**Notes on data:**

Group numbers*:*

Group 3- Man Identity, Woman TA

Group 4- Man Identity, Man TA

Group 5- Woman Identity, Woman TA

Group 6- Woman Identity, Man TA

tagender- 1 for male, 0 for female

taidgender- 1 for male, 0 for female

“gender” = student’s gender - 1 = male, 2 = female

*student ratings index* = factor score (pcf) for 12 variables (excluding communication, clear, and overall)

Notes from email correspondence with Lilly (6/12/2015):

Part of our IRB agreement was not to link the grades to any specific evaluation, so we have them for each group, but not each individual. I don't think this should matter too much for what you want to do--the only potential hiccup is that we have grades for 47 people, but evaluations from only 43 (because not everyone responded to the evaluation). There's no way for us to know which grades are from people who did not respond, so we cannot remove the 5 non-responders from the grade dataset.

Also, Adam sent me the following information about the student gender tests, in case it is at all helpful to you:

"We did t-tests to explore whether or not there were any differences in how male and females students were rating the actual male and female TAs, or the male and female TA identities. What we found were that there were no significant differences in how the female students rated the actual TAs (3.93 to 4.25, p = 0.513), how male students rated the actual TAs (3.91 to 3.93, p = 0.941), and how male students rated the TA identities (3.71 to 4.06, p = 0.482). The only significant difference we found was between how females students rated the female ID (3.70) and the male ID (4.44) (p = 0.05). That being said, there are better ways of running these analyses and I believe there's a better way of asking this question than just splitting up the groups"