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ABSTRACT
Research shows that despite well-deserved advances and achievements to diversifying and gaining access to higher education institutions in the United States (U.S.), such progress has failed to reduce student perceptions of inferiority and mediocrity towards female teachers and teachers of colour. Most higher education research in the U.S., focusing on teacher race-ethnicity and gender, occurs at the four-year university level. Less research examines the relationship between a teacher’s race-ethnicity, gender, and student teaching expectations at the two-year community college level. This study explores student teaching expectations using original survey data collected from a convenience sample of students enrolled in a large, predominately white two-year higher education institution in the U.S. referred to as community colleges. Overall, results show statistically significant positive relationships between a teacher’s race-ethnicity and students’ teaching expectations. Teacher gender is significantly associated with student teaching expectations, but only as it is intersectionally examined in association with the teacher’s race-ethnicity. More research focused on teaching expectations, the intersectionality of race-ethnicity and gender, course evaluations, and classroom climate is needed at the two-year community college level to understand how students frame their teaching expectations and the impact on women and women of colour faculty.
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Introduction
Improving the quality of teaching and increasing student academic performance are shared goals among higher education educators. Teachers are the designated authority figure in the classroom; however, female teachers and teachers of colour often feel their subject matter expertise is frequently undermined and devalued, particularly compared to their white, male counterparts (Edghill, 2007; Pittman, 2010). It is well documented within U.S. higher education literature that effective classroom instruction is positively connected to higher academic performance (Booker, 2007; Nelson Laird, Chen, & Kuh, 2008; Pianta & Hamre, 2009). Many female teachers and teachers of colour find the goal of furthering individuals’ academic pursuits difficult, given particular race-ethnicity and gender-based attitudes students display within the classroom environment (Dion, 2008). Educators understand that students do not enter higher education classrooms...
as “blank slates,” but with a variety of race-ethnic and gender-based experiences, many of which reflect societal attitudes, that cannot be overcome simply by utilising well-prepared lecture materials and innovative teaching techniques (Croteau & Hoynes, 2002; Schonwetter, Clifton, & Perry, 2002). W.E.B. DuBois stated that “the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color-line,” and many scholars argue that this is not just a problem of the twentieth century, but also the twenty-first century (Holt, 2002; White, 2020). With this “problem of the color-line” being witnessed in recent events of racial injustice across the U.S., this study speaks to the relevance of understanding how societal attitudes show up in the classroom environment and reflect in students teaching expectations. In this study, the author sets out to examine how particular social identities of the classroom instructor and student influence student’s teaching expectations. In particular, the following research questions help to frame this research: (a) How are students’ teaching expectations associated with the teacher’s race-ethnicity and/or gender? (b) How are students’ teaching expectations associated with a student’s race-ethnicity and/or gender? (c) How are students’ teaching expectations associated with intersecting social identities of race-ethnicity and gender for both the teacher and student?

Race-ethnicity and gender and the role of community colleges

Community colleges in the U.S. play a vital role in higher education. In the U.S., community colleges are primarily two-year higher education institutions with a strong commitment to teaching and learning and workforce preparation. Community colleges are open-access institutions that provide economically affordable entry into higher education. About half of first-time college students enrolled in higher education institutions are enrolled in community colleges, and community colleges serve as transfer pathways to four-year colleges and universities (Beach, 2011). However, despite the important role and primary focus of community colleges, students may perceive community college teaching as inferior and less desirable than four-year institutions (Dougherty, Lahr, & Morest, 2017; Twombly, 2001; Twombly & Townsend, 2008). This general discontented view of community college teaching has a lot to do with the historical legacy of community colleges, with most two-year schools formally named or referred to as “junior colleges.” Community colleges do have one reason to boast of progress: they tend to employ higher percentages of female and minority teachers compared to traditional four-year institutions (Antonio, 2002; Marcotte, Bailey, Borkosi, & Kienzl, 2005; Turner, 2001). While employing higher percentages of female and minority teachers is commendable, most higher education institutions continue to be predominately white and male-dominated (with the notable exception of minority-serving institutions). Overall, despite higher percentages of women and minority teachers, empirical research reveals such teachers experience high levels of stress and discontent in terms of how students treat them in the classroom (Allen et al., 2002; Pittman, 2010).

For many female teachers and teachers of colour, the classroom environment serves as a reminder of the unfortunate social ills plaguing our society (Harlow, 2003; Seo & Hinton, 2009). Women and people of colour are often described as being both powerful and powerless within the classroom. The academic position of women and people of
colour make them both subject matter experts and classroom leaders; however, these same teachers may be perceived by students as intellectually inferior and weak simply because of their race-ethnicity and/or gender (Pittman, 2010; Walkington, 2017). Racial minorities and female teachers often receive less-than-favourable classroom evaluations, and several studies report female and minority teachers’ intellect is severely undermined and often challenged in the classroom (Dagaz & Harger, 2011; Harlow, 2003; Huston, 2006). Female teachers and teachers of colour describe classrooms as “chilly climates” in terms of their personal experiences (Morris & Daniel, 2008), thus, making it a difficult workplace environment coupled with an increase in emotional stressors (Henderson, Hunter, & Hildreth, 2010). All these events describe a potentially difficult classroom environment for female teachers and teachers of colour to effectively teach, be respected and have positive interactions with students.

**Race-ethnicity and the classroom environment**

For decades, racialised conflicts have taken place across college campuses. Such racialised conflicts may be perceived as an indicator of more significant unresolved racial problems (Sommersell, 2003). Given the overall low percentage of minority teachers in predominately white institutions, limited meaningful racialised interaction happens; therefore, constrained race relations continue to occur within American institutions of higher learning. Female and minority teachers often feel tension and anxiety in the classroom and find the classroom environment difficult and hostile. Yet empirical research consistently shows students receive positive educational benefits when taught in a racially diverse educational environment (Castañeda, 2004; Terenzini, Cabrera, Colbeck, Bjorklund, & Parente, 2001). For example, Terenzini et al. (2001) find a direct positive link between classroom diversity and student learning. This is because a diverse classroom contributes to new perspectives of thinking and learning, as well as an expanded vision for research at the institutional level.

Teachers know that conflicts, disruptions, and resistance are inevitable aspects of their chosen profession. Traditionally, teachers have been highly respected by students for their work within the classroom. However, today’s student–teacher relationship and authority acceptance require continuous negotiation (Chesler & Young, 2007). Pace and Hemmings (2007) note that when a teacher’s classroom authority is not accepted or viewed as illegitimate, the student–teacher relationship is weakened or nonexistent. Understanding authority is essential, for it is considered “a social relationship in which some people are granted the legitimacy to lead and others agree to follow” (Pace & Hemmings, 2007, p. 6). Thereby, when female and minority teachers’ authority is not accepted or valued within the classroom environment, quality teaching and learning suffer (Chesler & Young, 2007; Pace & Hemmings, 2007).

**Gender and the classroom environment**

Community colleges and universities continue to be male-dominated workplaces, and in accordance with gendered roles, students expect female teachers to show more compassion, concern, and leniency towards their issues or situations (Sampaio, 2006). Baker and Copp (1997) conducted a study analysing students’ gender-based
expectations and their impact on teaching evaluations. The researchers found that once students perceive the teacher has met their gendered expectations, teaching evaluations soared. When teachers fail to meet all of the students’ gendered expectations, evaluations suffer greatly. Baker and Copp (1997) write that “[s]tudents’ expectations of female professors are contradictory because the low status of women clashes with the high status of professors” (p. 9). Additional studies reveal how teaching evaluations are highest when instructors are perceived to conform to their stereotypical, gendered-appropriate roles and positions. Straying from such roles could indicate lower teaching evaluations (Dion, 2008; Harlow, 2003). Studies show that students apply different evaluative methods for male and female instructors, which he argues, has more to do with gender than teaching effectiveness. These teachers received lower evaluations for students who believed they did not receive the friendliness and support expected from their female teachers. Those female teachers who do perform well in the classroom as measured by student evaluations do so, arguably, by a series of negotiations and by conforming to or reducing contradictions with student expectations (Centra & Gaubatz, 2000; Dion, 2008; Harlow, 2003; Lord, 2017).

**Theoretical framework**

Much of the research surrounding classroom bias, prejudice, and stereotypes show teacher denigration occurs in higher education classrooms all across America (Boysen, 2012; Boysen & Vogel, 2009; Boysen, Vogel, Cope, & Hubbard, 2009; Ghoshal, Lippard, Ribas, & Muir, 2013). Student bias in college classrooms is commonplace with stereotypes and prejudice among the most reported (Boysen & Vogel, 2009). Fiske (2010) defines stereotypes as individual beliefs, thoughts, and expectations about categories that are applied to all members believed associated with that group. Prejudice acts similar to stereotypes in that prejudice deals with one’s judgement towards an individual because he or she belongs to a particular group (Ferrante, 2013). Political commentator, Walter Lippmann (1922), classically describes stereotypes as mental projections or pictures that begin to develop when we think about a group of people. Such mental projections serve as a shortcut to one’s thinking about individuals belonging to a particular group. Arguably, it’s the pictures that students develop regarding their teachers, whether conscious or unconscious, that determine whether students will positively or negatively evaluate teaching expectations. Together, prejudice and stereotypes may work in such a way that female teachers and teachers of colour believe they must overcome an inconceivable amount of preconceived judgements for student teaching evaluations to reflect positively on their teaching.

Another theory of particular importance for this study is intersectionality. Intersectionality theory extends the examination of race-ethnicity and gender by allowing for an exploration of intersecting identities. Traditionally, social theorists examine race-ethnicity and gender as single identities; however, intersectional scholars argue for a multidimensional examination of race-ethnicity and gender interacting together to gain a better understanding of the phenomenon (Collins, 2015; Hancock, 2013; Nash, 2008). Nash (2008) states that “… intersectionality seeks to demonstrate the racial variations within gender and the gendered variations within race through its attention to subjects whose identities contest race-or-gender categories” (p. 2–3). Intersectionality
opens up the possibility of seeing and understanding much more regarding the interplay between a teacher’s race-ethnicity and gender and student teaching expectations (Collins, 2015; Crenshaw, 1991). All of the aforementioned theories explore relationships between a teacher’s race-ethnicity and gender and teaching expectations for community college students as single identities and intersecting identities.

Using descriptive analysis, this study explores relationships between a teacher’s race-ethnicity, gender, and teaching expectations for community college students. The survey instrument used in this study allows for descriptive analysis of associations between student teaching expectations and teacher race-ethnicity and gender as well as the student’s race-ethnicity and gender. Using the chi-squared statistic, this study finds significant, positive relationships between a teacher’s race-ethnicity, gender, and student teaching expectations.

Methodology

Participants

The sample consists of students (N = 1,621) from a large, predominately white community college in North Texas. Students were sampled from 28 classrooms across various disciplines during one academic school year.\(^2\) Table 1 lists percentages and frequencies of students sampled in the study according to their race-ethnicity and gender. Students’ racial-ethnic makeup is as follows: white students make up 54% of the sample, while black and Hispanic students represent 10% and 14%, respectively. All other races make up approximately 21% of students sampled. The “other” race-ethnic group includes students classified as Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander/Hawaiian, and multiple-raced. The respondents’ overall gender makeup is as follows: 57% of sampled students are female and 43% of sampled students are male. The sample of students in this study volunteered to take part in the research project, thus a convenience sample; results cannot be generalised beyond the sample.

Because students were asked to disclose their expectations for receiving quality teaching from their course instructor, it is important to discuss the percentage of responses according to their teacher’s race-ethnicity and gender. As illustrated in Table 2, the majority of student responses are for white teachers (80%). Black teachers make up 9% of student responses, Hispanic teachers make up 4% of responses, and 7% of responses were for teachers classified here as “other” races. The “other” race-ethnic

| Student race-ethnicity | Male | Female | Row Total |
|------------------------|------|--------|-----------|
| White                  | .56  | .53    | .54       |
|                        | (388)| (486)  | (874)     |
| Black                  | .10  | .11    | .10       |
|                        | (66) | (102)  | (168)     |
| Hispanic               | .14  | .14    | .14       |
|                        | (99) | (133)  | (232)     |
| Other                  | .20  | .22    | .21       |
|                        | (143)| (204)  | (347)     |
| Column Totals          | 100% | 100%   | 100%      |
|                        | (696)| (925)  | (1,621)   |

Number of responses appears in parentheses. Percentages reflect rounding. A total of 3 non-responses. Non-responses are excluded from data results.
groups include teachers classified as Asian, American Indian, Pacific Islander/Hawaiian, and multiple-raced. Additionally, 71% of responses were for female teachers, and 29% of responses were for male teachers.  

**Procedure**

During the 2012–2013 academic year, 28 full-time teachers volunteered their classes to take part in this study. A colleague and I visited these 28 classrooms before any substantive lecture took place to invite students to participate in the research project. Collecting data early in the course was particularly useful because students have no confirmed basis for judging teaching expectations (Gillespie, 2003). The survey consisted of questions regarding student demographics, race-ethnicity, and gender of the course instructor, discipline information, and teaching expectations. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved all procedures involving human subject research. Teachers were sent an email inviting them to volunteer their classes to take part in this research. Only full-time teachers were invited to take part in this study. The inclusion of only full-time faculty was done for two reasons. The first reason is to reduce the potential pitfalls associated with comparing results. This concern is primarily due to the stigma of inferiority that is often associated with faculty employed part-time at community colleges. The second reason for only using faculty employed full-time is that part-time faculty are not tenured but teach on an as-needed basis and concerns regarding reprisal, particularly if the survey results reflect negatively on them as instructors.

**Measures and analysis**

In order to examine the relationship between a teacher’s race-ethnicity and gender and student teaching expectations, participants were asked to respond to the following question: “Do you expect to receive quality teaching from the instructor teaching this course?” Students were asked to choose between three responses: “yes, no, or not sure.” This study uses the chi-squared statistic to determine if the dependent variable (i.e.
student expectations for receiving quality teaching) is contingent or associated with the teacher and/or student’s race-ethnicity and gender.

The chi-squared is a measurement of statistical significance for group association and provides an appropriate measurement for examining the relationship between dependent and independent variables. A significant probability associated with the chi-squared statistic \( p < .05 \) represents the presence of a relationship between student teaching expectations and the teacher’s race-ethnicity and/or gender. If the chi-squared probability fails to reach significance, the dependent and independent variables are independent of each other, and therefore no relationship exists. The conventional rule for applying the chi-squared statistic is the “Rule of Five,” which assumes all expected values are greater than 5. This standard rule does not apply to observed values, which are listed in the contingency tables, but applies to expected values (Greenwood & Nikulin, 1996).

While the chi-squared statistic examines group associations, the chi-squared does not confirm a measure of strength. In order to measure the strength of the relationship between the dependent and independent variables, the Cramér’s V is applied and interpreted within the study (Rea & Parker, 1992). Although, generally speaking, the higher the chi-squared statistics, the stronger the relationship, for the purpose of this study, the researcher argues that the Cramér’s V is a better, quantitative measurement for the strength of association between dependent and independent variables (see Table 3). Contingency tables are used to present results of variable associations; measures used for determining the strength of association are as follows:

### Table 3. Cramér’s V index for relationship/association strength.

| Cramér’s V   | Relationship/Association description       |
|--------------|-------------------------------------------|
| .00 and under.10 | Negligible Association                   |
| .10 and under.20 | Weak Association                         |
| .20 and under.40 | Moderate Association                     |
| .40 and under.60 | Relatively Strong Association            |
| .60 and under.80 | Strong Association                       |
| .80 to 1.00    | Very Strong Association                  |

Adapted from Rea and Parker (1992) p. 203

Results

The results presented in Table 4 show that a statistically significant relationship exists between students’ teaching expectations and teachers’ race-ethnicity. For students who responded affirmatively (i.e. “yes”) to the survey question regarding expectations for receiving quality teaching from their course instructor, the results are interpreted as positive teaching expectations. For students who responded “no” to the same question, the results are interpreted as negative teaching expectations. Lastly, for students who responded, “not sure,” the results are interpreted as students are uncertain about their expectations regarding quality teaching. By interpreting these data in this manner, this study overcomes one of the potential limitations of analysing data using the chi-squared statistic: the chi-squared statistic failure to determine the direction of results.
Table 4. Students teaching expectations by teacher race-ethnicity.

| Student teaching expectations | White | Black | Hispanic | All other races | Row Totals |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|----------|----------------|------------|
| Positive expectations         | .91   | .93   | .93      | .93            | .91        |
| (1,169)                       | (138) | (56)  | (113)    | (1,476)        |            |
| Negative expectations         | .01   | 0     | .02      | .01            | .01        |
| (13)                          | (0)   | (1)   | (1)      | (15)           |            |
| Not sure what to expect       | .07   | .07   | .05      | .06            | .07        |
| (93)                          | (10)  | (3)   | (7)      | (113)          |            |
| Column Totals                 | 99%   | 100%  | 100%     | 100%           | 99%        |
| (1,275)                       | (148) | (60)  | (121)    | (1,604)        |            |

Chi-squared = 60.70 Degrees of freedom = 24 Cramér’s V = .11 Prob. = < .01

Number of responses appears in parentheses. Percentages reflect rounding. A total of 6 non-responses. Non-responses are excluded from data results.

The results presented in Table 4 show overwhelmingly positive for quality teaching for all course instructors independent of the teacher’s race-ethnicity (91%). A very small percentage of students responded with uncertainty regarding teaching expectations (7%), and an even lower percentage of students responded with negative teaching expectations (1%). However, despite the statistically significant relationship between student teaching expectation and the teacher’s race-ethnicity, the association between the variables is relatively weak when the Cramér’s V is examined (i.e. Cramér’s V = 11).

Because this study has determined a statistically significant, albeit weak, relationship between student teaching expectations and the teacher’s race-ethnicity, the researcher must determine for which students in terms of their race-ethnicity this significant relationship exists. By applying the chi-squared statistic to multiple iterations of teaching expectations using the student’s race-ethnicity and teacher’s race-ethnicity, results show a statistically significant association for white and Hispanic students. Table 5 presents the results between white students’ teaching expectations and the teacher’s race-ethnicity. Results reveal, similar to that of Table 4, an overwhelmingly positive teaching expectation by white students for teachers of all racial backgrounds. The strength of the association is relatively weak for white students (Cramér’s V = .15), yet higher than the initial strength reported in Table 4 for a general relationship for students teaching expectations and teachers’ race-ethnicity (Cramér’s V = .11).

Table 6 reveals that the vast majority of Hispanic students report positive teaching expectations for teachers of all reported racial backgrounds (91%). The results from
Table 6. Hispanic students teaching expectations by teacher race-ethnicity.

| Hispanic students teaching expectations | White | Black | Hispanic | All other races | Total |
|----------------------------------------|-------|-------|----------|----------------|-------|
| Positive expectations                  | .90   | .96   | .875     | .93            | .91   |
| (166)                                  | (22)  | (7)   | (13)     | (208)          |       |
| Negative expectations                  | .02   | 0     | 0        | .07            | .02   |
| (3)                                    | (0)   | (0)   | (1)      | (4)            |       |
| Not sure what to expect                | .08   | .04   | .125     | 0              | .07   |
| (15)                                   | (1)   | (1)   | (0)      | (17)           |       |
| Total                                  | 100%  | 100%  | 100%     | 100%           | 100%  |
| (184)                                  | (23)  | (8)   | (14)     | (229)          |       |

Chi-squared = 60.40 Degrees of freedom = 18 Cramér’s V = .30 Prob. = <.01

Number of responses appears in parentheses. Percentages reflect rounding. A total of 3 non-responses. Non-responses are excluded from data results.

Hispanic students are similar to that of white students, with 93% of white students reporting positive teaching expectations for teachers of all reported races. Although white and Hispanic students report similar teaching expectations, the strength of association for these two groups is not at all similar. The strength of association between Hispanic students and their reported teaching expectation is double that of white students’ reported teaching expectation (Cramér’s V = .30 & .15, respectively). The higher Cramér’s V value for Hispanic students indicates a much stronger association between Hispanic students’ reported teaching expectations for all reported racial-ethnic backgrounds than white students’ reported teaching expectations.

While statistically significant associations were found for student teaching expectations when analysing teacher and student race-ethnicity, insignificant results were found when analysing whether student teaching expectations were associated with the teacher’s gender. Insignificant results for association were also found when examining student teaching expectations based on the student’s gender.4

Based on the aforementioned results, it appears that race-ethnicity may be the only salient variable influencing student teaching expectations; however, this is not the case. This study continued to examine multiple iterations of student teaching expectations based on student race-ethnicity and gender and found additional significant relationships, particularly for two groups of students: white, female students, and Hispanic, male students. Tables 7 and 8 present results for these two significant intersectional

Table 7. White, female students teaching expectations by teacher race-ethnicity.

| White, female students teaching expectations | White | Black | Hispanic | All other races | Total |
|--------------------------------------------|-------|-------|----------|----------------|-------|
| Positive expectations                      | .94   | .96   | 1.00     | .90            | .94   |
| (357)                                      | (48)  | (20)  | (28)     | (453)          |       |
| Negative expectations                      | .01   | 0     | 0        | .01            | .01   |
| (3)                                        | (0)   | (0)   | (0)      | (3)            |       |
| Not sure what to expect                    | .06   | .04   | 0        | .1             | .05   |
| (21)                                       | (2)   | (0)   | (3)      | (26)           |       |
| Total                                      | 100%  | 100%  | 100%     | 100%           | 100%  |
| (381)                                      | (50)  | (20)  | (31)     | (484)          |       |

Chi-squared = 87.79 Degrees of freedom = 21 Cramér’s V = .25 Prob. = <.01

Number of responses appears in parentheses. Percentages reflect rounding. A total of 3 non-responses. Non-responses are excluded from data results.
Table 8. Hispanic, male students teaching expectations by teacher race-ethnicity.

| Hispanic, male students teaching expectations | Teacher race-ethnicity | White | Black | Hispanic | All other races | Total |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------|-------|----------|----------------|-------|
| Positive expectations                        |                        | .94   | 1.00  | 1.00     | .875           | .94   |
|                                              |                        | (73)  | (11)  | (1)      | (7)            | (92)  |
| Negative expectations                        |                        | 0     | 0     | 0        | .125           | .01   |
|                                              |                        | (0)   | (0)   | (0)      | (1)            | (1)   |
| Not sure what to expect                      |                        | .06   | 0     | 0        | .05            | .05   |
|                                              |                        | (5)   | (0)   | (0)      | (0)            | (5)   |
| Total                                        |                        | 100%  | 100%  | 100%     | 100%           | 100%  |

Chi-squared = 100.55 Degrees of freedom = 18 Cramér’s V = .58 Prob. = <.01

Number of responses appears in parentheses. Percentages reflect rounding. A total of 1 non-response. The non-response is excluded from data results.

relationships. White, female students, and Hispanic, male students have the same percentages (94%) regarding positive teaching expectations for teachers across all reported racial backgrounds. Only a small percentage (6%) of white, female, and Hispanic, male students respond with uncertainty and/or negativity regarding their teaching expectations. The most significant difference between white, female, and Hispanic, male students teaching expectations is the strength of the relationship. The strength of association for Hispanic, male students teaching expectation is more than double that of white, female students; thus, indicating a much stronger association for Hispanic, male students’ and their teaching expectations (Cramér’s V = .58 & .25, respectively).

This study further examined intersecting associations for race-ethnicity and gender, which included not only the student’s race-ethnicity and gender but also the teacher’s race-ethnicity and gender. Table 9 presents statistically significant results found for two groups: (1) black, male students teaching expectations for their white, male teachers, and (2) white, male students teaching expectations for their Hispanic, female teachers. Eighty-five percent of black male students report positive teaching expectations for their white, male teachers. Similarly, 86% of white, male students report positive teaching expectations for their Hispanic, female teachers. These percentages are quite large, given that only four participants did not affirm positive teaching expectations.

Table 9. Intersectional characteristics: student teaching expectations by student and teacher race-ethnicity and gender.

| Black, male students teaching expectations | Teacher race-ethnicity and gender | White male teachers | White, male students teaching expectations | Hispanic female teachers |
|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Positive expectations                      |                                  | .85                | Positive expectations                      | .86                     |
|                                           |                                  | (11)               |                                          | (12)                    |
| Negative expectations                      |                                  | 0                  | Negative expectations                      | .07                     |
|                                           |                                  | (0)                |                                          | (1)                     |
| Not sure what to expect                    |                                  | .15                | Not sure what to expect                   | .07                     |
|                                           |                                  | (2)                |                                          | (1)                     |
| Total                                     |                                  | 100%               | Total                                     | 100%                    |

Chi-squared = 6.07 Degrees of freedom = 2 Cramér’s V = .30 Prob. = <.05

Chi-squared = 7.79 Degrees of freedom = 3 Cramér’s V = .14 Prob. = <.05

Number of responses appears in parentheses. Percentages reflect rounding. A total of 1 non-response for black, male students. The non-response is excluded from data results.
The strongest relationship between both groups is for black, male students and their white, male teachers. The strength of the relationship between black, male students and their white, male teachers is more than twice that compared to the relationship between white, male students and their Hispanic, female teachers (Cramér’s V = .30 & .14, respectively) indicating a much stronger association for positive teaching expectations among black, male students and their white, male teachers. The significant associations for intersecting relationships add credibility to arguments put forth by many intersectional scholars in favour of increasing the focus on intersectional identities as opposed to examining race-ethnicity and gender identities separately (Crenshaw, 1991).

**Limitations**

Given the interests of this study to provide a descriptive way of exploring relationships between student teaching expectations and teacher’s race-ethnicity and gender, this study has several limitations that pose some concern regarding generalisability. The first is that the sample was collected from one community college, and although no discipline or course was rejected, the sample only included students taught by full-time faculty. Therefore, the results cannot be generalised beyond the data. Another limitation has to do with the small number of minority teachers. Because this study includes only a small number of minority faculty, the results lack the variation required to examine the difference between particular groups.

Additionally, results regarding teaching expectations may not reflect students’ “true” feelings. Students may be reporting what they think they “should” say instead of their “true” feelings. It is possible that students are self-reporting positive teaching expectations while unconsciously holding negative thoughts and opinions for the instructor (Banaji & Greenwald, 2013). This possibility may have some merit, given that each student who agreed to participate in this study was given a description of the project in the consent form as stipulated by the institutional review board. More open-ended questions could have been added to the survey instrument to uncover some of these thoughts by students that could not be captured using the survey instrument. By using a qualitative research approach, gaining more in-depth insight into how students determined their evaluations of teaching excellence of faculty could have been achieved. By employing a qualitative approach, we can expand our contextual understanding of how students arrive at their assessment of teaching effectiveness and how women faculty and faculty of colour perceive their experiences within the classroom.

**Conclusions**

This study’s results indicate a statistical relationship between a student’s teaching expectations and the race-ethnicity and gender of the instructor. These associations reveal a more complicated relationship when examining the intersectionality of an instructor’s race-ethnicity, gender, and students’ teaching expectations. Student teaching evaluations can provide valuable feedback to the instructor; however, not every faculty member is similarly situated in student evaluations (Dion, 2008; Huston, 2006). Understanding the threat that racialised and gender bias have in student evaluations is
significant and should be a continued focus as higher education institutions continue to seek ways to promote a more equitable system for utilising and analysing student teaching evaluations.

Several conclusions can be drawn from this research regarding student teaching expectations and the relationship with the race-ethnicity and gender of faculty. First, the results of this study illuminate the relationship between the intersectionality of race-ethnicity, gender, and student teaching expectations. Kimberlé Crenshaw (2016) explains through the lens of intersectionality how an individual’s stereotypical perception of ability and credibility creates obstacles and burdens for individuals with overlapping social identities. Understanding student teaching expectations for women faculty of colour in the classroom helps us to understand problems associated with race-ethnicity and gender stereotypes that may show up in student teaching evaluations. We cannot begin to know how to address and/or remove obstacles related to biased student teaching evaluations if we do not first understand how these stereotypes come about and show up in the classroom.

Second, student teaching evaluations are often the only metric used to determine teaching effectiveness. Because of this, colleagues, administrators, and institutional committees involved in the promotion and merit increase process must be clear in concrete terms of structural ways students evaluate teaching. Patricia Hill Collins (2000) explains through the lens of Feminist Thought how negative stereotypes or “controlling images” are constructed and normalised. These racialised, gendered images permit students to evaluate teaching effectiveness using variables unrelated to pedagogy. Therefore, everyone involved in the promotion and merit process must have an enhanced awareness of how students’ preconceived images of faculty inform student teaching evaluations, and the failure of institutions to understand how bias and stereotypes influence course evaluations will result in an unfair and inequitable assessment of merit increases and promotions.

Many women faculty and faculty of colour are often left to manage racialised, gendered teaching expectations, and classroom concerns on their own. Professors with different social group identities have different experiences within the classroom, and it is critical to develop a more texture and inclusive approach to studying these classroom experiences (Chesler & Young, 2007; Collins, 2015). Further research is needed to examine how students’ teaching expectations and course evaluations are related to racialised, gender-roles. Research investigating these areas will help inform faculty, students, and administrators about ways to improve the administering of course evaluations, and how to appropriately analyse results as not to penalise the most vulnerable of faculty. There is no universal teaching experience that blankets all faculty teaching in higher education classrooms. Moreover, it is vital to accurately capture and appropriately contextualise student evaluations to promote fairness and inclusiveness and exclude variables unrelated to effective teaching.

Notes

1. Terms such as teacher, instructor, and faculty are used interchangeably to describe academic personnel employed by an institution of higher education in the U.S. such as a college,
university, or community college whose primary responsibilities are teaching and/or research.

2. Community college students were surveyed during the 2012–2013 academic school year.

3. A total of 28 teachers volunteered their classes to participate in the research project. Of the 28 teachers, 22 teachers were female, and 6 were male. Students classified 22 teachers as White, and 6 teachers as Non-White.

4. This study does not include insignificant results found when analysing student teaching expectations and teacher gender.
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