a skeptical, feminist social psychologist. *Feminism & Psychology, 8*, 84–89. doi:10.1177/0959353598081007
- Yoder, J. D. (2010). Editorial: A feminist journal at the cutting edge of a psychology for women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 34*, 1–4. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2009.01535.x/abstract
- Yoder, J. D. (2013). *Women and gender: Making a difference* (4th ed.). Cornwall on Hudson, NY: Sloan.
- Yoder, J. D. (2016). Pseudo-blog assignments with discussion make undergraduates better users of academic research on women and gender. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 40*, 138–141. doi:10.1177/0361684315622644
- Yoder, J. D., Fischer, A. R., Kahn, A. S., & Groden, J. (2007). Changes in students' explanations for gender differences after taking a Psychology of Women class: More constructionist and less essentialist. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 415–425. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00390.x/abstract
- Yoder, J. D., Mills, A. S., & Raffa, E. R. (2016). An effective intervention in Research Methods that reduces psychology majors' sexist prejudices. *Teaching of Psychology, 43*, 187–196. doi:10.1177/0098628316640314
- Yoder, J. D., Snell, A. F., & Tobias, A. (2012). Balancing multicultural competence with social justice: Feminist beliefs and optimal psychological functioning. *The Counseling Psychologist, 40*, 1101–1132. doi:10.1177/0011000011426296
- Zawadzki, M. J., Shields, S. A., Danube, C. L., & Swim, J. K. (2014). Reducing the endorsement of sexism using experiential learning: The Workshop Activity for Gender Equity Simulation (WAGES). *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 38*, 75–92. doi:10.1177/0361684313498573