According to Brenda Allen (2011) research has shown that 'tea chers favor males over females by calling on them more in class and engaging with malesmore often than females" (Allen, 2011, p. 50). This a ct contributes to the stereotype and belief that males are superior to women in school and in the workplace. The act of calling on males more than females tends to be done subconsciously, but might have a subconscious influence on the students themselves, causing the students to engage and believe in genderseparation, gender privileges, gender discrimination, and gender power.

Dietert and Dentice found that coworkers a swell as upper management do not address transgender people in conversation and use the wrong pronouns (2009). This article shows that gender stereotyping and gender discrimination does happen in the real world, causing a nxiety and stress. Teachers also have a tendency to victimize gender-nonconforming students as gender stereotypes play a big role in the classroom. "Youths who are victimized for cross-gender behavior are at heightened risk for additional negative outcomes, including depression, substance abuse, truancy, social isolation, hopelessness, and violence" (Pauletti et al, 2014, p. 843).

Consequently, we wanted to explore unconscious gender bias in the classroom. We noted how many times our professor called on males and females and also if the comments are voluntary (students raised their hands) or involuntary (professor called on them).
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Table 1 included the number of males and females present in the class, then the number of times the teacher called on a student who volunteered information (by raising their hand), a nd the number of times the professor called on a student who was not volunteering information. A student could be called on/ volunteered more than once.

Our results have been calculated in the form of ratios. The total of number of males to females is $2 / 3$, the number of male voluntary to female voluntary is $4 / 5$, and the number of male non-voluntary to female non-voluntary is $5 / 6$.

| Table 1 | Males | Females |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total present in class | 8 | 12 |
| Voluntary Responses | 12 | 15 |
| Non-Voluntary | 5 | 6 |
| Responses |  |  |

## METHODS

We used partic ipant observation to help detect gender bias, because this method highlights "rules and noms that are taken forgranted by experienced participants or cultural insiders" (Guest et al, 2013, p. 77).

We totaled the number of men and women present in the class, in order to note if the class is mostly one gender. This could affect the results by showing gender bias when there is just a stronger presence of that gender in the class.

We looked for: how many times men and women volunteered and raised their hands and how many times men and women were called on when they were not volunteering. We used tally marks to track our observations. While tallying voluntary responses we noted how many of each gender raised their hand. When tallying non-voluntary we documented which male orfemale wascalled when their handsare not up.

If we find gender bias in the results, such as if one gender volunteered more than the other, we will avoid overgeneralizing by not assuming "that (our) find ings a re necessa rily true for every person within the group or every person in a society" (Purdue OWL, 2014). We recognize that our findings may not be true of every class at Manchester University, especially because we are not using tria ngulation in our research.

## DISCUSSION

While Allen (2011) states that tea chers call on males more than females in the classroom and offers "them more critic ism, praise, help, a nd correction" (Allen, 2011, p. 50), we did not find this to be true. During our observation, we found that females volunteered answers to contribute to class disc ussion 15 times compared to males volunteering 12 times. For involuntary answers (meaning the professor called on specific students), females were called on 6 times and males 5 times. According to this data, females offered their answers and were called on more than males.

We are aware that we may not find these results in other classes, because the ratio of malesto femalesthe Interc ultural class was 8:12. This means that there were fewer males for the teacher to call on, which played a part in the female data being higherthan the males. The data encouraged us to explore genderbias in other classes and the workplace. We want to encourage people to stop "thinking under the influence of the domina nt beliefs or stereotypes" (Allen, 2011, p. 9) a nd engage in conversation equally.

