

Fair division of labor? Examining access to prestigious teaching – formulating equitable and transparent policies¹

Dnr: STATSVET 2025/7

Luise Bendfeldt^a & Johanna Söderström^b
Department of Government, Uppsala University

^a PhD, researcher, luise.bendfeldt@statsvet.uu.se

^b PhD, docent, senior lecturer, johanna.soderstrom@statsvet.uu.se

Uppsala, 2025-04-10

¹ This project was funded by Uppsala University's funds for gender mainstreaming (jämställdhetsintegrering 2024), (JiUU), UFV 2022/564.

Table of content

Introduction	2
Data collection.....	3
Overview of the make-up of the department.....	3
Survey results: insights to preferences.....	4
Actual teaching patterns.....	8
Reasonings around staffing decisions and processes – interview data	23
Conclusion.....	25
References	29
Appendix	30
Teaching portfolios.....	30
Variable list	31
Descriptive statistics	33
Survey questions.....	34
Example of time sheet report.....	35

Introduction

Who teaches what matters. Not only is gender equality in teaching important for matters of representation (to both students and colleagues), but teaching experience has become increasingly important in questions of career progression and promotion. This report seeks to investigate who teaches what and the processes of becoming involved in or being selected for teaching. It does so by focusing on the data surrounding the division of teaching (by gender, level of seniority, type and level of teaching) and processes at the Department of Government.

Teaching makes up a large part of our work at the university, and many of our colleagues are involved in one form or another in it. However, it has repeatedly been made clear that the process of becoming involved in, or being selected for, teaching is relatively unclear. As such, getting to teach still seems to depend on informal networks. Women within the humanities and social sciences are known to do more of the teaching (Vetenskapsrådet 2021, p. 22), yet, is it a fair division of labor, where women do an equal amount of prestigious versus more menial forms of teaching?²

Research shows that these informal networks are particularly difficult to access for minorities and underrepresented people within academia while being essential to career success (see e.g. Espino and Zambrana 2019; Macoun and Miller 2014; Howe-Walsh and Turnbull 2016; Berger et al. 2015), as such getting involved in teaching may not be as equally accessible as it should be. Moreover, having teaching experience is increasingly important for future career prospects through hiring and promotions (as seen in Levander 2017), reflecting trends relating to holding service roles (Jernberg 2020), as seen through for example Uppsala University's increasing teaching requirements in order to become eligible for promotion to docent. While teaching at several levels is usually appreciated in job applications, teaching at higher levels (masters and PhD courses) is generally considered more prestigious as it allows the course to connect more with research, be more advanced and potentially lead to supervision possibilities. There is also a clear division in terms of what kind of teaching is more prestigious, as the role of course convener or providing lectures on a course allows the teacher to shape the course content more, as well as be the one seen as responsible. However, seminars or grading exams are usually areas of teaching where new teachers start out, often seen as more simple and less prestigious tasks.³ Grading theses on the other hand, we would argue is considered more prestigious, as is supervision. In this project, we investigated if there was consensus around these issues among our colleagues. Overall, we

² We recognize that staffing depends on many different things, and sometimes difficult and quick decisions need to be made, hence people might rely on the people they know and the networks they have, and other times, staffing may just continue in the same way it has been done in the past, without much reflection. We are not suggesting that uneven division of labor is the result of intent.

³ Note, we do not claim that such teaching tasks are easy, and indeed, conducting a good seminar and designing appropriate forms of examination are challenging tasks that often require a lot of experience and training. Similarly, teaching at lower levels, like the bachelor level, may perhaps at first seem like less challenging, but often entails guiding new students into the expectations of academia.

contend that both the type and level of teaching shape what is seen as prestigious and valuable. We also know that there are significant gender biases related to teaching in other ways, for instance in student evaluations (MacNell et al. 2015) and in-class participation (Ballen et al. 2018). Being the course convener also gives the teacher more power over the syllabus, ultimately affecting reading and citation patterns (Maliniak et al. 2013). Who gets to teach at what level, and how, matters a great deal.

In line with Uppsala University's *Gender Mainstreaming goal 1* for the period of 2023-2025,⁴ which stresses avoiding biases in recruitment processes among other things, we have collected data pertaining to the division of teaching at our department in order to gain insight into who teaches what at what level. This provides not only an understanding of who gets to teach, which is also relevant to consider from a student perspective in terms of potential role models (see e.g. Bettinger and Long 2005), but it is also an opportunity to give substance to the anecdotal experiences shared within our women faculty group. The latter has repeatedly brought up and discussed issues of informal networks, unfair allocation of teaching (both in terms of who gets to do the prestigious teaching as well as who does the more menial aspects of teaching within a teaching team), and the non-transparent processes surrounding these issues. However, when setting out on this project, how teaching was actually divided at our department was unknown. The overarching research question in this project is thus: *How is teaching divided at the Department of Government (by gender, academic rank, type and level of teaching)?*

Data collection

The main data for this report is based on the compilation and analysis of the teaching hours of the department's employees. This data was collected via the time sheets that the teaching employees use to report their teaching hours and activities of the preceding semester (for an example of what these reports look like, see appendix, Figure 1). The department's course administrator (Markus Gossas) helped us access the appropriate data (and removed any sensitive information before turning over the excel files to us). These time sheets have been in use since the fall semester of 2018, so there are several years of records to draw from, but in this report we only look at one year of teaching (2023/2024). The PhD students submit similar reports, but they are not quite as reliable, as these are the planned teaching reports (whereas the actual teaching is reported in a different manner alongside other prolongation). Based on these time reports, we were able to code the different teaching types (seminar, lecture, supervision, etc.), the level of teaching (undergraduate, master or PhD level), and the corresponding hours spent on it. We also coded some individual variables such as a person's gender, birth year, year of defense, whether they defended their PhD at the department or not. The analysis of these time sheets allows us to establish what the division of labor actually looks like. In addition, we have conducted a few interviews with key individuals involved in staffing courses, to discuss selection procedures and norms. While we had a relatively clear sense of what kind of teaching is more prestigious, part of the project was also dedicated to assessing to what extent these norms are pervasive and shared across the department (with a short survey). Depending on the patterns revealed in terms of the division of labor, we will evaluate what kind of policies around teaching assignments might mitigate such unfair divisions. Such policy recommendations we believe will not only be useful for the Department of Government, but also the university as a whole. Thus, while the exact same data might not be available everywhere, due to reporting of teaching happening in different ways, we hope that this report provides some inspiration and guidance as to how to investigate the division of teaching at other departments.

Overview of the make-up of the department

The specific time period under investigation is the teaching conducted in the fall 2023 and the spring 2024. Looking at the two annual reports from the department, which detail the situation in

⁴ Gender Mainstreaming Plan 2023–2025. UFV 2022/355. Uppsala University. <<https://www.uu.se/en/staff/organisation-and-governance/regulations/gender-mainstreaming-plan-2023-2025>>

December each year, we can note that at the end of HT23, the overall number of potential teachers was 96 (28% were doctoral students), and overall, the gender balance was **54% women and 46% men**. In contrast, at the end of 2024, hence a bit more removed from the time period under investigation, there were 104 potential teachers (27% were doctoral students), and the overall gender balance was 56% women and 44% men. Hence, there is a slight shift in the overall distribution and total amount of staff, but the numbers are relatively stable. Examining the gender distribution among the PhD students specifically, in December 2023 there were 59% women and 41% men, whereas in December 2024 there were 63% women and 37% men, as a smaller group with new cohorts being accepted each year and some graduating, it makes sense that there are larger shifts in the distribution here. See also Table 1 below for a detailed overview of teaching staff available across different positions (this division of type of positions is also what we will compare with when examining the teaching reports). In our comparisons below, we will focus on the numbers from December 2023.⁵

Table 1: Overview of teaching staff, December 2023

Position	Men		Women		Total	Percent of total staff
	#	%	#	%		
<i>PhD students</i>	11	41%	16	59%	27	28%
<i>Researchers*</i>	13	48%	14	52%	27	28%
<i>Associate senior lecturers (BUL)</i>	2	40%	3	60%	5	5%
<i>Senior lecturers (lektor)</i>	7	39%	11	61%	18	19%
<i>Professors**</i>	11	58%	8	42%	19	20%
Total	44	46%	52	54%	96	100%

*Researchers include all teaching staff that are not PhD students, and not employed in any of the other categories, that means we combine post-docs and researchers etc. in this category.

**Includes all types of professors, both promoted and recruited.

Survey results: insights to preferences

To discover whether there were any systematic preferences and experiences related to different types and levels of teaching we conducted a survey among teaching staff to gauge their experiences of teaching. The survey was sent out to staff, and involved a self-administered survey which took less than five minutes to answer. The survey was open for 36 days.⁶ In total 55 respondents answered the survey.⁷ While it is far from all teaching staff at the department, more than half of the teaching staff answered the survey.

⁵ Numbers from ÅRP, Statsvetenskapliga institutionen, Uppsala universitet 2024 and 2025.

⁶ The survey was made up of ten questions which asked the respondents to rank different types and levels of teaching according to prestige, enjoyment, and cost. Additional questions pertained to the respondent's gender identity, time since PhD defense and free-text questions asking respondents about their agency over teaching portfolios and further comments. Initially, the ranking questions were programmed to force respondents to select a rank for each item. However, not everyone had experience with all the items, thus this setting was changed so that respondents could choose not to rank items. We informed potential respondents about the change in the setting, and a further 27 responses were entered after this change.

⁷ In free-text answers and email communications about the survey, we also received some reactions to the survey itself, which ranged from support and encouragement for this project to feedback regarding not everyone having experience of teaching at all levels; several did not understand the question about cost of teaching; suggestions that we should have asked about whether teachers had the possibility to develop their own teaching material; and that the ranking questions forced teachers to rank items. Some respondents were critical of the premise of this project and stated that they had never thought about teaching in terms of whether it was prestigious or not, and do not think that it is particularly productive to do so.

Whether or not the group accurately reflects the makeup of the department is less important, as we are mainly interested in if there are systematic preferences, opinions about levels and forms of teaching. However, that said, the respondents overall reflect the composition of the department if we compare it to the employment numbers from the department's yearly report. Comparing these employment numbers (see Table 1 above) to the respondents of the survey, we have somewhat fewer doctoral students answering (20.0%). As the first-year students have yet to start teaching, they were less able to respond to the survey. However, the gender balance in the survey reflects the composition of our teaching staff quite well, with more women (54.5%) than men (43.6%) responding to the survey. We can also note that the survey respondents reflect various degrees of seniority as well: 16.4% of respondents with less than 5 years since defense; 23.6% of respondents defended between 5 and 10 years ago; 14.5% of respondents defended between 10 and 15 years ago; and 25.5% of respondents defended over 15 years ago.

The purpose of the survey was to discover whether there are systematic patterns in terms of what teaching is preferred, seen as more prestigious or costly in terms of preparation. The results from the survey were then compared with the distribution of actual teaching hours at the department. If these factors are randomly distributed, any potential uneven distribution of actual teaching matters less. But if there are systematic preferences across these factors, then if actual teaching is also systematically uneven in some way, this begs consideration. For this reason, the report below focuses on areas where there were clear systematic preferences and opinions about teaching among the respondents as a whole.

Overall, it is important to note that individual preferences vary, across all these questions, and most items are ranked at a particular level by someone (there are a few rare exceptions where no one has ranked an item in one position). We acknowledge that individuals need diverse teaching portfolios, and what they want more of will vary depending on what they have done. Previous experiences, personality and other traits will also influence what one enjoys the most and what one finds costly. We would also argue that our teaching practices, and how the work is reimbursed can influence how costly one perceives different forms of teaching to be. However, here, we focus on the systematic patterns, to the extent they exist.

What is prestigious?

First, a note on 'prestigious'. This defines something that is admired and respected, of high status. While this is of course subjective, requirements for career progression accord a certain amount of prestige to different types and levels of teaching. Detailed results from the survey can be found in Table 2 and Table 3. The results of the survey confirm the expected pattern at our department, where higher levels of teaching are seen as more prestigious by most (for instance 84.6% ranked PhD level as the most prestigious), whereas bachelor level teaching is understood as the least prestigious. Note, however, that not everyone ranked in the same way, some ranked in the complete opposite order. Similarly, looking at types of teaching, there are also some systematic patterns in terms of what is understood as more prestigious (course convener, lectures), and less prestigious (grading exams, seminars). In contrast, the pattern concerning supervising and grading theses is more mixed, and there is less of a consensus among the respondents.

Table 2: Prestigious ranking (types of teaching)

Rank*	1	2	3	4	5	6	N
<i>Seminars</i>	5.9%	5.9%	7.8%	19.6%	54.9%	5.9%	51
<i>Lectures</i>	13.5%	46.2%	28.8%	7.7%	3.8%	0%	52
<i>Grading exams</i>	6.0%	0%	2.0%	0%	6.0%	86.0%	50
<i>Course convener</i>	62.7%	13.7%	9.8%	2.0%	7.8%	3.9%	51
<i>Supervising</i>	13.5%	23.1%	32.7%	26.9%	1.9%	1.9%	52
<i>Grading theses</i>	0%	13.5%	19.2%	40.4%	25.0%	1.9%	52

*If possible, we have marked the options that constitute 50% or more, in one or two categories (largest and contiguous), in bold.

Table 3: Prestigious ranking (levels of teaching)

Rank	1	2	3	N
<i>Undergraduate</i>	11.5%	5.8%	82.7%	52
<i>Master</i>	9.6%	86.5%	3.8%	52
<i>PhD</i>	84.6%	3.8%	11.5%	52

*If possible, we have marked the option that constitute 50% or more, in bold.

What type of teaching is enjoyed more?⁸

Also here, there are some systematic preferences, see Table 4. Lectures and supervising are generally regarded as more enjoyable, whereas grading theses and being course convener are seen as less enjoyable. Grading exams is considered the least enjoyable type of teaching (69.2%).

Table 4: Most enjoyed ranking (types of teaching)

Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	N
<i>Seminars</i>	24.5%	26.4%	22.6%	17.0%	5.7%	3.8%	53
<i>Lectures</i>	31.5%	24.1%	27.8%	7.4%	5.6%	3.7%	54
<i>Grading exams</i>	3.8%	3.8%	3.8%	7.7%	11.5%	69.2%	52
<i>Course convener</i>	8.3%	16.7%	14.6%	33.3%	20.8%	6.3%	48
<i>Supervising</i>	42.3%	21.2%	17.3%	7.7%	9.6%	1.9%	52
<i>Grading theses</i>	2.0%	16.3%	12.2%	22.4%	32.7%	14.3%	49

*If possible, we have marked the options that constitute 50% or more, in one or two categories (largest and contiguous), in bold.

What costs more time?

If we look at how our colleagues rank teaching in terms of costs, the patterns are less clear, see Table 5 and Table 6. The question asked here was “Rank types of teaching based on cost (i.e. number of hours, with 1st being most costly).” As some respondents noted they did not quite understand this question, we also want to highlight that here.⁹ We were hoping to get a sense of which types of teaching feel cumbersome and time consuming in relation to how much they are paid. Of course, we also recognize that teaching can feel cumbersome when it is new, or when it is outside your comfort zone, or because of varying demands from students. Hence, it is possible that the less clear pattern here is due to confusion over the question. Comparing the cost of teaching across levels, the opinion is most divided concerning the PhD level, many ranking it as most costly and many as the least costly. The tendency is to rank bachelor level as the most costly, and the master level in the middle, but opinions are divided. Looking at the type of teaching, again, the opinions are quite mixed. About a third, however, rank seminars as the least costly, and also about a third rank the role of course convener and lectures as the most and second to most costly.

Table 5: Costly ranking (types of teaching)

Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	N
<i>Seminars</i>	10.2%	12.2%	24.5%	6.1%	14.3%	32.7%	49
<i>Lectures</i>	16.3%	32.7%	12.2%	16.3%	14.3%	8.2%	49
<i>Grading exams</i>	12.2%	12.2%	14.3%	22.4%	20.4%	18.4%	49
<i>Course convener</i>	32.6%	10.9%	17.4%	19.6%	6.5%	13.0%	46
<i>Supervising</i>	28.6%	18.4%	22.4%	16.3%	10.2%	4.1%	49
<i>Grading theses</i>	6.3%	18.8%	14.6%	20.8%	27.1%	12.5%	48

*If possible, we have marked the options that constitute 50% or more, in one or two categories (largest and contiguous), in bold.

⁸ Unfortunately, we did not ask about what levels of teaching are enjoyed more, so we do not have data on that.

⁹ A better way to ask the question might have been, compared to the number of hours you spend on each type of teaching, and the number of hours you are paid for each type, which one would you consider underpaid? Please rank according to which type of teaching you consider the most underpaid.

Table 6: Costly ranking (levels of teaching)

Rank	1	2	3	N
<i>Undergraduate</i>	50.0%	11.4%	38.6%	44
<i>Master</i>	18.6%	62.8%	18.6%	43
<i>PhD</i>	42.9%	11.9%	45.2%	42

*If possible, we have marked the options that constitute 50% or more, in bold.

The appendix includes a mean estimate for these rankings, across gender and seniority. Overall, the estimates are very similar, and we do not find any significant differences in this sample, suggesting that the general preferences are also quite consistent across these groups. Overall, this means that there are some clear systematic preferences and opinions related to both levels, and types of teaching (albeit different ones, and not in relation to all aspects). This motivates us to scrutinize the actual distribution of teaching across both levels and types. Ideally, the distribution should match the various compositional traits of our teaching staff, so that the fun, the burden and the potential career advantage of different forms (level and type) of teaching should be equally shared, e.g., so that we do not find that the forms of teaching that are the least enjoyed is disproportionately done by one gender. This is of course only possible within certain competence parameters as not all teaching is accessible to all teaching staff, for example one needs a PhD to teach at the PhD level, and master thesis supervision tends to also be done by those that have a PhD.

Changing your teaching portfolio

Our survey also included a question concerned with whether or not teachers felt like they had the possibilities of changing their teaching portfolio, if they have agency over their teaching. This was an open-text question, where respondents got to write as much or as little as they wished. 47 out of the 55 respondents answered this question. Of these, 16 say something to the tune of that they find it (somewhat) easy to change and answers from 10 respondents suggested that it is quite difficult for them to do so. Longer responses pertained to the fact that the process of staffing is not very transparent, as it appears to rely on informal networks and decisions feel quite arbitrary at times. A related impression was that those who had been at the department longer are given priority or rather have more agency over their teaching than those who have joined more recently. Specifically teaching at the higher levels (i.e. Master or PhD) is regarded as being difficult to get access to, particularly being a head teacher or course convenor at these levels. Some respondents also reflected that course convenors are seen to be the main gatekeepers to teaching and that at times, staff shortages in certain fields, means that people were taking on supervision or seminar teaching in excess of their already planned teaching. Yet, answers also included the point that it is unrealistic to suggest that everyone will only get the type of teaching they want, as the courses we have need to be staffed, and that with more seniority comes both privilege and responsibility, i.e. needing to be able to meet the needs of the department.

Some respondents also offered potential solutions to the above problems. The suggestions included having a central teaching profile database, where teachers input their expertise to provide an overview of possible teachers and ensure that all have access to this information rather than relying on informal networks. Other possible solutions included learning from other departments and ensuring greater rotation rather than head teachers holding onto courses for many years, as well as a more active Director of Undergraduate Studies, including more rotation on that post, and a more active NUGA (Nämnden för utbildning på grund- och avancerad nivå).

We also asked what kind of teaching our colleagues wanted more of. Here we have 55 responses too. Important to note that many added they would like to design their own courses / lectures / seminars, i.e. they would like more agency in their teaching. Several also raised the concern that it is easy to “get stuck” in your teaching, because there is too much time and investment related to changing your teaching portfolio. Many also wanted more teaching which is closer to their field of research. Only ten of the respondents noted that they were happy with the current setup, and the thing most wished for more of was lectures, and also supervision (particularly at the PhD level). The answers have been coded in the Table 7 below, where we indicate the type of teaching that respondents wish for as well as at which levels they want to conduct this teaching.

Table 7: Coding of responses about changing teaching portfolio

Type	Undergraduate	Master	PhD	Unspecified
Seminar	1	1		4
Lecture	2	2	1	11
Supervision		3	8	3
Course convenor		1		4
Grading theses				2
Grading exams				
Any teaching at this level	2	5	6	
Happy with current set up				10
Less teaching				2
Don't know				2

Final survey reflections

The last question of the survey asked respondents for other thoughts on this topic. Some respondents remarked that the prestige itself is derived from its respective importance for promotion and career development, and thus higher-level teaching tends to be considered more prestigious. One respondent made the point that while grading is a core task, they argued that it is increasingly underpaid due to the overall cut back on teaching (possibly because of the change of hours amounting to full-time teaching load). Regarding the system of recruiting teachers, respondents spoke to the need for a strategic way to plan ahead, which would also allow for more variation in staffing; that the current system seems to be quite *ad hoc* and reliant on insider information to express interest in specific teaching quickly; and one respondent suggested that the existing system works pretty well, and junior staff need gradual experience. Respondents expressed a desire for wider discussions around the staffing of teaching at the department, for instance in relation to new hires they wondered about the overlapping expertise among existing teachers, and perhaps it would be better to hire new people with different fields of expertise (increasing pluralism), but also diversifying the portfolio of courses and topics taught at the department.

Actual teaching patterns

Turning to our data from the time reports, we analyze how teaching hours were distributed the academic year 2023/2024. Given the results of the survey, we focus a bit extra on forms of teaching where there was strong and relative consensus in terms of preferences. This means, we will pay extra attention to lectures (often enjoyed, seen as prestigious), supervision (often enjoyed, experienced as costly by some), grading exams (least enjoyed, seen as least prestigious), course convening (seen as prestigious), and teaching at the master and PhD level (seen as more prestigious). We analyze across employment positions, gender, and internal vs. external PhD.

Teaching across types of teaching

Overall, 6086 lecture hours have been reported. These hours do not include hours completed by external staff, who for instance are called in with short notice to help out with supervision or examination etc.¹⁰ Below, whenever we refer to hours, we mean lecture hours.¹¹ In Table 8 below is

¹⁰ While getting an overview of the number of hours taught by externals is difficult, we know that at least 114 hours were done by externals. These hours pertain mainly to the bachelor level (96%), and only some hours at the master level (4%), and none at the PhD level. The hours were mostly to cover supervision needs (46%), but also seminars (42%), and to a much less extent lectures (9%), and thesis examination (4%). While we have not scrutinized these external teachers as much, we can note that 81% of these hours were taught by men, and only 19% were given by women. It was clear that these hours, however, were far from the total number of hours taught by externals. And while some of these hours cannot be taught by anyone at our department, as some call for competencies like legal or teacher training, many of these hours could be taught by individuals at our department.

¹¹ Lecture hours correspond to the total time that is remunerated per hour that is taught. Usually, an hour of face-to-face teaching would be remunerated with four clock hours, i.e. 1 lecture hour equals 4 clock hours. Occasionally some teaching is remunerated with more hours, and there is also some teaching which is remunerated with less (e.g. unprepared teaching) (for more details on this, see document "REMUNERATION PER DIFFERENT FORMS OF TEACHING", June 2019).

an overview of all teaching hours, across types of teaching and across different positions. The bulk of our teaching is done by staff with a PhD, whereas PhD students carry out 14% of the teaching hours at our department (PhD students: 864 hours, vs. PhDs: 5222 hours). While the teaching percentage in different positions vary, we can note that in general the distribution of hours across the different positions matches the composition of our department quite well. As associate senior lecturers have comparatively higher teaching loads, it makes sense that they contribute with relatively more hours compared to their employment numbers.

We can note that the teaching portfolios of *PhD students* are dominated by seminars (constituting 58% of their teaching hours), followed by grading exams (10%) and a form of other category, related to teaching administration (departmental service, such as being a member of FUN (Forskarutbildningsnämnden), admin related to the research seminar, the departmental board etc.). All tables pertaining to teaching portfolios are collated in the appendix. The teaching portfolio of *researchers* is also dominated by seminars (34%), then followed by supervision (19%), lectures (18%), grading exams (12%) and grading theses (11%). Researchers are sometimes, but rarely course conveners, and they do relatively little in terms of teaching administration. The teaching portfolios of *associate senior lectures* and *senior lectures*, are relatively similar. Associate senior lecturers' teaching portfolio is dominated by seminars (27%), lectures (21%), and course convening (16%). Senior lecturers' teaching portfolio is dominated by supervision (25%), seminars (24%), and lectures (17%). The main difference is that associate senior lecturers are more often course conveners (16%), and do more seminars (27%) and lectures (21%), whereas senior lectures have more supervision (25%) and grading of theses (8%). Note, that the group of associate senior lectures are only a handful of individuals, and relatively speaking have a much higher teaching load than other employees. The teaching portfolio of *professors* is dominated by supervision (25%), seminars (21%), and lectures (18%), followed by course convening (12%).

Table 8: Overview of teaching types across positions*

	PhD students		Researchers		Associate senior lecturers		Senior lecturers		Professors		Total	
<i>Seminars</i>	505	27%	541	29%	175	9%	399	21%	277	15%	1898	100%
<i>Lectures</i>	37	4%	287	30%	136	14%	279	29%	231	24%	970	100%
<i>Supervision</i>	27	2%	306	26%	99	8%	413	35%	325	28%	1170	100%
<i>Grading exams</i>	87	17%	184	36%	59	11%	147	29%	37	7%	513	100%
<i>Grading thesis</i>		0%	183	42%	17	4%	140	32%	100	23%	440	100%
<i>Course convener</i>		0%	73	16%	104	22%	140	30%	151	32%	467	100%
<i>Other (admin)</i>	162	40%	2	0%	46	11%	116	29%	75	19%	400	100%
<i>Other (course specific)</i>	47	51%	14	15%	16	17%	15	17%		0%	91	100%
<i>Other (mixed or unspecified teaching)**</i>		0%	1	0%		0%	32	23%	104	76%	137	100%
Total	864	14%	1591	26%	651	11%	1681	28%	1299	21%	6086	100%

*For comparison, percent of total staff: PhD students 28%; Researchers 28%; Associate senior lecturers 5%; Senior lecturers 19%; and Professors 20%.

**The bulk of these hours are mixed hours, a combination of lectures, seminars, course convener etc., pertaining to one course, typically reported by a few individuals only. We do not analyze these hours further.

If we turn to the distribution of teaching types in relation to gender, the overall pattern is visible in Table 9. Remembering the overall gender pattern of our staff, of 54% women and 46% men (among the PhD student we have 59% women and 41% men), we should expect women to do slightly more of each form of teaching. Indeed, if we look at the hours as a whole, women do 55% of all hours, and men 45% of all hours. If we compare across genders for each type of teaching, we can note that in general the distribution is quite even, but it is noticeable that women grade exams a lot more (64% for women vs. 36% for men), they also do a lot more of teaching administration (78% for women vs. 22% for men). While these hours to some extent might be considered academic housekeeping (which is known to be gendered), this is paid work. Other (admin) hours

pertain to central departmental service.¹² Hence, it is disconcerting that men are not taking part to the same extent in these kinds of tasks.

That women grade exams more, is more concerning, given the preferences around exams noted in our survey, where grading exams is considered the least prestigious and the least enjoyed. Women are also lower than expected on supervision and grading theses. As supervision is particularly enjoyed, this is also a pattern worth considering more. We can also see that it is mainly men who do not specify their teaching in detail in their time reports (96%).

Table 9: Overview of all teaching types across gender

	Men		Women		Total	
<i>Seminars</i>	861	45%	1036	55%	1898	100%
<i>Lectures</i>	432	44%	538	56%	970	100%
<i>Supervision</i>	609	52%	561	48%	1170	100%
<i>Grading exams</i>	183	36%	331	64%	513	100%
<i>Grading thesis</i>	238	54%	202	46%	440	100%
<i>Course convener</i>	217	46%	251	54%	467	100%
<i>Other (admin)</i>	88	22%	312	78%	400	100%
<i>Other (course specific)</i>	11	12%	80	88%	91	100%
<i>Other (mixed or unspecified teaching)</i>	131	96%	6	4%	137	100%
Total	2769	45%	3317	55%	6086	100%

If we look at the available hours across all positions in relation to gender, we can see that while overall we would expect to see women doing about 55% of specific hours, this shifts particularly when looking at specific positions. Thus, as a point of comparison, from Table 10, the balance among PhD students is 75% of all teaching is done by women. And while there are more women doctoral students at our department, see Table 1, that balance is only 59%. As we do not expect there to be a large difference in relation to the employment numbers, as doctoral students should be on the same teaching load, this is a bit odd. For researchers, there is an equal cap on how much people can teach, so these numbers should, and do, match the employment numbers well. For the other positions, the teaching load can vary more significantly, depending on external funding. If we look at senior lecturers, we would expect the number of hours done by women in our analysis below to be close to 66%, for associate senior lecturers it should be close to 60%, and for professors 29%. The gender balance for all staff with a PhD in terms of teaching hours they do, is 49% for men (2,555 hours) and 51% for women (2,667 hours).

¹² Within the different types of teaching, some was categorized as “other”. This includes three sub-types of other: 1) *admin*, 2) *course specific*, and 3) *mixed or unspecified teaching*. Here we provide detail and examples of what some of these sub-categories entail. Often, the form of teaching which we term *Other (admin)* can be considered prestigious, as it pertains to appointments at departmental or faculty level. Among senior staff, most of the hours within this category have to do with the recruitment processes (of PhD students, MA students for our department, or lecturers at faculty level), the organization of the bachelor and master thesis courses, and being part of UBU, the faculty’s committee for teaching. Additionally, this form of teaching hours includes other types of academic service, such as the committees overseeing the undergraduate, postgraduate and PhD studies (NUGA and FUN), or the Equal Opportunities Committee. For PhD students, this *Other (admin)* is primarily made up of participation in various committees and groups (NUGA and FUN, but also the Environment Group, the Equal Opportunities Committee and the Communication Group, as well as the Departmental Board). Some PhD students sit on committees at the faculty level, such as SDR or DN. Most of the items within this category, however, pertain to the departmental association for PhD students (chair and co-chair, the association’s representative to the department board, secretary). This category also includes the PhD student who works 5% for the Department’s Communications officer. We opted to include these hours as part of the total of teaching hours, as these are hours each individual could otherwise spend on regular teaching. Larger tasks, such as Dean of PhD studies, are reported and dealt with differently, and usually not seen as part of the percentage of teaching the person does, but instead leads to a reduction of teaching hours. The *Other (course specific)* pertains to other activities that are done in direct contact with the student, such as extra tutoring sessions, ‘datorlabb’ or ‘metodakut’ sessions, or excursions. This also includes any extra compensation for those that taught at very short notice or any additional office hours. Most of these hours correspond to methods teaching (at different levels).

Table 10: All teaching hours across all positions and gender

Position	Men		Women		Total	
<i>PhD student</i>	214	25%	650	75%	864	100%
<i>Researcher</i>	808	51%	782	49%	1591	100%
<i>Associate senior lecturer</i>	262	40%	389	60%	651	100%
<i>Senior lecturer</i>	568	34%	1114	66%	1681	100%
<i>Professor</i>	917	71%	382	29%	1299	100%
Total	2769	45%	3317	55%	6086	100%

Supervision

Supervision and course convening are teaching forms that are more sought after, either because they are enjoyed or because they are seen as prestigious. Comparing the total number of hours carried out by various groups, we can note that supervision is carried out in descending order by senior lecturers, professors, researchers, associate senior lectures and PhD students (Table 8 above). Course convening is carried out in descending order by professors, senior lectures, associate senior lectures and researchers. Overall, this matches expectations in terms of career progression. In the analysis below, we exclude PhD students, as they are not allowed to convene courses, and they cannot supervise at the master and PhD levels.

If we examine supervision patterns more, in particular looking at the average amount of hours spent on supervision, we can note that senior lecturers supervise the most on average (24.9 hours). The largest gender discrepancy is visible among the associate senior lecturers, where male associate senior lectures do a lot more supervision (28.8 hours) compared to female ones (13.8 hours). See Table 11. Note, that these hours include supervision at the PhD level, where the remuneration for each PhD student 9 hours per doctoral student and semester (shared between two supervisors), or if there are three supervisors they share 11 hours per semester.

Table 11: Average supervision hours per position and gender

Position	Male	Female	Total
<i>PhD student</i>	2.3	0.8	1.4
<i>Researcher</i>	15.3	11.2	13.3
<i>Associate senior lecturer</i>	28.8	13.8	19.8
<i>Senior lecturer</i>	23.0	25.9	24.9
<i>Professor</i>	21.4	20.3	21.0
Total	16.5	13.1	14.6

Hence, we also look at the average hours of supervision, if we exclude hours from PhD supervision, see Table 12. For this type of supervision, the overall average is 8.7 hours per person. The overall average is higher for men here as well (10.9 vs 6.8). It is only close to even across genders among researchers (10.8 vs 9.7). While the difference is slight among doctoral students, given the low number of hours spent on supervision, male doctoral students have on average more than twice as many hours compared to their female counterparts. Men in the other categories spend about 6 hours more on average on supervision.

Table 12: Average supervision (bachelor and master) hours per position and gender

Position	Male	Female	Total
<i>PhD student</i>	2.3	0.8	1.4
<i>Researcher</i>	10.8	9.7	10.3
<i>Associate senior lecturer</i>	17.8	10.8	13.6
<i>Senior lecturer</i>	16.6	10.1	12.4
<i>Professor</i>	12.2	6.2	10.2
Total	10.9	6.8	8.7

Similarly, if we look at the total amount of supervision hours conducted at the department, we can note, in Table 13, that while women overall do less supervision hours, among senior lecturers, women do most of the hours (68%) compared to male senior lectures (32%), and among professors the men do most of the hours (68% vs 32%). Remember that this needs to be compared to figures from Table 10, where we can see what the overall balance of hours is within each position; thus women associate senior lecturers should do about 60%, senior lecturers 66% and professors 29%. Women associate senior lecturers and researchers deviate the most compared to their available hours, doing much less supervision than they could. Table 14 below shows how the total amount of supervision hours is distributed across levels and gender. Here, it is clear that the biggest imbalance is found at the undergraduate level with men carrying out 63% of the hours, whereas women do 37% of the hours. Men also do more of the supervision at the master level. Notably, however, the pattern is reversed at the PhD level, where women do most of the supervision hours (57% vs 43%), which is a slight overrepresentation as women's available teaching hours at the PhD level are closer to 51%.

Table 13: Supervision hours across positions and gender

Position	Men		Women		Total	
	Hours	%	Hours	%	Hours	%
<i>Researcher</i>	184	60%	123	40%	306	100%
<i>Associate senior lecturer</i>	58	58%	41	42%	99	100%
<i>Senior lecturer</i>	131	32%	282	68%	413	100%
<i>Professor</i>	221	68%	104	32%	325	100%
Total	593	52%	550	48%	1143	100%

Table 14: Supervision hours across levels and gender

LEVEL	Men		Women		Total	
	Hours	%	Hours	%	Hours	%
<i>Undergraduate</i>	207	63%	123	37%	330	100%
<i>Master</i>	179	53%	158	47%	337	100%
<i>PhD</i>	206	43%	269	57%	475	100%
Total	593	52%	550	48%	1143	100%

If we scrutinize how supervision hours are distributed across positions and levels, the patterns are visible in Table 15. We can note that researchers carry out the largest portion of the supervision at the undergraduate level (41%), and the senior lecturers carry out the largest portion of the supervision at both the master and PhD level (37% and 43% respectively). In the research portfolios of researchers and associate senior lecturers, supervision at the undergraduate levels dominate, whereas both senior lecturers and professors do most of their supervision hours at the PhD level, see Table 45. If we look at the gender balance of PhD supervision, we can see that women do 57% of those hours, and the overall available staff for PhD supervision consists of 51% women, hence women are slightly overrepresented here.

Table 15: Supervision hours across positions and levels

	Undergraduate		Master		PhD		Total	
Researcher	136	41%	101	30%	70	15%	306	27%
Associate senior lecturer	42	13%	26	8%	31	7%	99	9%
Senior lecturer	82	25%	126	37%	205	43%	413	36%
Professor	71	21%	85	25%	169	36%	325	28%
Total	330	100%	337	100%	475	100%	1143	100%

Course convening

If we turn to course convening, Table 16, we can note that the overall average hours spent on this is 5.8, and that the average is very similar across men and women overall. However, if we look across positions and within positions, we see bigger differences. Female researchers spend more hours on course convening on average, than their male counterparts (3.9 vs 2.5), as do female senior lectures (10.3 vs 5.6). By contrast male associate senior lecturers spend more time on course convening (25.8 vs 17.5) as do professors (10.1 vs 8.4), than their female counterparts.

Table 16: Average hours spent on course convening across positions and gender

	Men	Women	Total
<i>Researcher</i>	2.5	3.9	3.2
<i>Associate senior lecturer</i>	25.8	17.5	20.8
<i>Senior lecturer</i>	5.6	10.3	8.7
<i>Professor</i>	10.1	8.4	9.5
Total	5.9	5.8	5.8

If we scrutinize the total amount of hours done at the department in terms of course convening, we can note that professors do most of these hours, closely followed by senior lecturers. Course convening at the undergraduate level is mostly carried about by senior lecturers (35%), professors do most of the course convening at the master (69%) and PhD (68%) levels, see Table 17. Again, this division seems quite reasonable in relation to career progression.

Table 17: Course convening hours across levels and positions

	Undergraduate		Master		PhD		Total	
<i>Researcher</i>	64	18%	9	10%		0%	73	16%
<i>Associate senior lecturer</i>	95	27%	9	10%		0%	104	22%
<i>Senior lecturer</i>	121	35%	11	12%	8	32%	140	30%
<i>Professor</i>	69	20%	62	69%	17	68%	148	32%
Total	349	100%	90	100%	25	100%	464	100%

If we look at course convening in relation to gender, we can note that while women overall do 54% of the course convening hours, among professors, women professors only do 28% of the course convening, and the men do 72% of the hours, but this reflects the gender pattern in this group quite well. The opposite pattern is visible among senior lecturers, where women do 81% of the course convening, and the men only 19%, see Table 18, and this differs more substantially from the gender division of all hours within this group. Particularly, among the associate senior lecturers, women are underrepresented when it comes to course convening and women are slightly overrepresented among senior lecturers and researchers. If we look at course convening across levels of courses, we can note, in Table 19, that women do slightly more course convening at the undergraduate level than men (58%), men do a lot more of the course convening at the master level (71%), and women do most of the course convening at the PhD level (88%) (but there are fewer actual hours available at this level).

Table 18: Course convening hours across positions and gender

Position	Men		Women		Total	
<i>Researcher</i>	30	41%	43	59%	73	100%
<i>Associate senior lecturer</i>	52	50%	53	50%	104	100%
<i>Senior lecturer</i>	26	19%	114	81%	140	100%
<i>Professor</i>	109	72%	42	28%	151	100%
Total	217	46%	251	54%	467	100%

Table 19: Course convening hours across levels and gender

LEVEL	Men		Women		Total	
<i>Undergraduate</i>	147	42%	202	58%	349	100%
<i>Master</i>	64	71%	26	29%	90	100%
<i>PhD</i>	3	12%	22	88%	25	100%
Total	217	46%	251	54%	467	100%

Lectures

Scrutinizing lecturing a bit closer, Table 20, we can see that the average hours are fairly evenly distributed across genders within each position. The largest discrepancy is that women associate senior lecturers do a lot more lecturing than their male counterparts. Overall, most of the lecture hours are done by researchers (30%), see Table 21. And if we look at lectures at the PhD level, these are mainly done by professors, senior lectures do most of the lectures at the master level, and researchers do most of the lectures at the bachelor level. If we compare the amount of lecture hours done overall at the department, across gender and positions, we can see that here it is more uneven. Women overall do a larger share among PhD students, associate senior lectures, and senior lecturers, than their male counterparts, see Table 22. However, if we consider the number of hours available for each group, we can note that amongst PhD students, women are not doing as many lectures as they could be, while women associate senior lecturers are slightly overrepresented. While, male professors do a larger share than their female counterparts, women professors do somewhat more lectures than they contribute hours overall. Table 23 shows that women lecturing are overrepresented at the master level, but underrepresented at the PhD level.

Table 20: Average hours spent on lecturing across positions and gender

	Men	Women	Total
<i>PhD student</i>	1.6	1.9	1.8
<i>Researcher</i>	11.0	14.1	12.5
<i>Associate senior lecturer</i>	20.0	32.0	27.2
<i>Senior lecturer</i>	17.5	17.2	17.3
<i>Professor</i>	14.3	14.6	14.4
Total	11.7	12.5	12.1

Table 21: Lecture hours across levels and positions

	Unspecified		Undergraduate		Master		PhD		Total	
<i>PhD student</i>		0%	34	4%	3	2%		0%	37	4%
<i>Researcher</i>	4	44%	238	32%	45	29%		0%	287	30%
<i>Associate senior lecturer</i>		0%	104	14%	30	19%	2	4%	136	14%
<i>Senior lecturer</i>	2	22%	216	29%	42	27%	19	35%	279	29%
<i>Professor</i>	3	33%	158	21%	36	23%	34	62%	231	24%
Total	9	100%	750	100%	156	100%	55	100%	970	100%

Table 22: Lecture hours across positions and gender

Position	Men		Women		Total	
<i>PhD student</i>	12	32%	25	68%	37	100%
<i>Researcher</i>	132	46%	155	54%	287	100%
<i>Associate senior lecturer</i>	40	29%	96	71%	136	100%
<i>Senior lecturer</i>	92	33%	187	67%	279	100%
<i>Professor</i>	156	68%	75	32%	231	100%
Total	432	44%	538	56%	970	100%

Table 23: Lecture hours across levels and gender

LEVEL	Men		Women		Total	
<i>Undergraduate</i>	336	45%	414	55%	750	100%
<i>Master</i>	64	41%	92	59%	156	100%
<i>PhD</i>	32	58%	23	42%	55	100%
Total	432	45%	527	55%	961	100%

Grading exams

Turning to grading exams, while the overall average number of hours spent grading exams is 6.4 hours, there are some extreme differences seen in Table 24. Here, we include PhD students in our overview again. It is only male researchers that do more hours grading exams on average than their female counterparts, but the difference is small. In contrast, female PhD students do a lot more grading on average (5.8 vs 1.7), and female associate senior lecturers also do a lot more grading exams than their male counterparts (17.3 vs 3.5). Overall, women at the department spend more hours on average grading exams (7.7 vs 4.9).

Table 24: Average hours spent on grading exams across positions and gender

	Men	Women	Total
<i>PhD student</i>	1.7	5.8	4.3
<i>Researcher</i>	8.3	7.6	8.0
<i>Associate senior lecturer</i>	3.5	17.3	11.8
<i>Senior lecturer</i>	7.8	9.1	8.6
<i>Professor</i>	1.7	3.9	2.4
Total	4.9	7.7	6.4

If we scrutinize the total amount of hours done at the department in terms of exam grading, we can note that researchers do most of these hours, closely followed by senior lecturers. Exam grading at the undergraduate level follows the same patterns, whereas exam grading at the master level is mostly carried out by associate senior lecturers, followed by researchers, see Table 25.

Table 25: Exam grading hours across levels and positions

	Undergraduate		Master		Total	
<i>PhD student</i>	82	18%	5	8%	87	20%
<i>Researcher</i>	166	37%	18	27%	184	43%
<i>Associate senior lecturer</i>	35	8%	24	35%	59	14%
<i>Senior lecturer</i>	132	30%	15	23%	147	34%
<i>Professor</i>	32	7%	5	8%	37	9%
Total	365	100%	61	100%	426	100%

If we look at all the hours spent on exam grading in relation to gender, we can note that while women overall do 64% of the exam grading hours, the female researchers do less than their male counterparts (46% vs 54%). The largest imbalance is found among associate senior lecturers where women do 88% of the total amount of grading hours compared to their male counterparts, closely followed by the female PhD students who do 87% of the total amount of hours by PhD students, female professors do 54% of the grading, even if they only make up 29% of all the teaching hours in this position, see Table 26. If we look at exam grading across levels of courses, women especially do more of the grading at the master level (76%), see Table 27.

Table 26: Exam grading hours across positions and gender

Position	Men		Women		Total	
<i>PhD student</i>	12	13%	75	87%	87	100%
<i>Researcher</i>	100	54%	84	46%	184	100%
<i>Associate senior lecturer</i>	7	12%	52	88%	59	100%
<i>Senior lecturer</i>	47	32%	100	68%	147	100%
<i>Professor</i>	17	46%	20	54%	37	100%
Total	183	36%	331	64%	513	100%

Table 27: Exam grading across levels and gender

LEVEL	Men		Women		Total	
<i>Undergraduate</i>	167	37%	280	63%	447	100%
<i>Master</i>	16	24%	51	76%	66	100%
<i>PhD</i>	183	36%	331	64%	513	100%
Total	167	37%	280	63%	447	100%

Teaching across different levels

Looking back at the results from the survey, respondents agreed that PhD level teaching was considered the most prestigious, followed by master level, whereas most saw the bachelor level as the least prestigious. Likewise, when asked what teaching respondents would like more of, it was PhD and master level that was mentioned the most, yet comments also suggested that teaching at higher levels was perceived as difficult to get access to. How then, does the actual division of teaching across different levels look like?

If we scrutinize how different teaching positions carry out teaching at different levels instead, see Table 28, we can see that teaching at the PhD level is mainly carried out by senior lecturers (38%) and professors (35%). The teaching hours for PhD students at this level are mostly admin-related. Researchers do a bit more of PhD teaching (9%) than associate senior lecturers (8%). Teaching at the master level is mostly carried out by professors (36%), followed by senior lecturers (27%), and researchers (23%). Teaching at the undergraduate level is mostly carried out by researchers (31%), then followed by senior lecturers (25%), PhD students (17%), professors (15%), and finally by associate senior lecturers (12%).

If we turn to teaching portfolios instead (see appendix), we can see that if we look at these numbers for each type of position, we also see that teaching at the undergraduate level is the largest teaching component for all groups (76% of the PhD student's teaching portfolio, vs 44% of the professors' teaching portfolio). Teaching at the PhD level is also the smallest component for all groups, but in the teaching portfolio of senior lecturers teaching at the master level (20%) and the PhD level (18%) are more similar in size. And for professors, the teaching is the most evenly distributed across the three levels (undergraduate: 44%; master: 35%; PhD: 21%). Again, we would argue that this distribution is quite reasonable in relation to career progression.

Table 28: Overview of all teaching hours across levels for all positions

	PhD student		Researcher		Associate senior lecturer		Senior lecturer		Professor		Total	
<i>Unspecified*</i>	84	48%	7	4%	1	1%	78	44%	6	3%	175	100%
<i>Undergraduate</i>	656	17%	1219	31%	461	12%	968	25%	566	15%	3870	100%
<i>Master</i>	45	4%	296	23%	129	10%	338	27%	457	36%	1264	100%
<i>PhD</i>	79**	10%	70	9%	60	8%	298	38%	270	35%	777	100%
Total	864	14%	1591	26%	651	11%	1681	28%	1299	21%	6086	100%

* Teaching which is not specified at a certain level, is often related to administrative tasks that pertain to several levels.

** While PhD students do not teach other PhD students, they do receive hours for administrative tasks related to PhD teaching, such as being a member of FUN.

If we turn to how gender is associated with the distribution of teaching across levels, see Table 29, we find that women are slightly overrepresented at the undergraduate and PhD level, but underrepresented at the master level. Women also do more teaching at unspecified levels, again this typically pertains to teaching administration that relates to several levels. Comparing the teaching portfolios of both genders, see Table 43 and Table 44, the types of teaching are similarly distributed, except again, men supervise more and grade exams less. And in terms of levels, the teaching portfolios are very similar, except women teach a little bit less at the master level.

Table 29: Overview of teaching hours across levels and gender

	Men		Women		Total	
Unspecified	12	7%	164	93%	175	100%
Undergraduate	1757	45%	2113	55%	3870	100%
Master	668	53%	596	47%	1264	100%
PhD	332	43%	445	57%	777	100%
Total	2769	45%	3317	55%	6086	100%

Internal or external PhD

If we turn to the question of teaching staff with a PhD from outside the department, compared to teaching staff with a PhD either from the Department of Government, we can to some degree examine whether it is harder to establish oneself as a newcomer to the department. Of course, we do not have data over time, and using position as a shortcut to how long you have been at the department has flaws. Here we exclude PhD students, as they are just starting their careers, and are developing as teachers. If we first turn to different types of teaching, see Table 30, we can see that teaching staff with a PhD from outside the department make up about 33% of the teaching hours. Some forms of teaching are quite close to this relative distribution, but individuals with an external PhD do relatively less of grading theses (10%), and somewhat less of supervision (30%) and Other (course specific) (30%). In contrast, they do relatively more of Other (admin) (57%), course convening (43%), and seminars (38%). Turning to different levels of teaching, see Table 31, we can note that individuals with an external PhD teach more at the PhD level (45%), whereas they teach less at the master level (22%) and in terms of unspecified levels (25%), compared to their overall hours.

Table 30: Overview of all teaching types across internal PhD vs. external PhD

	Internal PhD		External PhD		Total	
<i>Seminars</i>	869	62%	524	38%	1393	100%
<i>Lectures</i>	625	67%	308	33%	933	100%
<i>Supervision</i>	800	70%	343	30%	1143	100%
<i>Grading exams</i>	270	63%	156	37%	426	100%
<i>Grading thesis</i>	396	90%	44	10%	440	100%
<i>Course convener</i>	265	57%	203	43%	467	100%
<i>Other (admin)</i>	103	43%	136	57%	239	100%
<i>Other (course specific)</i>	31	70%	14	30%	45	100%
<i>Other (mixed or unspecified teaching)</i>	137	100%		0%	137	100%
Total	3495	67%	1727	33%	5222	100%

Table 31: Overview of teaching hours across levels and internal PhD vs. external PhD

	Internal PhD		External PhD		Total	
<i>Unspecified</i>	68	75%	23	25%	91	100%
<i>Undergraduate</i>	2092	65%	1122	35%	3214	100%
<i>Master</i>	953	78%	266	22%	1219	100%
<i>PhD</i>	382	55%	317	45%	698	100%
Total	3495	67%	1727	33%	5222	100%

Does this pattern remain, if we look at more senior staff? If we only look at people who are either senior lecturers or professors, the pattern is quite similar (see Table 32 and Table 33). Here the relative distribution is 30% of teaching hours done by external PhDs, whereas people with an internal PhD carry out 70% of the teaching hours. They also do comparatively little of thesis grading (13%), and somewhat less of seminars (27%) and a bit less of supervision (29%). And they tend to do a lot more of the Other (admin) (60%), and of the Other (course specific) (48%), and a bit more of grading exams (38%), lectures (36%) and course convening (35%). Their low level of participation in thesis grading is perhaps the most striking here. If we look at levels of teaching, people with an external PhD tend to teach more at the PhD level (51%), less at the master level (19%), and only marginally less at the undergraduate level (29%). Hence, people with an external PhD have clearly been integrated into teaching at the PhD level, but not at the master level.

If we only look at researchers, however, the discrepancies are larger (see Table 34 and Table 35). Then we see that researchers with an external PhD do more seminars compared to the researchers with an internal PhD, but otherwise they do much less of every other form of teaching, particularly lectures, grading theses, and course convening. They are also less involved in teaching at the master and PhD level. That this group is less integrated into our teaching is perhaps not that strange, as they are not hired in a teaching position, and they are also relatively new hires at the department, given the juniority of this particular position. Researchers with an internal PhD have continued their teaching at the department since they were doctoral students, and have had time to become integrated into the teaching at the department.

Table 32: All teaching types across internal PhD vs. external PhD (only senior lecturers and professors)

	Internal PhD		External PhD		Total	
<i>Seminars</i>	490	73%	186	27%	676	100%
<i>Lectures</i>	328	64%	182	36%	510	100%
<i>Supervision</i>	527	71%	211	29%	738	100%
<i>Grading exams</i>	114	62%	70	38%	184	100%
<i>Grading thesis</i>	208	87%	32	13%	240	100%
<i>Course convener</i>	190	65%	100	35%	290	100%
<i>Other (admin)</i>	76	40%	115	60%	191	100%
<i>Other (course specific)</i>	8	52%	7	48%	15	100%
<i>Other (mixed or unspecified teaching)</i>	136	100%		0%	136	100%
Total	2077	70%	904	30%	2980	100%

Table 33: Teaching hours across levels and internal PhD vs. external PhD (only senior lecturers and professors)

	Internal PhD		External PhD		Total	
Unspecified	64	76%	20	24%	84	100%
Undergraduate	1094	71%	439	29%	1533	100%
Master	641	81%	154	19%	795	100%
PhD	278	49%	291	51%	568	100%
Total	2077	70%	904	30%	2980	100%

Table 34: All teaching types across internal PhD vs. external PhD (only researchers)

	Internal PhD		External PhD		Total	
<i>Seminars</i>	356	66%	185	34%	541	100%
<i>Lectures</i>	261	91%	26	9%	287	100%
<i>Supervision</i>	261	85%	45	15%	306	100%
<i>Grading exams</i>	146	79%	38	21%	184	100%
<i>Grading thesis</i>	183	100%		0%	183	100%
<i>Course convener</i>	67	92%	6	8%	73	100%
<i>Other (admin)</i>	2	100%		0%	2	100%
<i>Other (course specific)</i>	14	100%		0%	14	100%
<i>Other (mixed or unspecified teaching)</i>	1	100%		0%	1	100%
Total	1291	81%	300	19%	1591	100%

Table 35: Teaching hours across levels and internal PhD vs. external PhD (only researchers)

	Internal PhD		External PhD		Total	
Unspecified	5	69%	2	31%	7	100%
Undergraduate	939	77%	280	23%	1219	100%
Master	278	94%	18	6%	296	100%
PhD	70	100%		0%	70	100%
Total	1291	81%	300	19%	1591	100%

Visible teaching

Given the importance of which teachers students meet, we have also analyzed the forms of teaching which are most visible. Here we have collapsed teaching hours for seminars, lectures, grading theses, and other (course specific), as these are teaching occasions where each teacher meets multiple students.

If we start to look at what positions are visible to our students, we can note that at the undergraduate level the researchers are the most visible (32%), followed by senior lecturers (24%). The least visible for our undergraduate students are our associate senior lecturers (10%), which is not surprising given the number of people employed in this category. For our master students our professors are the most visible (33%), followed by our researchers. The least visible for our master students are our PhD students (5%). For our PhD students, it is our professors (48%) and our senior lecturers (47%) which are most visible. This pattern of visibility largely makes sense. If we turn to who is visible in terms of gender, the distribution matches overall hours quite well, with women teaching 54% of all visible hours, and at the undergraduate and master level the division matches this. It is only at the PhD level, where women are slightly less visible (47% vs 53%), see Table 37 below. And if we turn to people with an external PhD vs people with a PhD from our department, we can see that it matches the total amount of hours done by people with an external PhD well, with an overall balance of 32% for external PhDs, see Table 38. We can also note that people with an external PhD are less visible at the master level, but more visible at the PhD level, whereas at the undergraduate level it matches their overall hours.

Table 36: Visible teaching hours across level and positions

	PhD student		Researcher		Associate senior lecturer		Senior lecturer		Professor		Total	
<i>Undergraduate</i>	555	21%	853	32%	269	10%	627	24%	343	13%	2647	100%
<i>Master</i>	32	5%	168	27%	71	11%	149	24%	205	33%	624	100%
<i>PhD</i>	1	1%		0%	4	3%	56	47%	57	48%	118	100%
Total	588	17%	1021	30%	344	10%	832	25%	605	18%	3390	100%

Table 37: Visible teaching across levels and gender

	Men		Women		Total	
<i>Undergraduate</i>	1186	45%	1461	55%	2647	100%
<i>Master</i>	294	47%	331	53%	624	100%
<i>PhD</i>	63	53%	55	47%	118	100%
Total	1543	46%	1847	54%	3390	100%

Table 38: Visible teaching across levels and internal/external PhD

	Internal PhD		External PhD		Total	
<i>Undergraduate</i>	1410	67%	682	33%	2092	100%
<i>Master</i>	456	77%	137	23%	592	100%
<i>PhD</i>	48	41%	69	59%	117	100%
Total	1914	68%	888	32%	2802	100%

Diffused teaching?

As we collected the data, we noticed that some time reports were very scattered and others much more focused. Some teachers were engaged in small number of courses, and had a lot of their hours centered on one or two courses, which also means they have to pay attention to fewer course guides, course curricula, schedules, setups in Studium, and they may also have their teaching concentrated to certain parts of the year. Others, with a similar total number of hours, in contrast were more spread out. While this may of course be an individual choice, there is a cost associated with

this, and we wondered to what extent this was evenly distributed. We therefor decided to look at the average number of courses different groups are involved in, but also the average amount of hours different groups spend on a course.

Starting with the number of courses people are involved in, we can see that this varies from 0 to 9. This was calculated based on the number of disparate courses a person taught on during both semesters. If the same course is taught twice, both fall and spring, it is only counted once (same literature/setup etc.). We do not count administrative tasks. If “Swedish politics” is taught at different levels, they are treated as separate courses. Supervision is counted as separate courses, if at different levels (bachelor, master and PhD), we do not consider how many students it pertains to. The overall average is 4.15. Women have a slightly higher average (4.27) compared to men (4.00). In Table 39 we report the averages across positions. It is no surprise that the associate senior lecturers, which have a high teaching load, have the highest average and that doctoral students have the lowest. It is also clear that women have a higher average across all positions, but it is most pronounced among professors, where women on average are teaching on 5.80 courses, whereas men teach on 4.20 courses. Across all levels, people with an internal PhD have a higher average, except among professors.

Table 39: Average number of courses

Position	Men	Women	Total
<i>PhD student</i>	1.71	1.77	1.75
<i>Researcher</i>	4.25	4.64	4.43
<i>Associate senior lecturer</i>	6.00	7.00	6.60
<i>Senior lecturer</i>	5.17	5.45	5.35
<i>Professor</i>	4.20	5.80	4.73
Total	4.00	4.28	4.15

But of course, this analysis does not consider the number of hours each person does, so we also looked at the average number of hours per course. Here we divided the total amount of hours spent on teaching on specific course with the number of courses each person was involved in. The overall average here is 18.5 hours per course, but varies from 4.8 to 53.0 hours. See Table 40. Here the patterns vary more across positions and gender. Women on average have more hours per course (19.0) compared to men (17.9). Doctoral students focus more in their teaching per course, whereas researches seem to be most spread out. Again, the gendered difference is the largest among the professors, where male professors have more concentrated teaching. Indeed, female professors have the lowest average of hours per course (13.0).

Table 40: Average number of hours per course

Position	Male	Female	Total
PhD student	15.9	23.0	20.6
Researcher	16.8	16.6	16.7
Associate senior lecturer	21.1	17.1	18.7
Senior lecturer	17.8	20.3	19.4
Professor	19.9	13.0	17.6
Total	17.9	19.0	18.5

Summary of teaching patterns

Overall, the pattern and distribution of teaching is relatively even and make sense in terms of competence and availability of staff. More senior staff teach at more advanced levels for instance. People with an external PhD are generally speaking well integrated, the exception is at the researcher level. There are however, a few aspects which are worth taking note of.

Female teachers also do a lot more of teaching administration (78% for women vs. 22% for men). While these hours to some extent might be considered academic housekeeping (which is known to be gendered), this in contrast is paid work. However, it is disconcerting that men are not

taking part to the same extent in these kinds of tasks. Our survey did not ask about this type of tasks, but this is an area worth considering further.

Women do less of the total amount of supervision hours at the department (48%), compared to the total amount of teaching hours they contribute (55%). As supervision is particularly enjoyed, this is also a pattern worth considering more. Among senior lecturers, women do more of the supervision hours compared to their male counterparts (68%), but it is close to the relative number of hours women senior lecturers contribute, across the other positions women do 32-42% of the hours. In terms of levels, women do more of the supervision hours at the PhD level (57%), although this is quite close to their total amount of hours. In terms of the average amount of hours spent on supervision, we can note that senior lecturers supervise the most on average (24.9 hours). The largest gender discrepancy is visible among the associate senior lecturers, where male associate senior lectures do a lot more supervision (28.8 hours) compared to female ones (13.8 hours). However, these hours include PhD supervision, and if we only look at supervision at the undergraduate and master level, again we see that men have a higher number of average hours, but the pattern is particularly extreme among associate senior lecturers, senior lecturers and professors, where men on average spend about 6 hours more on supervision. We can also note that male doctoral students supervise on average twice as many hours as their female counterparts. This raises the question, why women do not seek out supervision to the same extent as men.

If we turn to course convening, a task often seen as prestigious albeit perhaps not particularly enjoyed, women overall do 54% of the course convening hours at the department. However, female professors do relatively little course convening, compared to their male counterparts, whereas female senior lecturers do more than their male counterparts. Women are more often course conveners at the undergraduate level, and the PhD level, and men convene more courses at the master level. If we look at the average amount of hours spent on course convening, female researchers spend more hours on course convening on average, than their male counterparts (3.9 vs 2.5), as do female senior lectures (10.3 vs 5.6). By contrast male associate senior lecturers spend more time on course convening (25.8 vs 17.5) as do professors (10.1 vs 8.4), than their female counterparts. People with an external PhD do more course convening, than people with an internal PhD.

In terms of lecturing, we can note that women do overall a larger share of these hours across all positions, except among professors, where male professors do a larger share than their female counterparts. However, if we consider the number of hours available for each group, we can note that amongst PhD students, women are not doing as many lectures as they could be, while women associate senior lecturers and professors are slightly overrepresented. Women lecturing are also overrepresented at the master level, but underrepresented at the PhD level.

Another area to consider further is grading exams. It is a task that is often the least enjoyed and it is not seen as very prestigious. Female teachers grade exams a lot more (64% for women vs. 36% for men). The largest imbalance is found among associate senior lecturers where women do 88% of the total amount of grading hours compared to their male counterparts, closely followed by the female PhD students who do 87% of the total amount of hours by PhD students. This is also reflected in the average amount of hours spent on grading by different groups, where female PhD students do a lot more grading on average (5.8 vs 1.7), and female associate senior lecturers also do a lot more grading exams than their male counterparts (17.3 vs 3.5). Overall, females at the department spend more hours on average grading exams (7.7 vs 4.9). Again, the reasons for this pattern are not obvious. In some courses grading is part and parcel of being a seminar teacher on the course, on other courses it is more flexible, and negotiated separately. It is a form of teaching, which while monotonous, also allows for flexibility. Are people saying yes to grading to be loyal to a course, or are people saying yes to grading because it can be more easily combined with work-life balance? Or are there other reasons for this imbalance?

Considering the teaching load in terms of how diffused it is, it was also clear that women have a higher average across all positions, but it is most pronounced among professors, where women on average are teaching on 5.80 courses, whereas men teach on 4.20 courses. If we consider the number of hours each person spends per course instead, we noted that women on average have more hours per course (19.0) compared to men (17.9). Doctoral students focus more in their teaching per course, whereas researches seem to be most spread out. Again, the gendered difference is the largest among the professors, where male professors have more concentrated teaching. Indeed, female professors have the lowest average of hours per course (13.0).

Reasonings around staffing decisions and processes – interview data

To ensure a well-rounded understanding of the division of teaching at our department and the associated staffing processes, we also conducted some interviews with headteachers, course convenors and admin staff in charge of teaching. These interviews are considered as a whole, and we do not name specific courses or course convenors, as this allowed the interviews to be as open as possible. This provides another perspective to certain staffing processes and outcomes. There are a number of points that came up throughout the interviews: the informality in recruitment for course convening; the good support in staffing received from the administrative staff; invitation to teach on a course is primarily guided by thematic fit, expectancy of continuity on the course, to some degree by teaching experience; course convenors vary how much they actively consider the make-up of the teaching team; locked-in tendencies in teaching portfolios; lack of information about wishes, needs and skills; and challenges pertaining to staffing supervision in particular.

Recruitment into convening: In terms of how people became course convenors, we can note a certain informality to the process. All of those we spoke to either became course convenors for their respective courses as the previous course convenor left and had been involved in the course prior to this, i.e. as seminar teachers or lecturers, or they had been active in the initiation of the course to begin with. Some also describe fear of leaving a course, not only because of how it might affect their own teaching opportunities, but also that that particular sub-field may become less represented, and effectively disappear at the department. Often, people tend to co-convene – particularly for the larger courses on the bachelor level – which helps to ensure continuity in cases where convenors are unavailable if on sick leave, parental leave or similar. However, there are also examples where convenors were recruited onto courses that they had not taught on before. Here, the reasoning behind such recruitment tends to be thematic fit. Similarly, the choice of course convenor is also affected by a desire for longevity from the perspective of the department, as such, people that are permanently employed are prioritized as course convenors. Indeed, only 16% of all course convening hours are carried out by researchers. All of the above in turn aligns with the results from the survey, where respondents noted a certain lack of transparency to the staffing process when it comes to course convenors and a perceived difficulty to themselves becoming course convenors. It was also clear that given the limited number of master courses taught at our department, we do not even have enough courses to ensure that each professor at the department can convene a course. That said, not all master courses are convened by professors.

Staffing the course: One major interest of the interviews was also to determine the staffing processes for teachers onto courses, conducted by the course convenors. Here, convenors relayed that there are a number of different ways in which teachers can get involved with their courses. Most often, the opportunities to involve new people occur when others leave the course. In the cases where the outgoing teachers are not suggesting someone that could take over, or there is no one within the existing teaching team that could do it, convenors have to recruit otherwise. They do this in two ways. On one hand, and most commonly, convenors themselves decide who to have on their courses. In these cases, they are aware of who might be interested either through teachers registering their interest with the convenors or the teaching admin. In both of these cases who is recruited becomes a question of who has registered their interest first, teaching competence and long-term planning for the course. In the cases of the latter, convenors involve teaching admin by asking if they are aware of anyone who has registered interest with them. On the other hand, there are sometimes occurrences when the teaching admin relay to convenors that certain people need teaching and have been allocated to the course in question. At rare occasions, convenors can and have disputed this allocation in favor of those who are already on the course. Likewise, teaching admin play a larger role in the staffing process in cases where the convenors are relatively new to the department and might not have a great overview of who is a potential teacher for their respective course. It was striking that while the strategies of course convenors at the bachelor level varied in terms of how much they relied on help from Gossas and Sigfridsson, staffing at the master level was not something that either one was ever involved in. Hence, at the master level, staffing overwhelmingly rely on convenors of the courses themselves. Some course convenors also use some of their course convening hours on the grading of the course, as they feel the grading is underpaid, and this is one way to ensure that people are more willing to grade.

Who then gets invited onto courses? Firstly, as described above, those that have indicated interest. However, there are other considerations to make in the staffing process. For example, convenors tend to recruit people that will teach on the course for a considerable amount of time – as taking on a new teacher to a course is a big commitment and cost (introducing new teachers often requires more time and effort from the course convenors), and convenors seek to ensure continuity on their courses. Secondly, while all convenors noted that thematic fit, in combination with interest, tends to be the primary selection criteria, convenors also consider the functioning of the teaching team as a whole as well as whether teaching on the course would be beneficial to where teachers are in their career development (the latter mainly applies in the cases of teachers who are PhD students). Course convenors often stressed the collegial signaling that showing up to meetings and being an active part of the teacher team entailed. Similar considerations are also applied in cases where teachers leave a course. While this mainly happens as people progress in their career, taking on positions elsewhere, leave for fieldwork, or for other reasons, hence creating a natural flow of people leaving a course, there are rare occasions when the course convener may have an opportunity to shape the staffing for other reasons. When teachers are phased out more actively, this might be due to not fulfilling teaching responsibilities, expectations or instructions, within the teaching team or as expressed by the course convener (or in other ways signaling that the teaching was not prioritized), and on rare occasions, mistreatment of students.

In relation to who gets invited to a course, it is also worth noting that staffing master courses is considered more. Here, long-term staffing is seen as even more important, also from the perspective of inviting teachers who could potentially take over, or at least briefly, take over the course as convenors. It is also reasonable that externals are sometimes used at the master level, especially for very specialized topics when that specific competency is not available at the department. However, when this practice becomes extended over many years, it is perhaps more possible to reconsider the focus of the master course and whether a different theme might make the course more available for someone already at the department.

Active consideration of make-up of teaching team? Whether or not convenors had considered the makeup of their teaching team varied. For some, the (gender) diversity of their teaching team was a concern – in terms of ensuring that there is a balance, and if that cannot be achieved discussing with and explaining this to the students. Likewise certain courses, may favor an over-representation of women to challenge certain stereotypes that students may have about that specific subfield. Likewise, convenors like to balance the position of teachers, i.e. ensure a good mix of people from varying career stages. This includes making sure that it is not only professors who teach the lectures while PhD students do the seminars – however, this may not always be possible. Some convenors are also aware that those who do not speak Swedish may have fewer opportunities to teach as not all courses are taught in English. As such, in cases where the course is taught in English, some convenors are mindful to recruit those without Swedish-language skills. Some convenors do not actively consider the teaching make-up of their team, this is particularly the case for courses that are difficult to staff. It simply is not worth the time on such occasions to spend effort on that.

Opportunities for change? Generally, convenors were happy with how the teaching and staffing process works at our department, especially when reflecting on it from their position as convenors. However, they all provided areas where there is room for improvement and suggestions as to how to achieve this. For example, convenors suggested that it might be a good idea to rotate convenors. It was clear to the people we talked to that this was a suggestion that ran counter to their own interests as course convenors, and still they stressed this proposal. While this might provide more instability, it would also ensure greater diversity within the convening teams and allow other staff to get involved at the convener level. The idea of rotation was particularly discussed in relation to courses on the master level.

Similarly, convenors commented on the fact that the high degree of autonomy in terms of teaching at our department is very much appreciated. Yet, this also means that there can be situations where certain teachers stay on the same teaching for a very long time, which in turn prevents others from gaining certain teaching experiences. From the perspective of teachers, this means that it is difficult to change teaching portfolios, especially when teachers want to move to another course than the ones they are on. Likewise, change and flexibility are difficult to achieve if individual teachers are already fulfilling all their allocated teaching hours.

Convenors also noted that working together with the teaching admin staff works very well. Reflecting a longer time horizon, having both a director of studies and an assistant director of studies for the undergraduate level has made a huge difference to the ease of staffing and planning at the department. They generally appreciated the support provided by the teaching staff and that they react very well to any issues that might arise. However, at times, convenors would like slightly longer time horizons, i.e. knowing more in advance who would be teaching on the course or how many students there will be to make long-term planning easier. A shift toward yearly planning sheets instead, would thus potentially help here, even if yearly plans are also likely to be more sensitive to changes in funding and similar, and thus less precise.

The biggest challenge that came up in our conversations was that there appears to be a knowledge gap when it comes to who can do what. Generally, it was an impression from the convenors that the teaching admin often are aware of people's skills and interests (particularly PhD students), yet it is unclear where they get this information from, as some teachers' expertise in certain subjects and fields appear to be unused and unknown. While staff sometimes signal via their time planning sheets things they would like to teach on, it is less apparent that all staff know that this is an appropriate forum to do so. And while it is clear that Gossas and Sigfridsson are always happy to talk to people about such issues, there is less focus on systematic career development in terms of people's teaching portfolios. For new hires at the department, whether as PhD students or more senior staff, there is a more organized first discussion about teaching preferences and plans.

Supervision: Staffing related to thesis supervision is very much a question of self-staffing, i.e. everyone is encouraged to sign up for supervision in their planning documents, and can then sign up on specific students once that list is released. To the extent that certain groups supervise less, it is not the result of being invited to supervise less, as we systematically have a shortage of supervisors (and often examiners too) and routinely everyone at the department is contacted when there is a shortage. Staffing supervision is also a question of costs for the department. We note that last semester, fall 2024, it seems that 1/6 of all bachelor theses were supervised by teachers employed elsewhere. Paying people with a fee rather than using staff already at our department is likely to incur greater costs for the department. It was clear that when a specific subfield has a shortage, simply having one individual disappear due to sickness or sabbatical, that can easily lead to a staffing shortage for that field in general, and as other courses tend to go first, this in turn can lead to more of a collapse and crisis for supervision within that particular field. Interviews also suggested that some people value their own thematic fit too much when deciding whether or not to take on a student (this can also apply to courses in general). Discussions around whether or not supervision is underpaid, is complex. On the one hand, as a form of teaching it is a difficult thing to do, often very personal and where calibration is difficult; in that sense it is costly. As a teaching practice, it also has to be considered low intensity teaching as it spreads out over time, which means it incurs costs in terms of work focus. Yet, other reflections stressed that it can be as underpaid as you allow it to be, as it is also a form of teaching you have a lot of control over if you like.

Conclusion

Overall, our investigation into the staffing of courses at our department shows that much of the teaching is equitably distributed and match the teaching hours available from various groups. It is clear that content and competence, as well as seniority are the deciding factors for a lot of our teaching, as it should be. It has also been clear from our work that teaching, and taking teaching seriously, is generally important and valued at this department. Overall, 54% of all hours are done by women at the department, and we cannot determine if this is in line with the percentage of teaching in people's contracts, but it is in line with the employment numbers at the department. Women are in the majority across teaching positions, except among professors (employment numbers: 58% men vs 42% women). There are however, a few areas where our investigation revealed some skewed patterns which merit consideration, especially in relation to the systematic preferences we have noted among our staff. There are four types of teaching where the distribution between men and women is skewed: men supervise more, grade theses more, whereas women grade exams more and do more teaching related administration. In terms of levels, men teach more at

the master level than women, and women do more hours related to unspecified levels (mostly this relates to administration related tasks noted above). Additionally, while men tend to have their teaching concentrated within courses, women's teaching is more spread out, this is especially the case for women professors. This could be due to personal preference, yet it begs interrogation whether this has unintended consequences in terms of its effect on career development and a reasonable workload. Scrutinizing the distribution in relation to seniority as well as people with a PhD from our department vs. an external PhD, there appears to be nothing unreasonably skewed.

Supervision: how can we help our fellow teachers to set boundaries for their supervision so they do not avoid supervision simply because they feel it is too costly? Why do women supervise less? What might help, more teacher team (lärlarlag) work around supervision, sharing best practices and solutions? The system through which supervision is allocated, i.e. that it is often the first form of teaching people drop when people need to cut back their hours, makes it a form of teaching that is quite vulnerable to changes during the ongoing semester. Our department is particular in the sense that people are able to let go of planned supervision hours despite communicating earlier that they can be scheduled for supervision. Similarly, thesis examination is also a form of teaching that is vulnerable to such changes, and if a teacher wants to know they have the hours, it is dangerous to sign up for this form of teaching, as there may not be enough students submitting their theses at the end of the semester. It may be worth considering to offer more of a guarantee to our fellow teachers that sign up for supervision, i.e. if you have signed up for a specific number of students and there are less in the end, you may still get remunerated for the initial number of (planned) supervision. This might make people more inclined to sign up and commit to supervision. There are also indications that people do not remember that they signed up for supervision or examination, and thus when the specific staffing questions appear, they have forgotten their original planning. Perhaps, creating a tentative schedule early on, where people see supervision in their time-edit calendars could help. However, the department always struggle with a shortage of supervisors, as visible from the number of external supervisors hired by the department. This is somewhat problematic as these externals at times have taken the students that staff at the department have wanted to supervise, but we also know from other investigations that having a supervisor that is not based at the department can be detrimental for the quality of the thesis (grade) and scientific curiosity.¹³ Yet at the same time, there are groups of people at our department that probably need to increase their supervision in their teaching portfolios. Supervision hours are also a requirement for career progression; hence this staffing pattern needs more consideration. Perhaps some individuals need to have more of a strategic discussion and planning of their teaching long-term. As supervision is so dependent on self-staffing, it is important to consider the conditions under which people opt in to supervise. It is clear that staff who are stretched thinly, or who have already over-committed because they are willing to help out on other courses they are involved in, are very unlikely to supervise when the time comes for staffing this. Either they will at that point drop out of supervising, or they are less willing to take on additional students. There also seems to be a tendency to prioritize master level supervision over bachelor supervision. This is likely explained both by the timing (of when supervisor are allocated and when teaching takes place) and how prestigious such supervision is, but the consequence of this, is that staffing for bachelor supervision becomes harder. Overall, it is clear, however, that teachers seem to think of supervising (and examination of theses) less as teaching they have committed to in comparison to forms of teaching which are placed in people schedule ahead of time, like seminars, lectures etc.

Grading exams: Women do more grading, and this is a form of teaching which is not readily enjoyed and which is seen as less prestigious. As we see this gendered pattern across positions as well, particularly among PhD students and associate senior lecturers, it is something where we need to think more about how this task is divided— how can we distribute this task more evenly? Encourage course conveners to check, but is the unevenness visible within each course? Do certain groups of people drop out of grading more readily than others?

Why are male teachers less interested or recruited less for teaching hours related to administration and departmental service? While such hours are paid, and thus appear in this report, research

¹³ Mårtensson, Moa, and Johanna Söderström. 2025. "Towards evidence-based supervision? A study of the connection between thesis supervision and student outcomes at Uppsala University." Uppsala University: Department of Government. Dnr: STATSVET 2025/6.

also indicates a distinct difference in the amount of ‘service work’ (or academic housekeeping) men and women do (see e.g. Järvinen and Mik-Meyer 2024, online first). Thus, despite being remunerated, these hours might not be as attractive to those that consider them less relevant for their research career and who want to concentrate on research and publishing. However, these hours often are also associated with positions of influence and as such provide an opportunity to shape the very environment that we research, teach and work in. These recruitment processes often occur through relevant people being asked as to whether or not they would like to be involved. While these teaching related administrative activities are still paid, the discrepancy in terms of who does them is still quite stark (though it is in line with expectations from prior research). This form of collegial service is often quite spread out over the year, leading to less focus, and often require more time than what they are paid. Possible solutions to this discrepancy might be two-pronged: broaden the pool of who gets asked, encourage men to take on more collegial duties, and for women to perhaps consider saying no more often.

Reform and streamline reporting practices: While our report was based on the time reports from our department, we would argue that similar types of analyses should be possible to do at other departments. We would however, encourage the time reports to be updated, in such a way to make such work even easier and enable a more comprehensive continuous analysis. For instance, the level of teaching (bachelor, master, PhD or unspecified/other) could be applied, instead of the current one where bachelor and master are lumped together. If course names are also provided in a list from where teachers input into their teaching reports, it would also be easier to keep track of teaching hours. The reporting practices for doctoral students most likely also need some consideration, as the current system makes it harder for them to keep track of their teaching more long-term. It also comes across as important that course convenors more clearly flag the use of external teachers ahead of time, as the current reporting clearly underreports their usage at the department, and it is hard to get a proper overview.

Information-sharing about teaching competencies and wishes: There seems to be a lack of information, both in terms of demand and supply. Teachers who want to teach in new areas or fields, and course convenors looking for teachers to staff their courses are sometimes in short supply of knowledge about such competencies and wishes. For new teachers, such as PhD students and new employees that have been recruited externally to the department, simply knowing what courses are out there that they could teach on can also be difficult. While some respondents to our survey suggested that we create a teaching portfolio database, we are not sure what the best way to do this is. We can also envision there being a place on the planning excel sheets to note wishes for the future, or it could perhaps be part of employee performance reviews (*medarbetarsamtal*) in a more systematic fashion. It was also clear from discussions around staffing your own course, that people clearly rely on their own informal networks, and people they already know (from a sub-seminar or because they are your PhD student), to identify relevant people. This suggests that topics which align less with a sub-seminar or research groups at the department, or that cut across seminars, have a larger information gap to deal with.

Language: It has also been clear in our discussions that considerations around language skills is key to staffing decisions. When people cannot teach in Swedish it severely limits their options, creating obstacles for both the department and the individual. The question then is how can the department support our teachers to learn Swedish over time? Here it became clear that helping our teachers find the best places or setups to learn Swedish could make a big difference, so that insights into what works well is shared and not something each person trying to learn Swedish has to figure out on their own. Ensuring that there is some room to do this as part of your career development and your regular hours, as a new hire at the department, can also be a smart investment for the department.

Work load and stress: In a few different areas, considerations and experiences which connect to stress and work load have appeared during the work with this report. Some of the imbalances we have noted, such as having your teaching very spread out, is bound to increase work load. The extent to which the importance of continuity was stressed, both for the course convenor and for those teaching on a course, clearly highlighted the high costs associated with taking on new teaching. To us, this suggests, that the only way people can make teaching not underpaid, is by keeping it for extensive periods of time. This seems unreasonable and unsustainable. Supervision planning and staffing, as well as conducting supervision also comes across as an area where stress is a key

factor. Thus, we would encourage reforms and management efforts that particularly target these kinds of problems, or even address them more actively in *medarbetarsamtal* or similar. Any other reform in this area also needs to seriously consider the consequences in terms of what the implications are for the workload and stress for our colleagues.

Path dependency, frozen system: As with any large system with many moving parts, there might be a certain amount of path dependency built into teaching at the department. If it has worked, and seems to still, why fix it? However, path dependency comes at various costs, some of which this report has highlighted and discussed. In particular, the informality of certain staff changes and the need for insider knowledge mean that those that are new(er) to the department are at a disadvantage when it comes to getting to do their desired teaching. Similarly, this path dependency might make it difficult for teachers to change their teaching portfolios as there is little rotation once people are allocated teaching. This is particularly true for PhD students at the start of their career, where teaching choices made early on can have lingering effects.

This lack of rotation appears most prevalently in relation to the master level. Both in the survey and in our interviews, colleagues noted that teaching on the master level is particularly path dependent and difficult to get involved in. Common reflections include that the trickle economics observed with other courses do not work at this level, that staffing at the master level is even more informal with minimal if no involvement from the teaching admin team, and that course convenors often hold onto their courses for a considerable time. How then can we ensure fair division of teaching at the master level? Teaching at this level is not just considered more prestigious by our colleagues than that at the bachelor level, it also matters more in terms of career development and pedagogical progression. Here, possible suggestions could include introducing a rotating system, where courses remain but a systematic turnover of convenors is ensured, or where specific courses rotate, or the possibility of introducing more courses at the master level to allow other teaching staff to expand their teaching portfolios to this level. However, this leaves questions of who should decide the staffing at the master level and how small or cheap could a master course be?

Related to expanding teaching portfolios, the pedagogical development of our teaching staff deserves to be discussed. Throughout this report, a feeling of being stuck in teaching or not feeling like you could change your portfolio came up a number of times. There is distinct need to consider teaching staff's pedagogical development. This includes ensuring both creativity and enjoyment as well as skill development among our teachers, while also considering the need for balanced and varied teaching portfolios over the span of a career. If we want and value innovation in our teaching, we need to ensure that our colleagues receive investment and care that supports this. A possible solution could be to introduce pedagogical development meetings, where the director of studies discusses teaching staff's portfolios, or encouraging everyone to include such discussions in their *medarbetarsamtal*. Any expansion of teaching portfolios, however, also needs to consider the considerable costs that appear to be associated with taking on a new course.

Finally, it is also important to note the advantages of the current teaching system. Most importantly, our report indicates that the flexibility and autonomy that teachers have over their individual teaching is much appreciated. This is particularly relevant as teaching preferences are not uniform and it is great that we can cater to individual needs, skills and desires. The loss of a high level of autonomy was sometimes named as an unfortunate outcome of changes that might be implemented. How can we get the best of both worlds?

Limitations of our report: Our report could only investigate the hours reported by staff at our department, and the hours done in teaching by external staff could not be scrutinized. Yet, we do note that a fair number of hours are done by external staff, and thus if our own staff are having difficulties finding teaching hours this is a potential pool of hours that can be considered. It was also notable that it was not particularly easy to get a full overview of teaching hours done by this group. This is due to several things, but course convenors are expected to inform Gossas before the course runs about their staffing, and not every course convener relays this information, and sometimes this is only discovered when an external teacher reaches out to get payment for their hours.

We have also not looked at trends over time. Hence, we cannot determine how things change over time, for instance, as someone with an external PhD is integrated over time, when they remain in the same employment position.

References

- Ballen, Cissy J., Dahsol Lee, Lise Rakner, and Sehoya Cotner. 2018. "Politics a "Chilly" Environment for Undergraduate Women in Norway." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51(3): 653-658.
- Berger, Laura, Yvonne Benschop, and Marieke van den Brink. 2015. "Practising Gender When Networking: The Case of University–Industry Innovation Projects." *Gender, Work & Organization* 22(6): 556-578.
- Bettinger, Eric P., and Bridget Terry Long. 2005. "Do Faculty Serve as Role Models? The Impact of Instructor Gender on Female Students." *The American Economic Review* 95(2): 152-157.
- Espino, Michelle M, and Ruth E Zambrana. 2019. "" How Do You Advance Here? How do You Survive?" An Exploration of Under-Represented Minority Faculty Perceptions of Mentoring Modalities." *The Review of Higher Education* 42(2): 457-484.
- Howe-Walsh, Liza, and Sarah Turnbull. 2016. "Barriers to women leaders in academia: tales from science and technology." *Studies in Higher Education* 41(3): 415-428.
- Jernberg, Signe. 2020. "Transparent makt: Om hur utnämningar och uppdrag tillsätts vid Samhällsvetenskapliga fakulteten." Uppsala: Samhällsvetenskapliga fakulteten.
- Järvinen, Margaretha, and Nanna Mik-Meyer. 2024, online first. "Giving and receiving: Gendered service work in academia." *Current Sociology*: 1-19.
- Levander, Sara. 2017. *Den pedagogiska skickligheten och akademins väktare: Kollegial bedömning vid rekrytering av universitetslärare*, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- MacNell, Lillian, Adam Driscoll, and Andrea N. Hunt. 2015. "What's in a Name: Exposing Gender Bias in Student Ratings of Teaching." *Innovative Higher Education* 40(4): 291-303.
- Macoun, Alissa, and Danielle Miller. 2014. "Surviving (thriving) in academia: feminist support networks and women ECRs." *Journal of Gender Studies* 23(3): 287-301.
- Maliniak, Daniel, Ryan Powers, and Barbara F Walter. 2013. "The Gender Citation Gap in International Relations." *International Organization* 67(4): 889-922.
- Vetenskapsrådet. 2021. *Hur jämställt är det i högskolan? Kvinnors och mäns förutsättningar att bedriva forskning*. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.

Appendix

Teaching portfolios

Table 41: Teaching portfolios for different positions across types of teaching

	PhD students		Researchers		Associate senior lecturers		Senior lecturers		Professors		Entire department	
Seminars	505	58%	541	34%	175	27%	399	24%	277	21%	1898	31%
Lectures	37	4%	287	18%	136	21%	279	17%	231	18%	970	16%
Supervision	27	3%	306	19%	99	15%	413	25%	325	25%	1170	19%
Grading exams	87	10%	184	12%	59	9%	147	9%	37	3%	513	8%
Grading thesis		0%	183	11%	17	3%	140	8%	100	8%	440	7%
Course convener		0%	73	5%	104	16%	140	8%	151	12%	467	8%
Other (admin)	162	19%	2	0%	46	7%	116	7%	75	6%	400	7%
Other (course specific)	47	5%	14	1%	16	2%	15	1%		0%	91	2%
Other (mixed or unspecified teaching)*		0%	1	0%		0%	32	2%	104	8%	137	2%
Total	864	100%	1591	100%	651	100%	1681	100%	1299	100%	6086	100%

* The bulk of these hours are mixed hours, a combination of lectures, seminars, course convener etc., pertaining to one course, typically reported by a few individuals only. We do not analyze these hours further.

Table 42: Teaching portfolios for different positions across levels of teaching

	PhD student		Researcher		Associate senior lecturer		Senior lecturer		Professor		Entire department	
Unspecified*	84	10%	7	0%	1	0%	78	5%	6	0%	175	3%
Undergraduate	656	76%	1219	77%	461	71%	968	58%	566	44%	3870	64%
Master	45	5%	296	19%	129	20%	338	20%	457	35%	1264	21%
PhD	79**	9%	70	4%	60	9%	298	18%	270	21%	777	13%
Total	864	100%	1591	100%	651	100%	1681	100%	1299	100%	6086	100%

* Teaching which is not specified at a certain level, is often related to administrative tasks that pertain to several levels.

** While PhD students do not teach other PhD students, they do receive hours for administrative tasks related to PhD teaching, such as being a member of FUN.

Table 43: Teaching portfolio for different genders across types of teaching

	Men		Women		Entire department	
Seminars	861	31%	1036	31%	1898	31%
Lectures	432	16%	538	16%	970	16%
Supervision	609	22%	561	17%	1170	19%
Grading exams	183	7%	331	10%	513	8%
Grading thesis	238	9%	202	6%	440	7%
Course convener	217	8%	251	8%	467	8%
Other (admin)	88	3%	312	9%	400	7%
Other (course specific)	11	0%	80	2%	91	2%
Other (mixed or unspecified teaching)	131	5%	6	0%	137	2%
Total	2769	100%	3317	100%	6086	100%

Table 44: Teaching portfolios for different genders across levels of teaching

	Men		Women		Total	
Unspecified	12	0%	164	5%	175	3%
Undergraduate	1757	63%	2113	64%	3870	64%
Master	668	24%	596	18%	1264	21%
PhD	332	12%	445	13%	777	13%
Total	2769	100%	3317	100%	6086	100%

Table 45: Supervision portfolios across positions and levels

Position	Undergraduate		Master		PhD		Total	
Researcher	136	44%	101	33%	70	23%	306	100%
Associate senior lecturer	42	43%	26	26%	31	31%	99	100%
Senior lecturer	82	20%	126	30%	205	50%	413	100%
Professor	71	22%	85	26%	169	52%	325	100%
Total	330	29%	337	29%	475	42%	1143	100%

Variable list¹⁴

Label	Name	Coding
Gender	GENDER	1 = woman, 0 = man
Birth year	BIRTHyear	Year of birth
Defense year	DEFENCEyear	Year of defense, 0 = if not defended
External PhD	ExternalPhD	1 = PhD completed outside Department of Government, 0 = PhD completed at the Department of Government
Position	position	1 = PhD student, 2 researcher, 3 = associate senior lecturer, 4 = senior lecturer, 5 = professor
Semester	SEMESTER	0 = HT23, 1 = VT24
Level	LEVEL	0 = unspecified, 1 = undergraduate, 2 = master, 3 = PhD
Type of teaching	TypeTeaching	1 = seminars, 2 = lectures, 3 = supervision, 4 = grading exams, 5 = grading thesis, 6 = course convener, 97 = Other (admin, not on course), 98 = Other (direct

¹⁴ Some of the variable are used both in the dataset organized per teaching item and for the dataset organized around individuals.

Hours Visible	HOURS visible	contact with students), 99 = Teaching but not specified or mixed Hours spent on each teaching item 1 = if teaching is lectures, grading thesis, seminars, other (direct contact with students, 0 = OW
PhD student	PhDstudent	1 = PhD student, 0 = OW
Researcher	researcher	1 = researcher, 0 = OW
Associate senior lecturer	BUL	1 = associate senior lecturer, 0 = OW
Senior lecturer	lecturer	1 = lecturer, 0 = OW
Professor	professor	1 = professor, 0 = OW
Lectures	lectures	1 = lectures, 0 = OW
Grading thesis	grade_thesis	1 = grading thesis, 0 = OW
Seminars	seminars	1 = seminars, 0 = OW
Grading exams	grade_exams	1 = grading exams, 0 = OW
Other (admin)	admin	1 = other (admin), 0 = OW
Supervision	supervision	1 = supervision, 0 = OW
Course convening	convener	1 = course convening, 0 = OW
Other (mixed and unspecified)	other_mix	1 = other (mix), 0 = OW
Other (course specific)	other_teach	1 = other (course specific, student contact), 0 = OW
Total number of hours	TOTHOOURS	The total amount of hours a person spent teaching both semesters
Hours taught at unspecified level	L0	= all hours taught at unspecified level
Hours taught at undergraduate level	L1	= all hours taught at bachelor level
Hours taught at master level	L2	= all hours taught at master level
Hours taught at PhD level	L3	= all hours taught at PhD level
Seminar hours	T1	= all hours taught seminars
Lecture hours	T2	= all hours taught lectures
Supervision hours	T3	= all hours taught supervision
Supervision hours (undergraduate and master)	T3_um	= all hours taught supervision at undergraduate and master level
Grading exam hours	T4	= all hours taught grading exams
Grading thesis hours	T5	= all hours taught grading thesis
Course convener hours	T6	= all hours taught course convener
Other (admin) hours	T97	= all hours taught Other (admin)
Other (course specific) hours	T98	= all hours taught Other (course specific, direct contact with students)
Other (mixed or not specified) hours	T99	= all hours taught Other (mixed or not specified)
Number of courses	NoCourses	The total number of disparate courses a person taught on during both semesters. If the same course is taught twice, both fall and spring, it is only counted once (same literature/setup etc). We do not count administrative tasks. If "Swedish politics" is taught at different levels, they are treated as separate courses. Supervision is counted as separate courses, if at different levels (bachelor, master and PhD), we do not consider how many students it pertains to.
Hours per course	HperCourse	= (TOTHOOURS - T97) divided by NoCourses

Descriptive statistics

Table 46: Descriptive statistics for teaching items

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
BIRTHyear	906	1979.4	9.46	1957	1996
ExternalPhD	906	.274	.446	0	1
DEFENCEyear	881	1766.6	657.269	0	2023
position	906	3.10	1.335	1	5
GENDER	906	.557	.497	0	1
SEMESTER	906	.48	.5	0	1
LEVEL	906	1.458	.772	0	3
TypeTeaching	906	10.643	26.14	1	99
HOURS	906	6.718	5.805	.5	60
PhDstudent	906	.118	.323	0	1
researcher	906	.304	.46	0	1
BUL	906	.116	.32	0	1
lecturer	906	.278	.448	0	1
professor	906	.184	.388	0	1
seminars	906	.221	.415	0	1
lectures	906	.221	.415	0	1
supervision	906	.219	.413	0	1
grade exams	906	.115	.319	0	1
grade thesis	906	.056	.231	0	1
convener	906	.086	.281	0	1
admin	906	.052	.222	0	1
other teach	906	.023	.151	0	1
other mix	906	.008	.088	0	1
visible	906	.521	.5	0	1

Table 47: Descriptive statistics per person

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
BIRTHyear	80	1980.975	9.907	1957	1996
ExternalPhD	80	.25	.436	0	1
DEFENCEyear	80	1482.862	890.288	0	2023
position	80	2.8	1.496	1	5
GENDER	80	.537	.502	0	1
TOTTHOURS	80	76.077	43.557	2	209.75
L0 (hours unspecified level)	80	2.188	6.083	0	30
L1 (hours bachelor level)	80	48.373	32.397	0	162
L2 (hours master level)	80	15.8	25.172	0	159
L3 (hours PhD level)	80	9.716	16.078	0	86.5
T1 (hours seminars)	80	23.72	18.254	0	74
T2 (hours lectures)	80	12.123	11.308	0	44
T3 (hours supervision)	80	14.626	14.322	0	71
T4 (hours grading exams)	80	6.417	7.318	0	35
T5 (hours grading thesis)	80	5.497	11.109	0	51
T6 (hours course convener)	80	5.84	11.98	0	65.5
T97 (hours other admin)	80	5.005	9.582	0	40
T98 (hours other course specific)	80	1.143	3.592	0	25
T99 (hours unspecified or mixed)	80	1.706	11.787	0	102
PhDstudent	80	.25	.436	0	1
researcher	80	.287	.455	0	1
BUL	80	.062	.244	0	1
lecturer	80	.212	.412	0	1
professor	80	.188	.393	0	1
NoCourses	80	4.15	2.262	0	9
HperCourse	78	18.504	8.379	4.821	53
T3 um (hours supervision bachelor and master)	80	8.683	9.904	0	44

Survey questions

1. How many years has it been since your PhD defense?
2. What is your gender identity? Here the respondents could select multiple options, but only two were used.
3. Rank types of teaching according to how prestigious you think they are.
4. Rank levels of teaching according to how prestigious you think they are.
5. Rank types of teaching according to what you enjoy most.
6. Do you feel as though you could change your teaching portfolio, if you so wished? As in: do you know who to ask, how to go about it, feel as though you have agency in these decisions?
7. Rank types of teaching based on cost (i.e. number of hours, with 1 being most costly).
8. Rank levels of teaching based on cost (i.e. number of hours, with 1 being most costly).
9. What type of teaching do you want more of?
10. Feel free to share other thoughts you might have regarding this topic:

Means

Table 48: Prestige ranking relative to seniority (years since PhD defense)

	Seminars	Course convener	Lectures	Supervising	Grade exams	Grade thesis	Bachelor	Master	PhD
PhD student	4.00	2.09	2.64	2.82	5.27	4.18	2.70	2.00	1.50
Less than 5	4.67	1.44	2.11	3.11	5.89	3.78	3.00	2.00	1.00
Between 5 and 10	4.54	1.67	2.38	2.77	6.00	3.69	3.00	2.00	1.00
Between 10 and 15	4.43	2.14	2.14	3.00	5.00	4.29	2.50	1.75	1.38
Over 15	3.91	2.17	2.67	2.75	5.54	3.42	2.33	1.92	1.50
Total	4.29	1.90	2.42	2.87	5.58	3.83	2.71	1.94	1.27

Table 49: Prestige ranking relative to gender

	Seminars	Course convener	Lectures	Supervising	Grade exams	Grade theses	Bachelor	Master	PhD
Woman	4.35	1.97	2.37	2.80	5.52	3.97	2.71	1.93	1.36
Man	4.38	1.65	2.43	3.00	5.65	3.68	2.70	1.96	1.17
Total	4.36	1.84	2.39	2.88	5.57	3.84	2.71	1.94	1.27

Table 50: Cost ranking relative to seniority (years since PhD defense)

	Seminars	Course convener	Lectures	Supervising	Grade exams	Grade thesis	Bachelor	Master	PhD
PhD student	4.38	3.57	2.50	2.88	3.63	5.14	1.38	2.29	2.83
Less than 5	3.63	2.57	3.25	1.67	4.33	4.25	2.00	1.67	1.83
Between 5 and 10	4.54	2.85	3.62	2.85	2.92	2.85	2.09	2.18	1.45
Between 10 and 15	4.43	2.29	3.71	3.86	4.14	3.57	2.00	2.00	2.43
Over 15	3.23	3.33	2.31	2.67	4.33	3.92	1.92	1.83	2.00
Total	4.00	2.96	3.04	2.73	3.82	3.81	1.89	2.00	2.02

Table 51: Cost ranking relative to gender

	Seminars	Course convener	Lectures	Supervising	Grade exams	Grade thesis	Bachelor	Master	PhD
Men	4.35	3.00	3.13	2.27	4.09	3.59	1.90	2.00	2.00
Women	3.80	2.92	2.88	3.00	3.58	4.08	1.82	2.00	2.09
Total	4.00	2.96	3.04	2.73	3.82	3.81	1.89	2.00	2.02

Table 52: Enjoyment ranking relative to seniority (years since PhD defense)

	Seminars	Course convener	Lectures	Supervising	Grade exams	Grade thesis
Currently a PhD student	2.50	3.86	2.70	2.67	4.60	4.50
Less than 5 years	2.33	4.29	1.89	1.89	5.67	5.00
Between 5 and 10 years	2.92	3.08	2.38	2.38	5.69	4.08
Between 10 and 15 years	2.63	3.25	2.88	2.13	4.75	3.57
Over 15 years	2.69	3.85	2.36	2.23	5.42	3.62
Total	2.64	3.60	2.43	2.27	5.27	4.10

Table 53: Enjoyment ranking relative to gender

	Seminars	Course convener	Lectures	Supervising	Grade exams	Grade thesis
Woman	2.79	3.69	2.24	2.21	5.18	4.44
Man	2.54	3.48	2.54	2.30	5.35	3.83
Total	2.67	3.60	2.38	2.25	5.25	4.15

Example of time sheet report

Below is an example of what the time sheet reports look like. Under teaching, each teacher would fill out the details of the teaching they have completed over the last semester.

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	TEACHING	HT	2024			
2						
3	BASIC INFORMATION (DON'T FILL IN GRAY CELLS):				TOTALS (GENERATED AUTOMATICALLY)	
4	Name:	First name and last name			Total teaching duties (year/2):	82,875
5	Year of Birth:	1975			Total teaching hours (for this semester):	41,75
6	Total working time in %:	100				
7	Research in % of total working time:	50				
8	Administration in % of total working time:	10				
9					Balance (for this semester):	-41,125
10	Teaching in % of total working time:	39			Current balance (lektor hours):	-38,125
11	Compensation deduction in % (kompensationsavdrag)	1				
12	Balance brought forward from previous semester (lektor hours)	3				
13	Yearly working hours:	1700				
14						
15	TEACHING					
16	Course	Level	Type of teaching	Lektor hours	Comment	
17	Name of course 1	Undergraduate or Masters	Seminars	12		
18	Name of course 1	Undergraduate or Masters	Lectures	8		
19	Name of course 2	PhD	Examination	4		
20	Supervision	Undergraduate or Masters	Supervision	13,75		
21	Thesis examination	Undergraduate or Masters	Examination	4		

Figure 1: Example of time sheet report