Order Number 9431288

Gender equity instruction in Michigan teacher education programs

Mader, Cynthia E., Ph.D.

Michigan State University, 1994

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION IN MICHIGAN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

By

Cynthia E. Mader

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirement
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of College and University Administration

1994

ABSTRACT

GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION IN MICHIGAN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

By

Cynthia E. Mader

The purpose of this study was to determine if gender equity instruction was present in teacher education programs and identify program characteristics, faculty attitudes, preferred curricular approaches, barriers and facilitators.

Extensive research had confirmed the presence of gender bias affecting female students. Reform efforts were present in federal legislation and feminist scholarship, but mainstream education had been relatively absent from the discourse. Moreover, gender equity instruction for future teachers had been neither recently studied nor widely implemented.

This exploratory study surveyed 30 program administrators and 247 faculty members in Michigan pre-service programs. The study employed content analysis and descriptive statistics including frequencies, percentages, and measures of central tendency and variance.

Analysis of the data revealed that gender equity instruction was present at a minimal level. It did not occupy a prominent place in program policies or curricular design. Faculty advocated gender equity instruction and inclusive approaches to a greater extent than they included them in their own classes. Factors considered most

facilitative included more time and increased student interest; least facilitative factors included accreditation guidelines and certification requirements. Faculty ranked themselves higher than their programs and their programs higher than the profession in general on the incorporation of scholarship on women. Open-ended comments revealed interest in improving gender equity instruction and frustration with obstacles to progress.

Further research was suggested on inclusion patterns, actual inclusion compared to advocated inclusion, the differential impact of perceived barriers and facilitators, and the application of phase theory analysis to gender equity instruction.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the assistance and encouragement of my advisor Dr. Eldon Nonnamaker and committee members Dr. Louis Hekhuis, Dr. Keith Anderson, and Dr. Kathryn White.

Many dear friends and colleagues also deserve my gratitude for their patience, good humor and startling insights. To each of them I offer my sincere appreciation.

Most especially, I wish to thank my mother and father, Helen Mader and Clifford Mader. Their love, support and respect have allowed me the pleasure of always studying and working in the company of scholars.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES vi

Chapter

I. THE STUDY 1

General Perspective 1
Gender Equity Instruction and Teacher Education . 3
Statement of the Problem 5
Purpose of the Research 6
Rationale for the Study 6
Research Questions 8
Methodology 9
Assumptions of the Study 10
Limitations of the Study 10
Terminology 11
Organization of Subsequent Chapters 12

II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE 13

Research Trends: General Context 15
Educational Practice 18
Educational Theory and Teacher Education. 30
Reform Efforts 37
Gender Equity Instruction in Teacher Education . 46
Summary 58

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY . . 59

Research Questions 59
Study Population 61
Instrumentation 64
Data Collection 69
Data Analysis 72
Summary 74

IV. RESULTS OF THE STUDY. 75

Program Survey 75
Faculty Survey 87
Summary 108

Chapter Page

V. ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS 109

Conclusions. 109
Interpretations 122
Directions for Future Research 126

APPENDICES

A. Program Survey Instrument 130

B. Faculty Survey Instrument 134

C. Other Gender Equity Topics Included in Classes . . 141

D. Facilitators of Gender Equity Instruction 145

E. Barriers to Gender Equity Instruction 154

F. Additional Comments 162

BIBLIOGRAPHY 166

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Program Size By Number of Candidates Completing Program Annually	76
2	Program Size, Accreditation, and Public/ Private Status	77
3	Program Personnel By Gender and Rank or Position	78
4	Faculty Inclusion of Concrete-Level Gender Equity Topics	92
5	Faculty Inclusion of Mid-Level Gender Equity Topics	93
6	Faculty Inclusion of Abstract-Level Gender Equity Topics	94
7	Faculty Inclusion of Concrete, Mid-Level, and Abstract Topics By Mean Score of Respondents	95
8	Preferred Curricular Approaches to Gender Equity Instruction	100
9	Facilitators of Gender Equity Instruction	101
10	Instructional Typology: Ranking for Self, Program, and Profession	104
11	Faculty Inclusion of Concrete, Mid-Level, and Abstract Topics By Mean Score of Respondents	115

CHAPTER I

THE STUDY

General Perspective

Research conducted over the course of more than two decades has documented that female students are a "gender at risk" in elementary and secondary schools. (Sadker, Sadker, & Donald, 1989, p. 212).

Studies have shown that females start school academically even with or ahead of males but finish behind (Sadker, Sadker, & Donald, 1989). Females' self-confidence has been found to drop significantly between elementary and high school (Brown & Gilligan, 1992). Females who are competent in mathematics and science have been found to be less likely than males to pursue careers in these fields (National Science Foundation, 1990). Research shows that teachers pay less attention to females, call on them less often, and provide less encouragement in classroom activities (Brophy & Good, 1974; Jones, 1989a; Lockheed, 1984). Scholarships based on test scores are twice as likely to go to males even though females are more likely to go to college and receive higher grades (Rosser, 1989). School texts have been found to ignore or marginalize the contributions of women (Scott & Schau, 1985); a 1989 study

showed little change occurring over the last 80 years (Applebee, cited in American Association of University Women, [AAUW], 1992). Topics of concern to many females, such as sexual abuse, depression and gender politics in society, are rarely covered in school classrooms.

Attempts to address gender equity in education have been apparent in federal legislative action, state and local education policies, and national accreditation guidelines.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in education programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance. In 1974, the U. S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement established the Women's Educational Equity Act to fund educational programs for women and girls. In 1992, the U. S. Supreme Court extended its interpretation of Title IX to allow student victims of sexual harassment or discrimination the right to bring suit for monetary damages. In 1993, legislation known as the Gender Equity in Education Act (H. R. 1793, S. 1465) was introduced in Congress. Its goal was the reduction of sex discrimination in elementary and secondary education.

State agencies have examined gender equity in schools. Proposals for multicultural education in Michigan have included recommendations for combatting sexism and gender bias in state schools (Michigan State Board of Education, 1991b). Similarly, Michigan's school accreditation

standards have provided for a "gender-fair core curriculum for all students" (Michigan State Board of Education, 1992).

Local school districts have encouraged in-service training in gender equity. For example, the Grand Rapids Public School District offers training for teachers, administrators, and board members to remedy weaknesses identified by multi-cultural and gender-fair needs assessments (Grand Rapids Public Schools, 1991).

Accreditation agencies have also begun to address issues of gender equity (Woolever, 1981). The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), for example, includes multicultural education in its standards for teacher education programs, defining "multicultural perspective" to include recognition of the importance of sex and gender (NCATE, 1990, p. 65).

Gender Equity Instruction and Teacher Education

Reformers have also called upon schools and colleges of education to help future teachers recognize and combat gender bias in their schools and in their own teaching.

Sadker and Sadker (1985) recommended that teacher educators inform student teachers about Title IX, integrate equity information into courses, and include studies of women in education, sex differences, and gender bias in K-12 textbooks. Also urged were practice in equitable teaching skills and the inclusion of gender equity concerns in student-teaching evaluation forms and supervisory sessions.

Rose and Dunne (1989) called for similar revision of teacher education, targeting the elimination of bias in classroom dynamics, guided exposure to gender stereotypes and sexist language in textbooks, incorporation of research on biased teaching methods, and curriculum courses that inform students about resources promoting equal participation and achievement of women.

In its report summarizing almost a quarter of a century of gender research in education, the American Association of University Women (1992) included the following suggestions for teacher education reform among its 40 recommendations for reducing gender bias in K-12 education:

1. State certification standards for teachers and administrators should require course work on gender issues, research on women, classroom-interaction bias, and the development and implementation of gender-fair multicultural curricula.

2. Teacher-training courses must not perpetuate assumptions about the superiority of traits and activities traditionally ascribed to males in our society. Assertive and affiliative skills as well as verbal and mathematical skills must be fostered in both females and males. (AAUW, 1992, p. 85)

Statement of the Problem

In the face of this considerable body of research, it might be anticipated that teacher education programs would have incorporated gender equity instruction into their curricula. As the preceding discussion demonstrated, awareness of gender issues had increased, and numerous calls to action had been issued from those with gender equity concerns. Furthermore, model programs for teachers had been developed and tested; research showed that teaching methods improved with exposure to gender-fair practices; many teacher educators identified gender equity instruction as a topic suitable for teacher education; and practicing educators themselves reported an interest in improving gender equity in their classrooms (Grand Rapids Public Schools, 1991; Grant & Secada, 1990; Lambert & Rohland, 1983; Sadker & Sadker, 1981, 1985).

Yet a disparity seemed to exist between reform recommendations and actual practice in teacher education programs. Howe (1979) pronounced teacher education programs "among the most resistant to the impact of the women's movement" (p. 413). Powers (1981) noted that sex equity in teacher education programs remained "an optional and peripheral issue" (cited in Lather, 1983, p. 110). Lather's study (1984) revealed that "sex equity is largely invisible as a curricular issue in schools of education" (p. 11). Sadker and Sadker (1985) suggested that teacher education programs "may be reinforcing or even creating

biased teacher attitudes and behaviors" (p. 145). Sadker, Sadker and Donald (1989) underscored the absence of gender equity as a topic in most professional discussions of educational reform: "There is an eerie silence at one of education's most shocking and perplexing problems--the growing achievement gap between male and female students" (p. 212).

Thus, according to most scholarly commentary, not only had a "gender gap" been present in the education of youth, but perhaps an instructional gap had also existed between what was known about gender equity issues and what was taught to future teachers.

Purpose of the Research

The effort in this research was to determine whether such disparity existed in Michigan pre-service teacher education programs and to examine attitudes toward gender equity instruction.

The professional literature suggested that teacher education programs were giving only modest attention to gender equity issues despite a growing body of evidence that such attention was warranted.

Rationale for the Study

In providing information about the status of gender equity instruction in teacher education, this study might suggest possible directions for education reform efforts. Previous studies and commentaries, although limited in

number, had been helpful in assessing certain aspects of gender equity instruction. This study built on these previous efforts, in some cases narrowing the focus, in other cases expanding it.

Earlier commentaries had shed light on the apparent resistance to gender equity instruction in teacher education by suggesting barriers observed in other disciplines and in higher education in general (Maher & Rathbone, 1986; Rose & Dunne, 1989; Dunne & Rose, cited in Rose & Dunne, 1989). Additionally, Lather's (1983) valuable study surveyed teacher educators directly, although only those identified as already having feminist concerns; furthermore, the study was conducted some ten years prior to the present effort and before much of the current research on gender issues in education was available. More recently, Wilson (1993) surveyed teacher education administrators on gender equity components in their programs with the intent of identifying facilitators; however, the survey was given to program administrators, not faculty, and did not conceptualize gender concerns from an overtly feminist perspective.

In contrast, the current study included both feminist and general gender equity issues, provided a current assessment based on a range of literature, and drew from a population that included both administrators and faculty in teacher education programs.

Research Questions

The research questions of this project fell into two separate areas, the first having to do with programmatic efforts, the second having to do with individual faculty instruction efforts. Each of these also contained several specific topics of inquiry which elaborated upon the general questions. The two research areas were as follow:

Programmatic Response to Gender Equity Instruction

How was gender equity instruction characterized at the program level in Michigan teacher education programs?

1. To what extent were pre-service teacher education programs providing for gender equity instruction in their curriculum?

2. Had changes in coverage occurred recently; were any anticipated? What were the time frames?

3. To what extent did faculty, administrators, and formal policies support gender equity instruction?

4. What were the perceived barriers to inclusion of gender equity instruction?

5. What were the perceived facilitators of inclusion of gender equity instruction?

Faculty Response to Gender Equity Instruction

How was gender equity instruction characterized at the individual level for faculty members in teacher education?

1. To what extent were individual faculty members providing gender equity instruction in their classes?

2. To what extent did individual faculty members think gender equity instruction should occur in teacher education programs?

3. What were the preferred curricular approaches to gender equity instruction?

4. At what phase of a five-phase instructional typology did faculty members place themselves, their programs, and teacher education in general?

5. What were the perceived barriers to inclusion of gender equity instruction?

6. What were the perceived facilitators of inclusion of gender equity instruction?

Methodology

This exploratory study was based on the use of written questionnaires. Information was gathered through the administration of program surveys and faculty surveys. Results were reported in terms of descriptive statistics. A pilot study to modify the instrument and methodology was conducted prior to the actual study.

Institutions included in the study were 30 of the 31 Michigan public and private colleges and universities approved for teacher education by the Michigan Department of Education. The excluded institution served as the site of the pilot study. Programs under study within these institutions were the pre-service programs which prepare candidates for initial certification to teach in Michigan

elementary and secondary schools. Faculty members surveyed were those teaching the professional education courses required of all teacher candidates regardless of certificate level or endorsement.

Assumptions of the Study

The problem under investigation was based on assumptions which, if violated, could affect the validity of the study. Respondents were assumed to be sufficiently knowledgeable to respond accurately about their program's curriculum and about gender equity instruction. Perceived levels of instruction and perceived barriers and facilitators were assumed to correspond to actual levels of instruction and actual barriers and facilitators. Finally, it was assumed that survey items provided sufficient information for respondents to answer the research questions.

Limitations of the Study

Interpretation of the results of this study are limited by several considerations. Findings are applicable only to Michigan teacher education programs or similar programs in other states. They especially cannot be generalized to states or programs in which gender equity instruction is mandated. Findings are applicable only to courses and faculty members within the required professional education sequence. They cannot be generalized to other units in the university or other faculty who might teach courses also

taken by prospective teachers. Findings are applicable only to pre-service programs. They cannot be generalized to programs for the education of already-certified teachers or programs such as in-service, post-certification, and graduate studies.

Terminology

Gender Bias

Although gender bias can affect both males and females, this study focused primarily on bias affecting females. It stems from attitudes and beliefs, often unconscious, which relegate females to an invisible, passive, or inferior status.

Gender Equity Instruction

In teacher education programs, gender equity instruction is that which prepares future teachers to recognize and address the effects of gender bias in schools and society. Also included is an awareness of how the educational system itself can perpetuate inequity based on gender.

Pre-Service Courses/Professional Program

These courses comprise the professional education sequence required of all teacher candidates regardless of certificate level or endorsements. These sequences typically consist of courses in psychology and human development, educational history and foundations, curriculum and methods, and clinical/field experiences.

Organization of Subsequent Chapters

Chapter I introduced the topic of gender equity in K-12 schools and gender equity instruction in teacher education. It also included the rationale for the study, statement of the problem, and purpose of the research. It presented the research questions, assumptions and limitations of the study, methodology, and terminology.

Chapter II reviews the literature related to gender equity issues in educational practice and theory. It examines studies on gender equity instruction in teacher education programs and outlines instructional typologies which describe the process whereby scholarship on women enters the post-secondary curriculum. Much of the material presented in Chapter II also forms the basis for individual items used in the research instruments.

Chapter III describes the design of the study, details the actual research questions, and describes the population, instrumentation, procedures and data analysis.

Chapter IV reports results of the investigation. Chapter V contains a discussion of findings of the study with conclusions and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Two separate but related threads of research and scholarly writing informed and supported the current inquiry. The first related to the topic of gender equity in educational practice and theory. It was comprised of a considerable body of literature related to school curriculum, the discipline of education and teacher education, and educational reform efforts. As will be evident, the findings from this literature have been incorporated extensively into the creation of the questionnaires for this study.

The second thread which informed and supported this research was comprised of previous studies examining gender equity instruction in teacher education programs in institutions of higher learning. It examined the extent of such instruction, its effectiveness, and obstacles to its inclusion in teacher education curricula. These efforts explored whether future teachers have been made aware of gender equity issues.

Concern with and interest in gender equity has been so ubiquitous in the 1990's that it is tempting to regard the topic as new and revolutionary. In a two-year period, the

nation experienced the agony of the 1991 Anita Hill-Clarence Thomas hearings in which a Supreme Court nominee was accused of sexual harassment, followed in 1992 by the much-touted political Year of the Woman, during which females were elected to political office in unprecedented numbers.

As this research study was underway, a $360 million legislative package known as the Gender Equity in Education Act (H. R. 1793, S. 1465) was still to be voted on in Congress. The nine-bill omnibus measure would establish an Office of Gender Equity at the U. S. Department of Education designed to address sex discrimination in elementary and secondary schools.

Such efforts to redress gender inequity in education were in part, if not entirely, based on growing public awareness of the topic of gender equity in education. As the professional literature passed into the public domain, popularized by television commentators and newspaper reporters ("Center Research," 1992), the term "gender equity" became a new buzzword stimulating discourse, discussion, and debate.

However, as was evident from scholarly findings published in journals and reported at conferences for two decades, gender equity for female students was not really a new concern for professional educators but a concern which had already received considerable attention. (For extensive reviews of literature on the topic, the reader is directed to AAUW, 1992; Biklen & Pollard, 1993; Ginsburg & Clift,

1990; Grant & Secada, 1990; Sadker and Sadker, 1994; and Sadker, Sadker & Klein, 1991). The review of the literature which follows will detail some of the most salient research information.

Research Trends: General Context

Prior to the 1970's, discussion of the so-called "boy problem" (Hansot, 1993, p. 14) dominated most research and commentary on gender issues in elementary and secondary classrooms. Long concerned about lower grades earned by male students, lower reading proficiency scores, higher drop-out rates, classroom management problems, school crime and other at-risk behaviors, educators also feared the "feminization" of young males in school cultures thought to favor docile, compliant behavior (Sexton, 1969). Substantial efforts were devoted to identifying and remediating the deficiencies of male students and establishing environments suited to their presumed interests (Hansot, 1993). Although the needs and concerns of female students were probably not intentionally ignored by scholars, attention was more often directed toward problems experienced by male students.

When the "woman question" (Hansot, 1993) was raised, it was in the context of preparing females for marriage and motherhood rather than for intellectual and personal development. Nineteenth century female academies and their curricula had originated during a time of reverence for the Christian ideal of "true womanhood," with educational goals

of piety, purity, obedience and domesticity (Solomon, 1985, p. 25). Twentieth century academic versions of "true womanhood" included class offerings in home economics, nutrition, hygiene, and secretarial studies (Hansot, 1993; Sadker, Sadker & Klein, 1991).

The early 1970's marked a turning point in gender research when attention shifted to young females as the "gender at risk" (Shakeshaft, 1986, p. 499). While national debate on human rights and civil rights flourished, the women's movement challenged traditional assumptions about women's roles. Researchers began to question whether males and females who sat side by side in the same classroom were receiving the same education (Tetreault, 1986b). Research on educational gender bias experienced exponential growth in this period (Sadker, Sadker and Klein, 1991).

At least two counter-approaches to remedying gender bias evolved. Tetreault (1986b) labeled the earlier approach of research and practice "compensatory education" (p. 227). Compensatory education brought improved educational access for female students, a curriculum that was more gender-fair, and substantial changes in educational practices and attitudes. Also called "equity research," this emphasis continues to be reflected in current educational practices. As Tetreault pointed out, however, compensatory research and practice utilized a male norm, with females educated to fit it.

A second perspective, "transformative education" (Banks, 1989; Lather, 1983), focused on the female experience itself, emphasizing female learning styles and female contributions, especially in non-public spheres of home and family. This approach recognized traditionally female strengths as characteristics to be developed and valued in all humans, both male and female.

Events in the early 1990's provided a watershed of sorts for gender issues in both the public consciousness and to professional educators. In 1992, during the tumultuous political events referred to earlier, the American Association of University Women released a 116-page national report on gender bias in education (AAUW, 1992). The report received extensive news and media coverage and imprinted on the popular consciousness the need to address gender issues in education. Although the report broke no new ground, it summarized convincingly nearly a quarter of a century of gender research and, at minimum, provided significant impetus for the legislative reform described earlier.

In addition to these general contexts for gender equity research, the findings of research and scholarship related to gender equity in at least four distinct areas have had significant impact on the current study. These areas include: (a) gender issues in educational practice; (b) gender issues in educational theory and teacher education; (c) reform efforts related to gender equity, and (d) gender equity instruction in teacher education programs.

Educational Practice

Formal Curriculum

Although females enter school ahead of males on all standardized measures of achievement, twelve years later they leave high school with lower achievement scores, diminished self-esteem and self-confidence, and restricted career plans (Sadker, Sadker & Donald, 1989). Many components of educational practice, including the "formal" curriculum, the "hidden" curriculum, and the "evaded" curriculum (AAUW, 1992, p. 75), were scrutinized in research on gender in elementary and secondary schools in an effort to understand this phenomenon.

For example, one area of long-standing interest to researchers had been the discrepancy between male and female achievement in science and mathematics. As measured by tests such as the National Assessment of Educational Progress, Scholastic Aptitude Test, and Advanced Placement tests, gender differences in science achievement appeared to be increasing (Mullis & Jenkins, cited in AAUW, 1992). Differences also existed in mathematics although the gender gap seemed to be lessening (Friedman, 1989). Nonetheless, males continued to outscore females in mathematics, physics and biology. The gender gap widened as students advanced: Among high school students, only half as many females as males scored at the highest cognitive levels of reasoning in mathematics and science (AAUW, 1992).

Even when females earned good grades in mathematics and science, their confidence in these abilities and belief in their own competence were shown to decline. Females were found to choose careers in science and mathematics in disproportionately low numbers, even females who excelled in these subjects (AAUW, 1992; Sadker, Sadker and Klein, 1991). In exploring reasons for low female achievement in mathematics and science, researchers focused attention on factors such as differential course enrollment patterns (Pallas and Alexander, 1983), test bias (Cleary, 1991), and teacher and counselor encouragement (Campbell; Campbell & Metz; Hewitt & Seymour: cited in AAUW, 1992).

Also examined for evidence of gender bias were school textbooks, basal readers and other instructional materials which formed the basis of the formal school curriculum. Major studies in the 1970's found females to be under-represented and sex-role stereotyped. Dick and Jane As Victims (Women on Words and Images, 1972, 1975) examined 134 readers and found an overwhelming preponderance of male biographies, male-centered stories, male main characters, and even male animal characters. A 1975 teacher education textbook openly urged teachers to favor male-oriented books: "It has been found that boys will not read 'girl books' whereas girls will read 'boy books.' Therefore, the ratio of 'boy books' should be about two to one in the classroom library collection" (Rubin, cited in Sadker, Sadker & Klein, 1991, p. 278).

When Smith, Greenlaw and Scott (1987) asked 254 elementary teachers to identify their favorite books to read aloud to students, eight of the top ten choices contained male protagonists. Males were portrayed as self-sufficient; females were portrayed as wives and mothers, often in need of assistance. In a later study of elementary reading texts from four major publishers, males were found to be more frequently represented than females and portrayed as more active, more adventurous, and less emotional than females (Gonzalez-Suarez & Ekstrom, cited in Sadker, Sadker & Donald, 1989). Applebee's 1989 study of book-length works most frequently assigned in high school English courses found that nine of the top ten choices were written by white male authors and contained content which differed little in gender balance from the most frequently assigned books of 1907 (cited in AAUW, 1992). Purcell and Stewart's (1990) replication of the research design used in Dick and Jane As Victims demonstrated the presence of considerably more gender balance but also documented the continued portrayal of females as helpless.

Subject area texts received mixed reviews on elimination of gender bias. Compared to the androcentric bias reported in Trecker's (1971) study of 12 United States history textbooks, later studies revealed increased coverage of the activities of daily life rather than exclusive emphasis on wars, laws and public policy; however, females continued to be overshadowed by male adventurers, identified only as

social protesters, or patronized by the usual "famous women" approach (AAUW, 1992; Davis, Ponder, Burlbaw, Garza-Lubeck, & Moss, 1986; Tetreault, 1986a). Science and mathematics texts were found to reflect a more equal gender balance (Nibbelink, Stockdale, & Mangru, 1986; Powell & Garcia, 1985); however, Rutherford and Algren (1989) noted the continuing predominance of European scientific history and a traditional "great men" approach even in materials purporting to emphasize equity. Other textbook analyses identified overt and subtle forms of bias, critiqued curricular strategies, and proposed theoretical models of gender-fair curriculum approaches (Wilbur, cited in AAUW, 1992; Banks, 1989; McIntosh, 1989; Style, 1992; Tetreault, 1985).

Considering the foregoing findings, it is interesting to note that one of education's sturdiest assumptions has been that schools serve young females better than young males, as evidenced by lower numbers of female placements in remedial and special education programs (Harvey, 1986). Actual findings not only countered this assumption but also documented a male bias in most remediation efforts. Even though learning-related disabilities occurred equally in males and females, females were found to comprise only 33% of special education enrollments. When females were referred for help, they were generally older, had lower IQ's, were further behind academically, and exhibited more severe problems than male referrals. The greatest

differences were found to occur in categories influenced by subjective teacher judgment, categories such as learning disability and emotional impairment. These findings suggest that the more compliant behaviors of females might result in females not receiving special help (AAUW, 1992; Harvey, 1986; Mercer, 1973; Vogel, 1990).

Males were also found to predominate in regular academic remediation programs, not only in areas of acknowledged male under-achievement such as reading, but also in mathematics, an area of remediation where females might be expected to need help. Nor were male-targeted remedial efforts confined to formal remediation programs: Beginning in 1983, for example, Michigan regulations required that all teachers receive training in reading methodology (Michigan State Board of Education, 1990). No certification regulations required teachers to receive training in remediating the mathematics and science deficiencies experienced, typically, by females.

A provocative aspect of gender bias research examined the traditional curriculum and concluded that it may have evolved to serve the needs of male students:

> Two conclusions emerge repeatedly from the research on gender and schooling. First, what is good for males is not necessarily good for females. Second, if a choice must be made, the education establishment will base policy and instruction on that which is good for males. (Shakeshaft, 1986, p. 500)

Greenberg (1985), Baenninger and Newcombe (1989), and AAUW (1992) observed that early childhood programs emphasized male developmental needs: language development, small motor skills, and behavior control. Female needs such as spatial training, large motor skills, and creative experimentation were often relegated to free time and recess activities. Shakeshaft (1986) cited examples ranging from the age at which students study long division to the age at which they read Huckleberry Finn to demonstrate that grade level determinations have often been based on male readiness: "The result is that girls are often ahead of the game in some areas and never in the game in others. Some grow bored, others give up, but most learn to hold back, be quiet, and smile" (p. 500).

The term "evaded curriculum" has been used to describe topics rarely included in the traditional curriculum which may be of particular interest to females (AAUW, 1992, p. 75). Topics such as female contraception, eating disorders, depression, child abuse, sexual abuse, domestic violence, rape, pornography, and societal issues of gender, power, sexism and gender politics were either undertaught or entirely absent. When these issues were addressed, discussion occurred in sex-segregated classrooms or in the private offices of school counselors and social workers rather than being legitimized in open discussion benefiting all students. Among its 40 recommendations, the AAUW report addressed the evaded curriculum:

> School curricula should deal directly with issues of power, gender politics, and violence against women. Better-informed girls are better equipped to make decisions about their futures. Girls and young women who have a strong sense of themselves are better able to confront violence and abuse in their lives. (AAUW, 1992, p. 85)

Martin (1982) contended that the very purpose of traditional schooling has been the preparation of students for male-oriented public spheres of employment, success, achievement, competition and citizenship--evidenced by the traditional content of classes in history, government, economics, and debate. Schools have emphasized a male "ethos of rights" rather than the "ethos of care" and "connected learning" which typify female learning and interaction styles (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger & Tarule, 1986; Gilligan, 1982).

Classroom Interactions

Not only did males benefit from the formal school curriculum, research also suggested that they benefited from the informal, "hidden" curriculum comprised of school culture and classroom interactions as well.

The system of coeducation itself, according to researchers, may have favored male development. In all-female schools, young women were found to develop greater

self-esteem, demonstrate higher academic performance, and gain more practice in leadership activities than they did in coeducational settings. Young males did well academically in either setting; however, in coeducational settings males benefited from a "secondary curriculum" of desirable social and behavioral skills gained from exposure to female classmates (Shakeshaft, 1986).

The professional literature also examined teacher-student interactions, concluding that teachers themselves reinforced male dominance and female invisibility. Studies showed that teachers interacted more frequently and initiated more contact with male students; male students also initiated more contact with teachers. Furthermore, teachers were reported to respond even to inappropriate male student interruptions, but when female students called out of turn they were ignored or told to raise their hand (Sadker, Sadker & Thomas, cited in AAUW, 1992; Brophy & Good, 1974; Sadker & Sadker, 1986). Other findings suggested that teachers' encouragement and evaluations of students may explain why females become more orderly and conforming: Not only did teachers interact with male students at higher cognitive levels and ask them more complex, abstract, and open-ended questions, they generally encouraged males to persist with difficult tasks but allowed females to give up or completed tasks for them, implying that females were incapable of difficult work. When praising students, teachers more often complimented males

for creative thinking and intellectual content of assignments, females for neatness of assignments and good behavior (Sadker & Sadker, 1982). Although higher grade point averages earned by females were sometimes cited to refute the notion of gender bias, other research suggested that good grades came to females at the price of learned helplessness, diminished assertiveness, and lack of belief in their own efficacy (Dweck & Goetz; Dweck & Repucci, cited in AAUW, 1992; Frazier & Sadker, 1973).

Research on student-student interaction was not as extensive as research on teacher-student interaction, but evidence suggested that student-student interactions also subtly discounted females and reinforced their invisibility. Not only were females shown to spend more time watching and listening in class while male students performed experiments and engaged in classroom activities, but females were also shown to receive less verbal attention and acknowledgement from male classmates. Questions asked by male students were answered by both male and females students, but questions asked by female students were answered only by other females (Rennie & Parker, cited in AAUW, 1989; Lockheed & Harris, 1984). In addition, female students had less opportunity than males to work independently, thus less chance to become creative, risk-taking and problem-solving. When male students failed, they attributed their failure to lack of effort; when female students failed, they attributed their failure to lack of ability. Conversely, when male students

succeeded, they attributed their success to ability; when female students succeeded, they attributed their success to luck (AAUW, 1989; Ryckman & Peckham, 1987).

Although considerable research demonstrated the benefits of cooperative learning strategies for minorities and handicapped students, preliminary findings suggested that such strategies may work to the detriment of female students. In fact, cooperative learning strategies may not only be at cross-purposes with student preference for same-sex friendships (Best, 1983), they may also reinforce the perception of males as group leaders, authority figures and problem solvers, with females serving the group effort as helpmates, subordinates, and followers (Lockheed & Harris, 1984).

Researchers also concluded that sexual harassment between students, both physical and verbal, was at "epidemic proportions" in schools (AAUW, 1993b; Stein, Marshall & Tropp, 1993). Four out of five teens, both male and female, reported experiencing sexual harassment, but females reported substantially more devastating effects on academic performance, self-confidence, and self-esteem. Scholars contended that harassing actions, language or graffiti were rarely dealt with by teachers and administrators. "The silence can be deafening . . . Few teachers even code it as a problem . . . . After all, boys will be boys, and girls will continue to receive their schooling in a hostile environment" (Shakeshaft, 1986, p. 502).

Student Perceptions

In addition to studies of the formal school curriculum and classroom interactions, a related line of gender equity research focused on students' perceptions of the role gender played. Riley's (1993) Wisconsin study replicated a 1982 Colorado study (Baumgartner-Papageorgiou), finding agreement on many conclusions even though 10 years had elapsed between the two studies. Major areas of agreement included student beliefs about sex-role stereotyping of jobs; the importance of appearance for females; the prevalence of sexual objectification of females; the socialization of males to be independent and females to be dependent; and the identification of home and child care as women's domain.

A study of 3,748 Michigan students between 1988 and 1991 replicated parts of the Wisconsin and Colorado studies (Michigan State Board of Education, 1991a). Some 75% of responding Michigan students, both male and female, said that teachers treated males and females differently. Males were expected to be disruptive and received more attention; females received gentler treatment and were often given a second chance. Many teachers were said to have lower standards for female students or expect them not to succeed. Females could "slack off," but males were "pushed" (p. 4).

Michigan students attributed achievement in certain subjects to gender-based skills. They also believed females were more concerned with appearance than with intelligence: "Like in chemistry, guys are thinking about putting stuff

together and blowing something up . . . and girls are there thinking, 'What about my make-up, will it melt?'" (p. 7).

Michigan students also believed that males and females had different life expectations: "Guys have always known they were gonna have to go to college, get a job, etc., but not girls . . . I think girls are more afraid of failure . . . they just need to stay home and take care of their man" (p. 7).

Nearly one fourth of female students indicated they had at some time wanted to be male. Even those who hadn't could cite numerous advantages to being male:

"I think I would be more secure about things."

"I would not be as shy or worried."

"I'd be taken seriously for once in my life."

"I wouldn't have to do things twice as well."

"My life would be a dream come true. I would love it." (p. 9)

Only 3% of male students said they ever wanted to be female, and only 7% could cite any advantages. Most remarkable was the extreme nature of male response when asked to imagine being female:

"I would most likely go to instant insanity."

"A girl is a cow, pig, horse, donkey, elephant."

"It would be dumb, stupid, sucky and awful."

"I'd smell like rancid tuna my whole life."

"I would kill myself right away." (pp. 11-12)

Educational Theory and Teacher Education

Just as research on K-12 schools demonstrated inequity in educational practice, so were androcentric patterns demonstrated in educational theory and in the implicit content and structure of teacher education. Three areas within the discipline of education and teacher education received particular attention: teaching as a profession, educational research, and male-centered orientations underlying the discipline.

Teaching as a Profession

In relation to the prevalent perception of teaching as a "woman's profession," scholarly discourse focused on suggestions of implicit misogyny, disempowerment, and androcentric notions of what constitutes a profession. The history of teaching showed that men dominated early teaching ranks, but forces such as compulsory schooling, rising school populations, and the need for an inexpensive labor pool soon resulted in a primarily female work force. Women drew lower wages than men, experienced less autonomy, and had less upward mobility. At the same time, male administrators set about standardizing school structure, grade levels, and curriculum (Freidus, 1990; Goodman, 1992; Maher & Rathbone, 1986; Strober & Tyack, 1980). Apple observed, "It is not a random fact that one of the most massive attempts at rationalizing curriculum and teaching [the curricular reform movements of the 1960's] . . .

has as its target a group of teachers who were largely women" (cited in Lather, 1983, p. 185).

School staffing patterns in schools continued to reinforce the impression that "women teach, men manage" (Strober & Tyack, 1980). Furthermore, university teacher education programs echoed the gender imbalance: Most professors were male, most students female. Male faculty held highest ranks, had full tenure, served as deans and department chairs, and predominated in fields of educational research, philosophy and administration. Female faculty held lower ranks, served as adjunct or visiting faculty, held fewer administrative appointments, and predominated in fields of curriculum and human development (Lather, 1983; McCune & Matthews, 1975a; Sadker & Sadker, 1985; Shakeshaft, 1986).

The association of schoolteaching with women's work has been said to explain the low status of teaching and schools of education within the university and society. Lanier and Little (1986) maintained that the status of professional schools was proportional to the status of the groups they served: Teacher education's customarily low status within the university itself may have resulted from the low status characteristics of its students--females--and the clientele they served--children (Ginsburg & Clift, 1990; Goodman, 1992). Moreover, most teachers were shown to have entered the profession because they were drawn to service and caring, characteristics associated with females and

traditionally undervalued by society (Goodman, 1992). Indeed, female teachers were expected to serve and nurture, men to administer and set policy (Maher & Rathbone, 1986; Strober & Tyack, 1980).

Lather (1983) cited Reisman's suggestion that female teachers have been both victims and participants in their own oppression:

> Dedicated to sacrifice and service, crowded into an occupation full of structural disincentives, and over-socialized to be 'good girls,' women teachers have focused on responsive concern for students and worries about job performance at the cost of developing a more critical stance toward their cultural task of passing on a received heritage. (p. 177)

Interestingly, several feminist commentators criticized efforts to "professionalize" teaching, labeling the efforts misguided and male-biased. Laird (1988), for example, analyzed references to teaching as "women's true profession." The slogan, popularized in 1846 by early educator Catherine Beecher, may have been simply descriptive at the time but, according to Laird, it became demeaning and stereotypical--to women, or teaching, or both. Efforts from reform bodies such as the Holmes Group and Carnegie Task Force to make teaching a "true" profession in the tradition of doctors, lawyers, engineers and other typically male occupations rankled feminist scholars as an affront to

the historical contributions of female teachers and an ill-conceived effort to "upgrade" the occupation by masculinizing it rather than by reconceptualizing it. Laird (1988) criticized both groups for discounting female teachers: Holmes for lamenting the loss of "a captive market of bright, energetic minorities and women (who) now have attractive alternatives in business, industry and other professions" (Holmes Group, 1986, p. 35); Carnegie for comparing the duties of female teachers to those of "semiskilled workers on the assembly line rather than those of professionals" (Task Force, 1986, p. 36). Laird noted gender bias in the Holmes and Carnegie implication that "'professional' values traditionally defined by men rather than so-called 'feminine' values associated with child-bearing must become sovereign in schoolteaching" (p. 458).

Educational Research

Educational research itself also came under close scrutiny. Considerable attention was directed to traditional educational research methods, practices, and conclusions which demonstrated and perpetuated gender bias. Not only were white males found to comprise the most frequently studied populations, with results overgeneralized to include all people, but most researchers were also white males, whose research was presented and published more often than that of females, and who comprised editorial boards selecting research for publication in scholarly journals.

The framing of research questions was said to either view females as victims or employ a deficit model of femaleness; publications in general were said to favor "difference research" by choosing studies demonstrating male-female differences or deficits over those demonstrating male-female similarities (Campbell & Greenberg, 1993).

Educational theory relied heavily on knowledge bases from educational psychology and human growth and development, both of which were criticized for androcentric bias (McCune & Matthews, 1975a; Tittle, 1985). Not only had developmental theories been based on studies of male populations, but when female subjects didn't "measure up" to male performance, researchers such as Freud, Erikson, and Kohlberg attributed the deficiency to gender, not to their research designs. Kohlberg (1969, 1981) identified six stages of moral reasoning after studying a sample composed solely of young males. When females were rarely found to advance beyond stage three of his model, the interpersonal stage, Kohlberg concluded that females were underdeveloped, not that the model should be bifurcated. Similarly, Erikson's (1950) Eight Stages of Man explored the male quest for autonomy, ignoring the theory's poor fit with female developmental tasks. According to O'Reilly and Frankel (1982), "Erikson believed that female identity would be complete after she had selected the man who would impregnate her" (p. 4). Commenting on Freud's theory that females envy males, Chodorow (1978) acknowledged the possible existence

of such envy but sensibly attributed it to a realistic acknowledgement of male power rather than to a symptom of female inferiority. Not until ground-breaking work by theoretical scholars such as Chodorow (1978), Gilligan (1982), and Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger and Tarule (1986), was it acknowledged that female development might simply be different from male development, not deficient. Subsequent research suggested a pattern of male development characterized by achievement, autonomy, responsibility, ethics and justice; a pattern of female development characterized by relationship, intimacy, nurturing, helping and connectedness. However, theories of female development were found not to receive the widespread attention that traditional theories of male development enjoyed (Maher & Rathbone, 1986; O'Reilly & Frankel, 1982; Shakeshaft, 1986).

Androcentric Orientation

An underlying androcentrism in the discipline was also identified. Ginsburg and Clift noted a pervasive masculine orientation in the hidden curriculum of teacher education:

> Classroom discourse tends to reflect masculine language, analyses of educators and other workers tend to be based on models of male experience, and the dominant orientation is that of "masculine intellectualism, abstractionism and consequentialism . . . (versus) compassion and caring" (Ginsburg & Clift, 1990, p. 458; Noddings, cited in Ginsburg and Clift, 1990, p. 458).

One such example of this masculinist orientation was said to be the profession's attraction to areas such as technology and competency-based objectives, criticized by some educators as technocratic, non-reflective, and more closely aligned with training than with education (Goodman, 1992). Lather (1983) criticized computer technology as "the latest and quite possibly most comprehensive version of the masculine enthusiasm for technological solutions to educational problems" (p. 169). Lather (1983) and Goodman (1992) also decried the over-use of computer education, educational technology, behavioral objectives, teacher-proof curricula, competency-based teacher education, and the overall "de-skilling" of teachers.

Lanier and Little (1986) noted the dearth of opportunities for teachers to become true participants in the educational process, while Ginsburg and Clift (1990) summarized other research on the existence of an underlying mechanistic orientation in teacher preparation programs. These included the cognitive emphasis of teacher education and the concept of knowledge as "given" (Berlak & Berlak, cited in Ginsburg & Clift, 1990; McCune & Matthews, 1975a); belief in the myth of "right answerism" embedded in teacher education programs (Cornbleth, 1987); the very notion that a corpus of pre-defined knowledge exists, thus serving to separate teachers and learners (Bartholomew, cited in Ginsburg & Clift, 1990); and the growing emphasis of teacher preparation on behavioral management and classroom control,

thus shifting the emphasis of teaching from emotional closeness to emotional detachment (Connell, cited in Ginsburg & Clift, 1990).

Research efforts also leveled criticism at teacher preparation programs which legitimized hierarchy and competition in their own sorting and selection processes. Admission to most schools of education was shown to be determined by quantifiable criteria such as grades, grade point averages and completion of course prerequisites (Ginsburg & Clift, 1990). Furthermore, passing scores on entrance and exit examinations were often required by accrediting agencies. In Michigan, as in many other states, certification was withheld until candidates passed state competency examinations, regardless of performance in their teacher preparation courses (Public Act 267, 1986; Public Act 282, 1992). Interpersonal characteristics of prospective teachers, including aptitude for teaching, cultural sensitivity, and personal values, received less legislative attention.

Reform Efforts

Attempts to redress inequity based on gender might be expected to emerge from three areas: legislation, mainstream education reform, and feminist scholarship. Legislation and feminist scholarship have proved more promising than mainstream education reform.

Legislative Reform

State and federal legislation has the clear potential to address gender diversity in education. Indeed, policy researchers in the field noted that such legislation had become a useful instrument in countering gender bias.

Three pieces of legislation formed the foundation of federal gender equity law. Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 prohibited sex discrimination in any educational program receiving federal funds. The Women's Educational Equity Act of 1974 (WEEA) provided funds for research, training, curriculum materials, and improved access for female students. The Vocational Education Act of 1976 (VEA), later the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, provided funding for gender equity programs in vocational education and required that each state appoint a full-time sex equity coordinator. Stromquist (1989) suggested that Title IX formed the "stick" of the law by threatening to withhold funding from institutions that discriminated; while WEEA and VEA represented the "carrot" of the law by providing assistance in implementing gender-fair programs. Historical research identified several obstacles preventing the speedy implementation of these federal efforts: Monitoring systems were ill-defined; sex discrimination complaints often took a back seat to racial discrimination complaints; funding was severely curtailed during conservative administrations; and the impact of Title IX was blunted by a 1984 Supreme Court decision restricting

fund withdrawal only from discriminating programs rather than from entire institutions (Grove City College v. Bell). In 1988, however, Title IX was strengthened with the Civil Rights Restoration Bill, and in 1992 a Supreme Court decision (Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools) enhanced Title IX's stature by allowing victims of sex discrimination to sue for monetary damages (Stein, 1993). The Gender Equity in Education Act (H. R. 1793, S. 1465), first introduced in Congress in 1993, would revitalize the WEEA by providing assistance and funds to local school districts to eliminate gender inequities (Lawton, 1993).

Unfortunately, a growing body of evidence indicated that federal legislation was not well understood by some educators. A 1990 report of school districts in 21 states showed that 73% of the administrators could not identify any Title IX violations in their districts even though investigators had identified several; 28% had made no effort to go beyond the letter of equal access law; some labeled concerns over equal access for females "stupid" or "frivolous" (Schmuck & Schmuck, cited in AAUW, 1992).

Critics who pointed to the limited impact of federal legislation contended that it was inattentive to curriculum and textbook inequities, did not provide for teacher training on a comprehensive scale, and was relatively unsuccessful in making itself known to mainstream educators (Stromquist, 1989). However, they noted that Title IX had a strong effect on improving opportunities for females in

athletics and vocational education, eliminating sex-segregated classes, increasing female participation in non-traditional programs, designing training materials for teachers, and requiring fairer treatment of pregnant students (AAUW, 1993a; Stromquist, 1989).

Education Reform

The term "eerie silence" characterized mainstream education's response to research about gender bias in schools (Sadker, Sadker & Donald, 1989, p. 212). Compared to responses from government policy makers, the silence from the profession itself was considered disappointing by gender equity scholars. Gender was virtually absent as a topic in the national debate on education reform despite the issuance of several major education reform reports after A Nation At Risk (1983) raised national concern over "the rising tide of mediocrity" in education. Shakeshaft (1986) suggested that political conservatism stalled the gender equity agenda in mainstream education reform by creating a false dichotomy between equity and educational excellence. Noting that then-President Reagan criticized what he perceived to be a national preoccupation with females, minorities and handicapped students, Shakeshaft responded, "If these three groups of students are eliminated, only about 15% of the school population remains" (p. 499).

Tetreault and Schmuck (1985) analyzed seven mainstream education reform reports between 1982 and 1984. Only one

report called for increasing participation of women in mathematics and science. Two reports mentioned sex bias but not how to address it. Three reports omitted gender entirely as a meaningful category. One report made no mention of Title IX or sex discrimination even though it referred to other equity legislation and discrimination based on race, color, religion and nationality.

Sadker, Sadker and Steindam (1989) conducted a line-by-line analysis of 138 reform articles published between 1983 and 1987 in nine professional journals. Only 1% of article content touched on gender equity; even then the topic was most often treated as inconsequential.

An analysis of 35 reform reports published between 1983 and 1991 by special commissions or task forces found only one that addressed opportunities for females and commitment to Title IX. Four reports included gender as a category. The remaining thirty, however, either identified high school pregnancy as the only gender issue or failed entirely to mention gender as an educational issue (AAUW, 1992).

Masland's (1992) line-by-line analysis of the Holmes Group Forum found no mention of gender equity, echoing an earlier report of feminist educators' concerns about efforts of the Holmes Group and Carnegie Task Force, especially their inattention to women's role in the educational workplace, inattention to issues of gender and equity, and gender-biased notions of what constitutes a profession (Tarbet, 1988).

Feminist Scholarship

The most fervent response to gender inequity in education came, predictably, from feminist scholars. Overall, the field of women's studies had experienced explosive growth, confirmed by reports from the Association of American Colleges and the National Women's Studies Association (cited in Mooney, 1993) and intense scholarly interest in the subject both nationally and internationally (McMillen, 1992). Early studies on gender "unleashed an extraordinary array of feminist scholarship" (Biklen & Pollard, 1993, p. 5). Although distinctions have been made here between compensatory education (or, equity scholarship) and transformative education (or, feminist scholarship), these two approaches were neither mutually exclusive nor exhaustive of the schools of feminist thought. In fact, labels such as socialist feminism, liberal feminism, radical feminism, materialist feminism, cultural feminism, and postmodern feminism prompted Biklen and Pollard (1993) to comment on the variety of American feminist thought:

> So at the end of the twentieth century we can no longer speak about a woman's movement or a feminist movement. Now we must speak in the plural. In the United States we speak of feminisms rather than feminism because there are many differences in the perspectives taken by feminist theoretical positions regarding the situations of women and men and their relationships to other women and men. (p. 7)

Even so, it must be recognized that liberal feminism and cultural feminism were central to scholarship on gender equity in United States elementary and secondary education. Liberal feminist scholars most often emphasized educational equity, an approach whereby females would receive equal treatment in classrooms and curriculum, come in contact with visible female role models, achieve equal educational outcomes, and emerge from school ready to assume their place alongside males in society and the workplace. Cultural feminist scholars viewed equity as an insufficient goal, calling instead for a transformation in education whereby traditionally female qualities such as nurturing, cooperation, and collaboration would be valued in their own right and developed in all individuals. According to this vision, males and females would emerge from school possessing the best attributes and skills of each gender, not just those traditionally ascribed to their own gender or to the dominant male gender.

Most feminist scholarship urged a transformative approach in K-12 classrooms and in teacher preparation programs rather than simply the addition of material and experiences on females to the curriculum. Manicom (1984) noted, "Feminist theory is not merely additive . . . it involves a profound critique of the nature of academic work" (p. 78). Feminist scholars decried "add-women-and-stir" strategies of curriculum transformation (Bunch, cited in Thibault, 1988, p. 69), and cited the limitations of

additive approaches: "We do not add the idea that the world is round to the idea that the world is flat" (Minnich, cited in Lather, 1984, p. 20).

Maher and Rathbone (1986) reflected on ways to introduce feminist concepts to future teachers and encourage their integration into teaching: how women have shaped American schools, how girls are socialized to be girls and boys to be boys, how female traits might be valued rather than exploited, recognizing implicit bias in language and curriculum, using microteaching strategies to practice fair teaching techniques, and instituting collaborative modes of learning.

Style (cited in AAUW, 1992) envisioned the school curriculum as a structure which should contain windows and mirrors. Females and students of color were described as having many curricular windows to look out at the dominant culture but few mirrors to validate their own lives. White males were described as having many mirrors but few windows to look out at those not of their race or gender, a perspective which distorts their view of their own power and privilege.

Developing concurrently with curriculum transformation theories, feminist phase theory typologies provided a useful tool for assessing the extent to which scholarship on women was being incorporated into the curriculum (Lerner, 1981; McIntosh, 1984, 1989; Schuster and VanDyne, 1984; Tetreault, 1985; Tetreault, Arch and Kirschner, 1982). These

typologies were used in a variety of efforts: to assess coverage of women's history in the curriculum (Lerner, 1981); to determine individual faculty members' integration of feminist consciousness (Schuster & VanDyne, 1984); to assess gender bias in high school materials (Talbot, 1987); to evaluate syllabi in teacher education programs (Lather, 1983); and to assess the consciousness of white feminists on matters of race and gender (Sleeter, 1993). The stages described in feminist phase theory also reflected a recurring theme in the overall literature: the evolution from an equity approach to a transformative approach in the curriculum of schools and future teachers.

As explicated by at least one phase theorist (Tetreault, 1985), first-phase curriculum does not contain scholarship on women nor is its absence noted; the norm in first-phase curricula is male. Second-phase curriculum recognizes the contributions of women but only those who prove "exceptional" by rising above their gender to excel in traditionally male spheres. Typical of mention in second-phase curricula would be female astronauts, female prime ministers and female school principals. Third-phase curriculum emphasizes the separate spheres of males and females, acknowledges women's oppression, and holds equity issues paramount. Third-phase curriculum encourages females to "rise" in the world of employment and public affairs, but, as in second-phase curricula, females are still measured against a male norm of success. The move to

a fourth-phase curriculum marks a dramatic shift toward "transformative" education: it abandons the male norm to focus on women's daily lives and quiet contributions, especially with children, friendships, and the work of maintaining human relationships. Fourth-phase curriculum validates traditionally female characteristics and stresses their availability to all human beings. Fifth-phase curriculum is multi-relational, searching for similarities between males and females and viewing "maleness" and "femaleness" as points on a continuum of humanness.

Gender Equity Instruction in Teacher Education

A major section of the literature on gender equity related directly to the investigation at hand: literature on gender equity instruction in pre-service teacher education programs. It was these works which had the most influence on the research process utilized in the current study.

There was no shortage of professional works relating to the inclusion of gender equity topics and the products of feminist scholarship in teacher education programs. Indeed, pre-service education was often viewed as the supremely logical place to address gender bias in education. However, as this review will demonstrate, surprisingly little empirical evidence was available about the effectiveness of gender equity instruction, the extent of such instruction in pre-service programs, or the obstacles preventing greater inclusion in teacher education programs. Relevant studies are summarized here.

Effectiveness of Gender Equity Instruction

Although limited in number, experimental studies were conducted to assess the effectiveness of pre-service gender equity instructional strategies. Tentative conclusions from a variety of efforts were reported by Grant and Secada (1990) and are included among the following findings pertinent to this discussion:

1. As measured by phase-theory analysis, social studies student teachers included more scholarship on females in their lesson plans after exposure to gender equity concepts in their social studies methods courses than students did who were not exposed (Nelson, 1990).

2. Recent teacher education graduates displayed the same amount of gender bias as experienced teachers despite their youth and presumed heightened awareness of gender issues. The extent of gender biased behaviors among 60 science teachers was the same for new teachers as for veteran teachers (Jones, 1989b).

3. A study of 876 prospective teachers exposed to a weekly lecture-discussion class in multicultural education showed females to be initially more sensitive to gender issues than males although the rate of positive change was the same for males as for females (Koppleman & Martin, cited in Grant & Secada, 1990).

4. Wisconsin teachers who completed five or more pre-service credits in multicultural education reported engaging in a significantly greater number of equitable teaching

behaviors than those who had completed four credits. The lowest number of equitable behaviors was reported by teachers who had completed only one or two credits (Sleeter, cited in Grant & Secada, 1990).

5. Specific, direct instructional strategies in gender equity were more effective than general, indirect strategies in decreasing sex-role stereotyping by 50 pre-service teachers (Lambert & Rohland, 1983).

6. Among student teachers who received instruction for 11 hours over the course of four days in gender equity topics, there was a significant gain in knowledge and attitudes. After 26 days, attitude gains diminished, but knowledge gains persisted (Henington, 1981).

7. Although traditional attitudes toward gender remained unchanged after exposure to 12 instructional modules, the lesson plans of elementary school teachers reflected growth in sex equity awareness (Smith, cited in Grant & Secada, 1990).

The largest reported experimental study on the effectiveness of inclusion was undertaken by Sadker and Sadker (1981) at 10 teacher education institutions. Six modules were used, covering issues of sexism in American education, impact of female teachers, psychology of sex differences, teacher-student bias, instructional bias, and school organizations. Student teachers found the topic of sexism relevant, urged its continuation in education

courses, indicated that the topic had increased in importance in their perception, and felt they better understood how teachers can influence sex stereotyping. More than half of the students also reported experiencing a critical insight as a result of the instruction.

A final example illustrates the unconscious nature of gender bias as well as teachers' eagerness to improve: In a training session on gender awareness, teachers viewed a videotape considered representative of good teaching practice both before and after receiving instruction in gender equity. Many were startled at the overt and subtle biases they failed to notice in the first viewing. Furthermore, as one teacher noted, "I thought I was being equitable. Then they scored me. I was doing what 90% are documented as doing." Trainer and researcher Myra Sadker noted, "Teachers are among the most equitable people we work with" ("Working Toward Equity," p. 16-17).

Extent of Gender Equity Instruction

In the past two decades, four studies were conducted on the extent to which specific teacher education programs incorporated gender equity instruction (Lather, 1983; McCune and Matthews, 1975b; Styer, 1982; Wilson, 1993). Additionally, two reports summarized information on the extent of such incorporation (Howe, 1973; AACTE, cited in Sadker & Sadker, 1985). Most of these efforts reviewed women's studies programs rather than teacher education programs, presumably because women's studies programs were

the most common vehicles for gender equity instruction during that time period. Most of the research did not distinguish between pre-service, in-service, and graduate training on gender equity topics. Furthermore, most surveyed program administrators and did not include teacher education faculty members. Interestingly, most of the studies were published during the early years of the period under consideration, indicating perhaps a gradual decrease in attention to the topic of gender equity in the intervening years or a presumption that the problem of gender inequity had been adequately addressed.

The earliest study (Howe, 1973) reported that, of some 1200 women's studies courses offered in United States universities, fewer than 10 were offered in schools of education. Two years later, McCune and Matthews (1975b) reported that 104 institutions of 1200 surveyed provided a total of 184 women's studies courses in education departments. Most of these were provided at public institutions and were elective offerings. These courses were found to reflect content in general awareness and consciousness raising, sex role socialization, instructional practices, and historical, legal, and professional issues. Limitations noted included inadequate discussion of male stereotyping, strong behavioral science orientations with insufficient applications to education, little opportunity for application of skills, and absence of comprehensive discussion of class and racial inequities.

The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education's study (1977) of 786 member institutions concluded that 52% of responding institutions provided for gender instruction in their programs; only 8.7% required such instruction (cited in Woolever, 1981).

Styer (1982) surveyed 228 women's studies directors in institutions providing teacher education, finding that 42% offered women's studies courses in their schools of education. Most of these occurred in public institutions; all but one were elective offerings. Areas of emphasis included sexism, women in the curriculum, instruction, history, career development, and counseling. Respondents in institutions with no women's studies offerings in teacher education identified teacher educators' lack of interest, lack of receptivity, and resistance to course development as reasons for this absence.

Lather (1983) surveyed 145 women's studies directors and 250 feminist teacher educators in conjunction with studying 85 syllabi from courses on gender and teacher education. Although the presence of a strong bias was acknowledged because respondents were drawn from a population known to have gender equity concerns, and courses by definition were those which had gender as their emphasis, the conclusions were nevertheless enlightening. Of the 85 course syllabi analyzed according to phase theory typologies described earlier, 19% functioned at the simplest, additive stage; 37% at the stage which questions the very structure

of the discipline; 22% at the stage that attempts to understand women's experience on its own terms; 14% at the stage which examines issues of class, power, and oppression; and 8% at the highest level of feminist analysis. From surveys and interviews with respondents, Lather further concluded:

1. Sex equity was largely invisible as a curricular issue in schools of education.

2. Infusion into the curriculum was a more prevalent pattern than separate courses.

3. Deans were more often indifferent than not; reactions of colleagues ranged from supportive to hostile.

4. Student responses ranged from anger to total change in perception.

5. Accreditation and state certification requirements were viewed as providing little support for increased visibility.

6. Few teacher education faculty were involved in women's studies programs.

Ten years after Lather's study, Wilson (1993) surveyed administrators of 547 teacher education programs with NCATE accreditation. Of the 200 respondents, 54% reported no gender equity component in their pre-service program. (Of the six Michigan institutions which responded, three provided no gender equity components in their programs.) Wilson's preliminary data indicated that accreditation was

not necessarily associated with the inclusion of gender equity instruction, infused and multicultural courses were more prevalent than separate courses, elective courses predominated, programmatic guidelines for gender equity were not prevalent, and assessment evaluating the success of gender equity instruction was rare.

Obstacles to Gender Equity Instruction

Considerable interest in identifying obstacles to the inclusion of gender equity instruction in pre-service classes for teachers was reflected in the professional literature. Howe (1973) found few courses in educational gender issues and described schools of education as "among the most resistant to the impact of the women's movement" (Howe, 1979, p. 413). Confirming Howe's conclusions, the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education declared that "any exposure of prospective teachers to sex equity issues is often elective and usually occurs outside the school's department of education" (cited in Sadker & Sadker, 1985). In 1981, Powers labeled gender equity an "optional and peripheral issue" in teacher education (cited in Lather, 1983, p. 110).

Lather (1983) found little programmatic commitment to gender equity instruction in teacher education programs; Sadker and Sadker (1985) further suggested that these programs "may be reinforcing or even creating biased teacher attitudes and behaviors" (p. 145). Grant and Secada (1990)

concluded: "The limited attention in the explicit university curriculum for pre-service teachers to social issues such as class, gender and race conveys the message that these issues are unimportant for prospective teachers" (p. 457).

Some researchers cited the lack of professional literature on gender equity as a major obstacle to its inclusion in the pre-service curriculum, concluding that its absence reflected the overall invisibility of gender issues in teacher education. Although gender-related topics appeared in other education journals, their appearance was rare in the professional literature of teacher education. A search of the ERIC data base for works published between 1978 and 1981 on teacher education found less than one half of 1% of article content related to race or gender equity (Girard, cited in Sadker & Sadker, 1985).

An examination of Journal of Teacher Education from 1972 through 1982 located the terms "sex" or "gender" only eight times in 564 feature articles, exclusive of one issue devoted to sexism. The topic did not occur even in articles where the fit would have been appropriate; for example, multicultural education, human relations, equal access and cultural awareness (Masland, 1992).

A search of ERIC documents for empirical research on gender equity instruction located only 10 studies published between 1964 and 1968. The researchers criticized the apparently marginal status of such research, also observing that most works appeared outside of mainstream publications:

> At best, this suggests great insensitivity among those engaged in the peer-review process for such journals. At worst, there is blatant bias against research efforts involving teacher education predicated on the existence of diverse populations. (Grant and Secada, 1990, p. 404)

Also cited as an obstacle to gender equity instruction for future teachers was the absence of suitable textbooks. In a study of the 24 best-selling teacher education texts, it was found that 23 of the 24 devoted less than 1% of their space to the issue of sexism. These texts provided little or no mention of Title IX, did not discuss women in American education, allotted five times more space to males than to females, and cited 20 males for every female cited. One text presented the advantages and disadvantages of differential pay scales for male and female teachers (Sadker & Sadker, 1980).

More recently, Titus (1993) found virtually no change in teacher education foundations textbooks. With the exception of one exemplary publication (Sadker and Sadker, 1991), gender coverage for future teachers had not changed in 13 years. Titus found that Title IX was given cursory coverage; terms such as "sex," "gender," "sex roles," and "gender roles" were used inaccurately; sexism was ignored as an issue of power and hierarchy; no mention was made of women's history in education or feminist analyses of

schooling; and students were not encouraged to question their beliefs on gender-related issues.

Still another obstacle to the inclusion of pre-service gender equity instruction cited in the literature was the lack of attention by accrediting agencies. Not until 1990 did the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) add explicit standards for instruction on gender. Earlier standards from 1979 and 1982 had stated only that "multicultural education could include . . . issues such as participatory democracy, racism and sexism, and the parity of power" (NCATE, 1979, 1982, 1990).

Disincentives to gender equity instruction suggested by other researchers included weak accreditation standards, the reluctance of state education agencies to interfere with college and university programs, and the relative isolation of teacher education programs from the actual world of K-12 schools and educational practice. The overcrowded curriculum of teacher education was also said to leave little room for courses on gender issues. Such courses, when they existed, were provided as electives; information on gender equity was seldom incorporated throughout the curriculum (Lather, 1983; McCune & Matthews, 1975a; Rose & Dunne, 1989).

The characteristics of students in pre-service programs were also examined to better understand the apparent difficulty of incorporating gender equity topics into the curriculum. For example, political activism, often the

catalyst for curriculum expansion and revision in academic disciplines, was found in two studies to be less common among education students than among those enrolled in other programs (Antonucci, 1980; Lather, 1981). Furthermore, studies of future teachers supported the conclusion that education students' awareness of and interest in gender equity was lower than those of other students in academia. Smith and Bailey (cited in Jones, 1989b), determined that pre-service teachers, 98% of whom were female, believed that men were more dedicated teachers than women and that students preferred male teachers to female teachers. Smith and Farina (1984) predicted that female students' internalized ideas about male superiority would surface in their subsequent teaching behaviors.

Faculty and administrative indifference and lack of knowledge about gender equity issues were also cited as further obstacles to inclusion of instruction. Courses on gender issues were found to be established, typically, by one or two female activists on each faculty, who then became the sole purveyors of content for that program. Even teacher educators committed to the inclusion of gender equity instruction were found to express frustration with the heavily male-defined curriculum (Howe, 1973; Lather, 1983; Rose & Dunne, 1989).

Finally, many scholars concluded that most traditional teacher education programs were reproductive rather than reconstructive in nature. Although some encouraged social

change, most reinforced rather than challenged prevailing social mores. A 1990 review of literature on the hidden curriculum in teacher education summarized this perspective:

> When society and its relation to schooling are discussed in teacher education, the hidden message is that existing institutions and social relations are natural, neutral, legitimate, or just given . . . Those involved in the education of teachers generally "transmit, often tacitly, benign or neutral visions of social reality [that encourage] uncritical acceptance of meritocratic arrangements of stratification and hierarchies." (Ginsburg & Clift, 1990, p. 457; Greene, cited in Ginsburg & Clift, 1990, p. 457)

Summary

As the foregoing discussion demonstrates, there was a substantial foundation upon which to erect the present study, including research on educational practice and theory and attempts to address gender equity instruction in teacher education. The current undertaking incorporated elements from this review of the literature as it focused on these questions: What was the status of gender equity instruction in Michigan's pre-service teacher education programs? What program and faculty characteristics were associated with varying levels of inclusion? What were the perceived facilitators and barriers to inclusion?

Chapter III will outline the research methodology and design of the study.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the status of gender equity instruction in Michigan pre-service teacher education programs. As an exploratory study it was focused upon discovering answers to certain questions rather than upon providing support for hypotheses. As the review of related literature in Chapter II demonstrated, there was insufficient evidence upon which to base hypotheses at the time.

On the other hand, a variety of questions were raised both by the literature review and by exposure to teacher education programs in the state. In addressing these questions this study aimed to provide a starting point for more rigorous research. By adding these heretofore unknown answers to the knowledge base it was hoped that further research about gender equity instruction would be facilitated.

Research Questions

The questions guiding the research fell into two general categories. The first category pertained to questions about programmatic response to gender equity

instruction in Michigan pre-service teacher education programs. The second category pertained to faculty response to such instruction.

Programmatic Response to Gender Equity Instruction

Questions related to gender equity instruction in Michigan teacher education programs which guided research at the program level were as follows:

1. To what extent were pre-service teacher education programs providing for gender equity instruction in their curriculum?

2. Had changes in coverage occurred; were any anticipated? What were the time frames?

3. To what extent did faculty, administrators, and formal policies support gender equity instruction?

4. What were the perceived barriers to inclusion of gender equity instruction?

5. What were the perceived facilitators of inclusion of gender equity instruction?

Faculty Response To Gender Equity Instruction

Questions related to gender equity instruction in Michigan pre-service teacher education programs which guided the research at the level of individual faculty were as follows:

1. To what extent were individual faculty members providing gender equity instruction in their classes?

2. To what extent did individual faculty members think gender equity instruction should occur in teacher education programs?

3. What were the preferred curricular approaches to gender equity instruction?

4. At what phase of a five-phase instructional typology did faculty members place themselves, their programs, and teacher education in general?

5. What were the perceived barriers to inclusion of gender equity instruction?

6. What were the perceived facilitators of inclusion of gender equity instruction?

Study Population

General Considerations For Selection

The programs and individual faculty members of all Michigan pre-service teacher education programs constituted the population to be studied.

Limitation of the population to this particular state was undertaken for several reasons, one of which was the familiarity of the investigator with teacher education in Michigan. Other reasons included the benefit of having only a single set of certification requirements as a study variable, as well as the fact that Michigan, like most other states, had no requirement for inclusion of gender equity instruction in teacher education programs. Michigan was also noteworthy in the large number of potential candidates

it prepared each year. In recent years, for example, two Michigan teacher education programs had ranked sixth and seventh in the nation in enrollment. (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, cited in Stewart, 1992).

The population was further defined by the requirement that only pre-service programs and faculty be studied. This study attempted to be as broad and fundamental as possible, a goal best served by studying pre-service education, the charge of which is to prepare candidates for working with all students. Other types of programs such as in-service training and graduate studies often focus on specialized responsibilities or clientele and were not considered suitable for this particular undertaking.

A decision was made to include only those pre-service courses which constitute the professional education sequence, not all courses a pre-service candidate might take. This sequence is limited to the core courses required of all candidates regardless of certificate level or subject area endorsement. Examples of courses excluded by this decision were specialized offerings such as mathematics education for elementary teachers or classroom management for secondary teachers. Although this exclusion eliminated potentially valuable perspectives within some programs, it was consistent with the study's intended focus upon teacher education programs rather than upon other units from which a teacher education candidate might choose courses. Focusing upon core courses required of all teacher candidates also

provided a more reliable assessment of the extent to which future teachers were exposed to gender equity instruction.

Programs and faculty members from both private and public institutions were included in this study. Both types of institutions have approval from the Michigan Department of Education for programs leading to teacher certification. Inclusion of both public and private institutions ensured that the focus could remain upon gender equity instruction rather than upon institutional ideology. Results, however, were cross-tabulated according to public/private status.

Institutions receiving questionnaires included Adrian College, Albion College, Alma College, Andrews University, Aquinas College, Calvin College, Central Michigan University, Concordia College, Eastern Michigan University, Ferris State University, Grand Rapids Baptist College, Hillsdale College, Hope College, Kalamazoo College, Madonna University, Marygrove College, Michigan State University, Michigan Technological University, Northern Michigan University, Oakland University, Olivet College, Saginaw Valley State University, Siena Heights College, Spring Arbor College, University of Detroit-Mercy, University of Michigan, University of Michigan-Dearborn, University of Michigan-Flint, Wayne State University, and Western Michigan University. Grand Valley State University served as the site of the pilot study.

Program Population

The program population was comprised of all pre-service teacher education programs in Michigan, with the exception of the institution which served as the site of the pilot study. Some 30 program administrators received questionnaires.

Faculty Population

The faculty population was comprised of all faculty members from 29 of the 30 institutions who were teaching courses in their institution's pre-service professional sequence during winter semester of 1993. One of the 30 institutions included in the program survey was excluded from the faculty survey because its curriculum was reported to be undergoing extensive revision and was in a transition period between old and new sequences. Some 247 individual faculty members in Michigan pre-service teacher education programs met the criteria to participate in this study.

Instrumentation

Two distinct instruments were developed for the study. These were the Program Survey Instrument (Appendix A) and the Faculty Survey Instrument (Appendix B). These questionnaires were designed after an extensive search of the literature established (a) that no other questionnaires suitable for such use existed, and (b) there was a sufficient amount of research on the topic of gender equity to provide a valid basis for constructing such measurement

tools. Items on the questionnaires were drawn particularly from research on gender equity in schools, literature on the formal and hidden curriculum in education and teacher education, and literature on the phase theory of feminist consciousness and scholarship on women. Descriptions within each phase of the instructional typology were adapted to apply to teacher education. Chapter II outlined much of this literature base for all the preceding topics.

The Program Survey Instrument

The Program Survey Instrument was designed to determine the extent to which gender equity instruction was systematically provided for in teacher education programs. It was also designed to identify existing curricular approaches to gender equity instruction, describe past and present barriers to the inclusion of gender equity instruction in particular programs, and define facilitators of gender equity instruction in each program. The Program Survey Instrument was addressed to program administrators in each of the 30 pre-service programs studied.

The Program Profile section of the instrument secured information about size of program, accreditation status, public or private status, and gender, rank, position and ethnic backgrounds of program faculty and administrators.

Section A of the instrument contained nine questions about the status of gender equity instruction, past coverage, anticipated changes, extent of faculty discussion, extent of administrative support, presence of student

competency requirements, presence of explicit gender equity instruction policies, and presence of gender equity instruction in specific courses. Section B contained three open-ended questions about barriers to and facilitators of gender equity instruction and provided space for any additional comments about the topic as well.

Faculty Survey Instrument

The Faculty Survey Instrument was designed to determine the extent to which individual pre-service faculty members incorporated gender equity concerns into their classroom teaching. It also assessed phases of awareness of scholarship on women, attitudes toward gender equity instruction's place in teacher education, curricular preferences, perceived barriers to such instruction, perceived facilitators of such instruction, and self-assessment according to a five-phase instructional typology.

The Respondent Profile of the Faculty Survey Instrument elicited information on age, sex, race and ethnicity, faculty rank, and instructional area of emphasis.

Part I contained two questions assessing overall amount of gender equity instruction provided and overall level of familiarity with gender equity issues.

Part II contained 30 examples of topics for potential inclusion in teacher education classes. Respondents were asked the extent to which they included these items in their classes, as well as the extent to which they thought these

items should be included in the teacher education program. Items were selected to operationalize a range from simple to complex awareness of gender equity concepts, from subtle to overt bias and discrimination, from formal curriculum to hidden curriculum, and from individual classroom practices to theoretical paradigms for teacher education.

Part III contained four questions to determine each faculty member's preferred curricular approach to gender equity instruction.

Part IV contained 10 questions designed to identify perceived facilitators to gender equity instruction.

Part V contained three open-ended questions on barriers to and facilitators of gender equity instruction, including one question which solicited any additional comments from the respondent.

Part VI contained a five-phase instructional typology asking faculty to rank themselves, their institution's program, and teacher education in general.

Reliability and Validity of the Instruments

Because both instruments used in this study were designed expressly for this effort, concerns may justifiably be raised about their reliability and validity. Several steps were taken to address these concerns.

With respect to validity, all of the items on each instrument were selected from the extensive professional literature on the basis of their particular suitability for this undertaking and on the topics of gender equity, gender

discrimination, sexism, gender bias, and feminist curricular phase theory as they related to educational practice and theory. Every effort was made, therefore, to ensure the content validity of these measures.

The establishment of construct validity for these questionnaires was beyond the scope of the present study, but it is likely that some initial steps in that direction can be made with this exploratory effort. For these measures to have construct validity, the construct of gender equity would first have required a more precise empirical definition than it enjoyed. As Cronbach (1970) has suggested, there are three parts to the process of construct validation for an instrument or test: suggesting what constructs possibly account for test performance (in the case of this study, what behaviors, beliefs, attitudes or perceptions about gender equity are related to respondents' performance on the questionnaire), deriving hypotheses from the theory involving the construct, and testing the hypotheses empirically (p. 143).

The intent of the study was to explore the extent of gender equity instruction in teacher education programs and educators' attitudes toward such instruction. It provided no evidence other than self-report about what they actually did about the topic in their programs or classes; consequently, it was impossible to link any outcome on the questionnaire with any empirical evidence of "gender equity." This will be a potential task for future research.

Data Collection

The study was conducted in two stages. First, the pilot project was undertaken to provide an estimate of the content validity and utility of the study instruments and procedures. Following this, adjustments in the instruments and procedures were made as needed.

The Pilot Project

A pilot project was undertaken prior to the actual study utilizing the pre-service teacher education program and faculty members at Grand Valley State University (GVSU), located in Allendale, Michigan. Grand Valley State University is a medium-sized public institution with a pre-service teacher education program accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Total enrollment of GVSU at the time of the pilot project was approximately 12,500 graduate and undergraduate students. Approximately 475 students were at some stage in the pre-service program at that time, of which approximately 230 completed the program that year and received initial Michigan teacher certification.

Fourteen GVSU faculty members met the study criteria. Eight faculty who taught pre-service classes but whose appointments were in units other than teacher education (e.g., psychology, art, mathematics, language arts, music, physical education) were also included in the pilot study, but these results were tabulated separately. Since these

subject area faculty appointments outside the teacher education unit at GVSU might be within teacher education units in other institutions, the presence of these faculty in the pilot effort was deemed useful.

The investigator of this study held an administrative appointment in the GVSU School of Education, a relationship whose effects upon the study could not be easily determined in advance. It was expected that day-to-day knowledge of and interaction with this program and its faculty would promote significant levels of co-operation with the pilot effort, however.

The 22 faculty members described above were provided with the Faculty Survey Instrument; the associate director of the unit was provided with the Program Survey Instrument. In addition to the survey items previously described and the respondent profile, the pilot subjects were asked to provide comments and suggestions on the construction, wording, instructions, or arrangements of the questionnaire as well. All subjects were assured of anonymity and confidentiality.

After the pilot instruments were tested, steps were taken to improve the instruments, including re-wording of ambiguous items and instructions, addition of items, and procedures for securing maximum participation.

The Full Study

In February of 1993, revised surveys were mailed to program administrators in 30 institutions and 247 faculty

members in 29 institutions. Stamped, addressed, return envelopes were enclosed; the instrument included a letter encouraging return of the completed materials within ten days. Questionnaires had been coded by institution and individual for purpose of data analysis and for follow-up procedures only. Coding was not used to associate individual respondents with responses.

The Program Survey Instruments were mailed to representatives from each of the 30 institutions under study. Names were obtained from the 1992 membership roster of the organization known as Directors and Representatives of Teacher Education Programs (DARTEP). Each Michigan teacher education program sent at least one representative to DARTEP, the focus of which was pre-service education programs. These representatives were likely to be knowledgeable about their institution's program and likely to give the questionnaire close attention.

To determine faculty who would be sent the Faculty Survey Instrument, two steps were taken. First, the investigator compiled a listing of each institution's pre-service professional program courses as provided in each institution's catalog. A listing of teacher education faculty names was also compiled from each institution's catalog. Then, telephone calls to teacher education offices in each of the 29 institutions during the month preceding the actual mailing verified accuracy of information and also identified those faculty members teaching courses in the

professional program during that semester. In instances where the institution's catalog had not sufficiently identified courses or faculty, the telephone call elicited the necessary information.

Surveys were sent to 247 individuals by name. If the survey was not returned after three or four weeks (depending on the spring break schedule of each institution), a follow-up reminder and another survey packet were sent.

Data Analysis

Plan of Data Analysis

Ten weeks after mailing the first questionnaires, it was decided that most questionnaires constituting the study had been returned and data analysis could begin. Seven questionnaires were returned after this point but were not included in the report of findings.

The Program Survey Instrument and Faculty Survey Instrument were coded and analyzed separately. Open-ended questions were coded to discover themes, for example, types of barriers to and facilitators of gender equity instruction.

Data Organization

For presentation, data has been displayed in tables as well as discussed in narrative fashion. Quantitative analysis was employed and appropriate statistics used, but an important part of the study was qualitative in nature. The qualitative aspect evaluated general themes presented by

respondents in answering questions related to barriers and facilitators. Every effort was made to determine each respondent's actual beliefs about gender equity instruction based upon the data provided by the questionnaires.

Statistical Analysis

Because of the exploratory nature of this study, descriptive statistics were the most appropriate. These included frequencies, percentages, and measures of central tendency and variance.

Certain segments of the questionnaires also yielded "scores." It appeared unwise to assume that these scores were interval in nature even though they appeared to be. A more supportable assumption was that they were ordinal. On the basis of the "score," it was possible to say that one respondent was more favorably inclined toward gender equity instruction than another, but exactly how much more could not be known. It was also possible to "order" the individuals on the basis of these scores: Individual A was more favorable to the topic than Individual B, Individual B was more favorable than Individual C, and so on.

Because the assumption of ordinal data could be supported, cross-tabulations also had utility in data analysis even though no hypotheses were being tested. In particular, scores were cross-tabulated with several demographic variables such as age, courses taught, faculty rank, program size, and accreditation status in order to ascertain whether relationships existed.

Summary

In this chapter a description of the research questions comprising this study was presented. It described the program population and faculty population to be studied and provided a rationale for selection. The design of both program and faculty survey instruments was outlined and study procedures detailed. Additionally, statistical procedures and the collection and analysis of data were described. Results of the study are presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

As discussed in Chapter III, two separate surveys were used to explore gender equity instruction in Michigan's pre-service teacher education programs: One survey focused on provisions for instruction at the programmatic level; the other on the practices of individual faculty members. In this chapter responses to both surveys will be presented and analyzed.

Program Survey

Representatives of 30 of the 31 teacher education institutions in Michigan were mailed the Program Survey Instrument (the remaining institution having served as the site for pilot testing the instruments). Of these, 73.3% (n=22) returned surveys. The information which follows is based upon information provided by these individuals.

Program Profile

Descriptive information collected on each teacher education program included institutional size in terms of number of candidates completing pre-service programs annually, national teacher education accreditation status,

public/private status, and number of faculty and administrators in the pre-service professional teacher education program by gender and rank or position. These descriptors provided a "picture" of teacher education institutions in the state and established a context for interpreting the results of the more detailed faculty survey which was conducted simultaneously.

Table 1. Program Size By Number of Candidates Completing Program Annually (N=22 Programs)

Size					
Under 100 n=10	101-200 n=5	201-300 n=1	301-400 n=1	401-500 n=0	Over 500 n=5
Albion	Andrews	UM-Ann Arbor	Central	___	Eastern
Concordia	Hope				Ferris
G.R. Baptist	UD-Mercy				M.S.U.
Kalamazoo	UM-Flint				Wayne
Madonna	UM-Dearborn				Western
Mich. Tech.					
Oakland					
Olivet					
Siena Heights					
Spring Arbor					

Table 1 provides the size distribution of the responding institutions. As is evident, the greatest number of schools returning program questionnaires recommended 100 or fewer teacher candidates for state certification each year. However, as Table 1 further illustrates, the five largest responding institutions provided training to at least 2.5 times more students than the 10 smallest institutions combined.

Table 2. Program Size, Accreditation, and Public/Private Status (N=22 Programs)

	Public		Private	
Size	Accredited n=8	Not Accredited n=3	Accredited n=2	Not Accredited n=9
Under 100	Oakland	Mich. Tech.	Spring Arbor Madonna	G.R. Baptist Olivet Concordia Siena Heights Kalamazoo Albion
101-200	UM-Dearborn UM-Flint	____	____	UD-Mercy Andrews Hope
201-300	____	UM-Ann Arbor	____	____
301-400	Central	____	____	____
401-500	____	____	____	____
Over 500	Eastern M.S.U. Wayne Western	Ferris	____	____

Table 2 illustrates the findings with respect to size, accreditation status, and public/private status of these institutions. Of the 11 public institutions, 72.7% (n=8) were accredited; of the 11 private institutions, 18.1% (n=2) were accredited. All of the programs holding accreditation were accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

Approximately 54.6% (n=12) of the teacher education programs did not have national accreditation at the time of

completing the survey. Some 58.3% (n=7) of the non-accredited programs recommended 100 or fewer students for certification each year, and 75.0% (n=9) of these 12 non-accredited programs were operated under private auspices.

Among the institutions whose representatives returned questionnaires, there was a strong relationship evident between public/private status, size, and accreditation status: Private institutions in general had smaller, non-accredited teacher education programs, while public institutions in general were larger and accredited by NCATE. There were, however, exceptions to both generalizations. For example, the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor is a somewhat large public program which is not NCATE accredited; Madonna University is a small private institution which does have NCATE accreditation.

Table 3. Program Personnel By Gender and Rank or Position (N=435 Positions)

Faculty/Administrators	Females		Males	
Rank/Position	n	%	n	%
Full Professor	41	31.8	88	68.2
Associate Professor	43	39.3	66.5	60.7
Assistant Professor	61	62.2	37	37.8
Visiting Professor	5	62.5	3	37.8
Instructor	2	50.0	2	50.0
Lecturer	8	80.0	2	20.0
Dean	3	23.1	10	76.9
Assistant/Associate Dean	11	47.9	12	52.1
Director	7.5	50.0	7.5	50.0
Assistant/Associate Director	1	20.0	4	80.0
Other Administrator	15	75.0	5	25.0

As Table 3 demonstrates, in terms of faculty or administrative positions in teacher education programs about which information was provided on the survey, data on a total of 435 individuals was secured. On an institution-by-institution basis the number of positions described ranged from 2 to 83. The median number of positions reported to include significant responsibility for pre-service teacher training in these institutions was 12.

Of these 435 positions, 54.5% (n=237) were held by males, and 45.5% (n=198) were held by females. Gender distribution across faculty ranks was not uniform. As Table 3 shows, males were reported to hold higher academic ranks and higher leadership positions in numbers disproportionate to their representation in programs as a whole.

Males were reported to hold twice as many positions as females at the rank of full professor and half again as many at the rank of associate professor. Male deans outnumbered female deans more than three to one; male associate or assistant directors outnumbered their female counterparts four to one. Conversely, females were disproportionately represented in positions such as assistant professor, visiting professor, lecturer, and other lower-level staff. In no upper-level categories did females outnumber males; in no lower-level categories did males outnumber females.

Program Response to Gender Equity Instruction

Program representatives were also provided an opportunity to respond to a set of questions designed to

elicit their broad appraisal of the inclusion of gender equity instruction in their program's curriculum.

In assessing the "overall amount of gender equity instruction," only 4.5% (n=1) of the 22 respondents described it as extensive; 59.1% (n=13) described it as moderate; 36.4% (n=8) described instruction as minimal. With the exception that the largest pre-professional teacher education program was rated by its representative as providing extensive inclusion of gender equity instruction, no consistent pattern of response related to program size was evident. The response of "minimal," for example, was given not only by schools with few graduates but also by programs with many. Similarly, moderate inclusion was reported by programs ranging in size from two of the smallest to two of the largest. Nor was any pattern evident on inclusion of gender equity instruction in relation to accreditation status or public/private status. No relationship between inclusion of gender equity instruction and either of these factors was supported by these results.

In describing trends related to the inclusion of gender equity instruction topics "over the past two to three years," 4.5% (n=1) noted that the amount in their program had decreased, 45.5% (n=10) reported no programmatic changes in either direction, and 50.0% (n=11) reported an increase. Looking to the "next two to three years," 45.5% (n=10) reported their programs would include more such instruction in the future; 45.5% (n=10) planned no change in either

direction; and 9.0% (n=2) were "not sure" whether their program inclusion levels would change. No respondents reported that their programs would include less gender equity instruction in the next two to three years. No relationship was apparent between future plans for inclusion and program size, accreditation status, or public/private status.

Describing "formal faculty discussion on gender equity discussion," some 63.6% (n=14) characterized such discussion as minimal; 36.4% (n=8) as moderate. No respondent reported faculty discussions in his or her program to be extensive. Variations between the responses of "minimal" and "moderate" were unrelated to program size, accreditation status, or public/private status.

In response to a question related to "expressed administrative support for gender equity instruction" within their programs, respondents provided a wider range of answers: 35.0% (n=7) noted minimal support; 45.0% (n=9) reported moderate support; and 20.0% (n=4) reported extensive support. Two respondents did not provide an answer. Of the four who noted extensive support, three were among the smallest programs; the fourth was one of the largest.

Asked to describe their program's requirements for "demonstrated student competency in gender-fair instruction," respondents' answers varied from "none" to "moderate." Some 54.6% (n=12) rated their requirements as

minimal, 31.8% (n=7) rated theirs as moderate, 9.1% (n=2) noted they were "not sure," and 4.5% (n=1) wrote that the program had no such requirement. No relationship between any of the descriptive program features and responses to this question was found.

Respondents also completed a question related to the presence of "a program policy and/or philosophy statement specifically addressing gender equity instruction." Fully half of the participants (50.0%, n=11) noted that no such provision existed in their programs. Some 45.5% (n=10) reported that their programs had such a provision, and 4.5% (n=1) did not answer this question. Programs with a policy/philosophy statement and programs without one did not differ with respect to size, accreditation, or public/ private status.

Respondents were asked whether their programs offered "at least one course devoted wholly to gender equity issues." In 86.4% (n=19) of the programs there was no course exclusively devoted to gender equity issues. In 13.6% (n=3) such a course was offered. In two of the three programs where the course was offered, it was a requirement for program completion; in the other program it was an elective.

In contrast, "at least one course devoted to equity issues, including gender equity" was reported to exist in 54.6% (n=12) of the 22 programs. Gender issues were a component of these courses but were not the sole emphasis.

Of the 12 programs with a general equity course, 58.0% (n=7) required the course for program completion. Programs with separate gender equity courses or with general equity courses, as a group, were not significantly different in any way from programs without such courses. That is, accreditation status, program size, and private/public status were not associated in any predictable fashion with the presence or absence of these course offerings.

Responses to Open-Ended Questions

Program administrators were provided with an opportunity to provide unstructured responses on the final page of the questionnaire. They were invited to list factors which had facilitated inclusion of gender equity instruction at the program level, as well as factors that were barriers to such inclusion. A section for additional comments was also provided.

Programmatic facilitators secured in this fashion included faculty influences such as the presence of diversity among faculty members and faculty research interests, accreditation standards, and features of the student population, including gender balance and student interest in the topics. A listing of all descriptions of program facilitators transcribed verbatim from questionnaires is included in Appendix D. Following are examples of facilitators suggested by program administrators:

"Faculty members who are supportive of the issue of gender equity"

"Textbook selection"

"Reasonably good research"

"The fact that we were an historically all-female college has fostered a strong tradition of the assumed competence of women. In addition, the religious congregation that sponsors our institution has public and prominent feminist values."

"A philosophical statement by faculty that supports equity issues. A diverse staff with a variety of experiences and backgrounds that brings such issues to meetings where curriculum decisions are made. Employment practices at this university."

"New standards for outcomes-based education from North Central Association and Michigan Department of Education"

Fewer barriers than facilitators were described. Most frequently mentioned were time constraints caused by an overcrowded curriculum and overall institutional climate not supportive of gender issues. A transcript of all open-ended responses to program barriers is included in Appendix E. Following are examples of barriers suggested by program administrators.

"(Gender equity) probably takes a back seat to other pressing issues such as ethnicity and class differences."

"Meeting university and state requirements for certification leaves no room for elective courses devoted to gender issues."

"Few convenient materials, including appropriate audio-visual material"

"Lack of sense that the 'real world' cares"

"Few women professors on campus"

Additional comments offered in the open-ended section included mention of the importance of gender equity instruction in pre-service programs, accreditation standards, the place of such instruction in the curriculum (pre- or post-certification), and availability of funds for gender equity research. Examples of additional open-ended comments are included in a section combining faculty and program comments later in this chapter. A complete transcript of all such additional comments provided on program questionnaires is included in Appendix F.

Summary of Program Responses

For the most part, gender equity instruction in Michigan's pre-professional teacher education programs reported at the formal program level was characterized as being present at a moderate to minimal level, with only modest increases occurring over the previous two to three years. Slightly less than half of the respondents reported plans to include more such instruction during the next two to three years.

Formal faculty discussion of gender equity instruction was generally reported to be minimal, but support at the administrative level was generally perceived by respondents (themselves administrators in many cases) to be at least moderate. Program requirements that students demonstrate competency in gender-fair instruction were generally absent or minimal. Furthermore, slightly less than half of the respondents noted that their programs had no policy or

philosophy specifically guiding instruction in this area. An overwhelming majority had no separate course on gender equity although slightly more than half offered a general equity course which included gender related topics as one area of focus.

None of the descriptive program features of size, accreditation status or public/private status were related to the responses from these program personnel. There was, however, a pattern of response observed in which respondents who described their programs as moderate or extensive on any one aspect tended to rate their program's performance or inclusion in all other areas as at least moderate. Similarly, there was a consistency in the pattern of responses from respondents who rated their program's inclusion of gender equity instructional topics or issues as minimal. Responses of these individuals throughout the questionnaires made it clear that gender equity instruction was generally addressed not at all in their programs; or, if it was, it was addressed at a minimal level.

In general summary, approximately half of the programs surveyed reported at least moderate attention to gender equity instruction via the amount of instruction, formal faculty discussion, administrative support, requirements for demonstrated student competency, adoption of policy and/or philosophy statements, and/or course offerings. These results, however, also documented that the other half provided minimal or no attention to these features.

Faculty Survey

The Faculty Survey Instrument was mailed to 247 individual faculty members in 29 of the 31 programs providing pre-service teacher education in the state of Michigan. Excluded from this part of the study were Grand Valley State University, where the instruments were pilot tested, and Michigan State University, where the teacher education program was reported to be in a transition period of extensive curriculum revision.

Of the 247 faculty surveys distributed, 53.0% (n=131) were returned in a timely fashion and included in the findings which follow. Responses were secured from faculty at 28 of the 29 institutions, including responses from educators in nine programs whose administrators did not return the Program Survey Instrument. Mean response rate from faculty at the 28 institutions was 65%. At two institutions, faculty return rate was 100%. Only 1 of the 30 institutions studied in this project (a small private college) was not represented in responses to either the Program Survey Instrument or the Faculty Survey Instrument.

The Faculty Survey Instrument was used to secure information in seven broad areas: (a) faculty demographic profile, (b) general perspectives on gender equity instruction, (c) actual inclusion of specific gender equity topics in classroom instruction and opinions on inclusion within the general pre-service curriculum, (d) preferred curricular approaches, (e) facilitators of gender equity

instruction, (f) appraisal within a five-phase instructional typology, and (g) an opportunity to respond to the topic of gender equity in an open-ended fashion. The results for each of these sections are presented separately.

Respondent Profile

Nearly all respondents (n=129) provided their age. Only one respondent was younger than 30 years of age; 10.9% (n=14) were 31 to 40 years of age; 44.2% (n=57) were 41 to 50 years of age; 29.5% (n=38) were 51 to 60 years of age; and 14.7% (n=19) were more than 60 years of age. For purposes of later analysis, it was necessary to dichotomize this independent variable. Age was re-coded into categories of "50 or younger" and "older than 50." After re-coding, 55.8% (n=72) were in the "50 or younger" category, and 44.2% (n=57) were in the "older than 50" category.

Surveys were sent to males and females in nearly equal proportion (46.2% to females, 44.9% to males, 8.9% to individuals whose first names did not reveal whether they were male or female). Surveys were returned by proportionally more females (55.6%, n=72) than males (44.5%, n=58).

In terms of race and ethnicity, 127 individuals provided this information. Of these, 5.5% (n=7) were African-American; .80% (n=1) were Asian; 90.5% (n=115) were Caucasian; .80% (n=1) were Hispanic; none was Native American; and 2.4% (n=3) selected "other," not specified.

For purposes of later analysis, this independent variable was also dichotomized, creating the categories of Caucasian and non-Caucasian. Within these categories, 9.5% (n=12) were non-Caucasian; 90.5% (n=115) were Caucasian. As is evident, the respondent group was markedly homogeneous with respect to racial/ethnic composition.

Information on faculty rank was also secured. Of the 128 respondents, 23.4% (n=30) were full professors; 25.8% (n=33) were associate professors; 30.5% (n=39) were assistant professors; 8.6% (n=11) were instructors; 10.1% (n=13) were lecturers; and 1.6% (n=2) described their rank as "other." This independent variable was dichotomized for analytical purposes into the categories of "full, associate or assistant professor," which included 79.7% (n=102) of the respondents, and "other faculty," which included 20.3% (n=26).

The tenure status of 129 responding faculty was reported as follows: Some 41.9% (n=54) were tenured; 27.9% (n=36) were tenure track but not yet tenured; 3.1% (n=4) were visiting professors; 17.8% (n=23) were adjunct professors; and 9.3% (n=12) considered themselves in an "other" status. This independent variable was also re-categorized as tenured (41.9%, n=54); tenure track (27.9%, n=36); and "other" status (30.2%, n=39).

Some 94.6% (n=122) of the respondents held sole or partial appointments in the department, school, or college of education. Another 5.4% (n=7) held sole appointments in

other schools or departments such as psychology or sociology.

As for current teaching assignments in one or more of five areas (foundations courses, methods courses, clinical courses, psychology and human development courses, or other courses), each area was well-represented by responding faculty. Many respondents (43.9%, n=58) indicated that they were teaching in two or more areas.

General Perspectives on Gender Equity Instruction

Provided in Part I with an opportunity to describe their perspectives on gender equity instruction in the most general terms, 10.9% (n=14) of the 128 who responded described as being extensive the amount of such instruction they currently were providing in their own classes; 50.8% (n=65) described this amount as moderate; another 35.2% (n=45) described the amount as minimal. The remaining 3.1% (n=4) of the respondents reported that they were providing no instruction at all on gender equity topics.

In response to a question devised to secure a self-rating of respondents' overall level of familiarity with gender equity issues, 29.9% (n=38) of the 127 educators who provided an answer characterized their familiarity as extensive; another 59.9% (n=76) rated their level of familiarity as moderate; the remaining 10.2% (n=13) selected minimal as the best descriptor. No respondents indicated that they had no familiarity with gender equity issues.

Gender Equity Topics

Part II of the questionnaire was comprised of a list of 30 gender equity topics arranged in ascending order of abstraction. That is, the first topics listed related to concrete, specific practices and research findings while later topics related to more abstract, generalized professional issues or concerns. Although not readily apparent to individuals completing the questionnaire, the 30 questions fell into three sections of 10 questions each.

Section 1 (questions 1-10) included the most concrete topics; for example, textbooks, Title IX, and extra-curricular activities. Section 2 (questions 11-20) included gender equity topics at a mid-level of abstraction; for example, teacher attention patterns, effects of language, and grading standards. Section 3 (questions 21-30) included the most abstract topics; for example, reliance on male developmental models, gender-specific concepts of success, and implications of teaching as a "female" profession.

Respondents considered each of the 30 topics in terms of two focused questions:

(A) Do you include this topic in the classes you teach?

(B) Should this topic appear somewhere in pre-service courses?

Forced choice options were provided to both questions. Choices were "not at all," "somewhat," and "in depth." Responses to Question A provided a measure of what pre-service educators were actually teaching about gender

equity, while responses to Question B represented what educators thought should be included in the curriculum about gender equity issues. The comparison of responses to Questions A and B then provided an estimate of the distance between what educators included and what they thought should be included in terms of each particular topic.

All 131 educators completed at least a part of this portion of the questionnaire. Most respondents completed the entire section.

Tables 4, 5, and 6 which follow provide illustrations of the responses secured from these educators. These tables display information on the number of educators receiving an average score of 1.0 ("not at all"), 2.0 ("somewhat"), or 3.0 ("in depth") on Questions A and B for each of the three sections of Part II of the questionnaire. Table 4 provides a summarized representation to responses about inclusion of the most concrete topics. Table 5 provides a summary of responses about mid-level topics. Table 6 provides a summary of responses about the most abstract topics.

Table 4. Faculty Inclusion of Concrete-Level Gender Equity Topics (Part II, Questions 1-10)

Extent of Inclusion	A. Include in Own Classes (N=130)		B. Should Be Included in Program (N=128)	
	n	%	n	%
1) Not At All	31	23.8	0	___
2) Somewhat	90	69.2	85	66.4
3) In Depth	9	7.0	43	33.6
	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	1.83	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	2.33

As Table 4 demonstrates, almost one-fourth of all respondents did not provide any instruction on the most concrete topics, as represented in Questions 1-10 of Part II. In contrast, 100% of the educators responded that these topics should be included somewhere in the curriculum. Only 7.0% (n=9) of the respondents noted that they covered these concrete topics in depth in their classes, in contrast to 33.6% (n=43) who noted that these topics should be included in depth in the pre-service curriculum.

The mean score for all respondents on Question A relating to actual inclusion of concrete topics was 1.83, a point between no inclusion and some inclusion. The mean score for the same respondents on Question B relating to what should be included on concrete topics was 2.33, a point between some inclusion and in depth inclusion.

Table 5. Faculty Inclusion of Mid-Level Gender Equity Topics (Part II, Questions 11-20)

Extent of Inclusion	A. Include in Own Classes (N=128)		B. Should Be Included in Program (N=125)	
	n	%	n	%
1) Not At All	32	25.0	3	2.4
2) Somewhat	83	64.8	79	63.2
3) In Depth	13	10.2	43	34.4
	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	1.85	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	2.32

Table 5 provides information on the analysis of responses to Questions 11-20 of Part II, the mid-level topics. Some 25.0% (n=32) of the respondents revealed that they provided no instruction on these topics. In contrast, almost 97.6%, all but three educators, felt that these topics should be included in the curriculum. These topics were covered in depth by 10.2% (n=13) of the respondents, compared to 34.4% (n=43) who believed they should be included in depth.

The mean score for all respondents on Question A for this section assessing inclusion of mid-level gender equity topics was 1.85, a point between no inclusion and some inclusion. The mean score for all respondents on Question B for this section was 2.32, a point between some inclusion and in depth inclusion.

Table 6. Faculty Inclusion of Abstract-Level Gender Equity Topics (Part II, Questions 21-30)

Extent of Inclusion	A. Include in Own Classes (N=128)		B. Should Be Included in Program (N=126)	
	n	%	n	%
1) Not At All	54	42.2	6	4.8
2) Somewhat	67	52.3	94	74.6
3) In Depth	7	5.5	26	20.6
	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	1.63	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	2.16

As Table 6 illustrates, response patterns to the abstract-level topics represented by Questions 21-30 of Part II were similar to those of the preceding two sections. Among respondents, 42.2% noted that they provided no instruction in their classes on these abstract-level topics. Only 4.8%, however, expressed the opinion that instruction on these topics did not belong in the pre-service curriculum. Some 52.3% provided at least some instruction on these topics, while 74.6% noted that at least some instruction should be provided. While only 5.5% currently provided in depth instruction, 20.6% said in-depth instruction on these abstract topics should be included.

The mean score for all respondents to Question A on actual practices related to instruction on the most abstract topics was 1.63, a point very close to "not at all." However, the mean score for Question B on inclusion of these abstract topics somewhere in the curriculum was 2.16, a point between "somewhat" and "in depth," although obviously closer to the former than to the latter.

Table 7. Faculty Inclusion of Concrete, Mid-Level, and Abstract Topics By Mean Score of Respondents

Level of Topic	A. Include in Own Classes	B. Should Be Included in Program
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$
Concrete	1.83	2.33
Mid-Level	1.85	2.32
Abstract	1.63	2.16
Overall "Score"	1.75	2.30

As displayed in Table 7, comparisons of the differential pattern of responses to Questions 1-10, 11-20, and 21-30 of Part II demonstrates that concrete topics were not only more generally included in actual instruction, they were also perceived to be topics that should be included to a greater extent in the teacher education curriculum.

Scores for all three sections which included all levels of gender equity topics were combined and re-coded to provide the overall score for comparison of totals representing Question A and Question B responses.

Individual respondent "scores" ranging from 3 to 9 were computed by summing each person's totals from the three 10-question sets. Summed scores of 3 and 4 were re-coded as 1 ("not at all"). Scores of 5 and 6 and 7 were re-coded as 2 ("somewhat"). Scores of 8 and 9 were re-coded as 3 ("in depth"). This re-coding was performed for responses to both questions so that at its completion each respondent had two overall, composite scores.

In terms of current teaching practices, respondents' overall mean score was 1.75, indicating the inclusion of gender equity topics between "not at all" and "somewhat" in their own actual instruction. In contrast to what these respondents felt should be included, the mean score was 2.30, between the "somewhat" and "in depth" levels.

Further Statistical Analysis

In further statistical analysis, chi-squares were computed utilizing the scores for Questions A and B on

concrete topics, mid-level topics, and abstract topics as two dependent variables and the respondent demographic characteristics, including information secured on the Program Survey, as a series of independent variables. In all, some 80 chi-square calculations were performed. For the most part, it was necessary to utilize the demographic variables in their dichotomized formats described earlier to facilitate the analysis process.

Insofar as concrete topics were concerned, few of the respondents' demographic characteristics were found to be related to their reported gender equity practices in a fashion which differed significantly from relationships expected to occur by chance. One exception was the relationship between accreditation status of the respondent's institution and his or her responses to Question B on what should be taught about these concrete topics (χ^2=3.983, 1 d.f., p=.046). Another exception was the relationship between respondent gender and Question B (χ^2=3.735, 1 d.f., p=.05).

The relationship between accreditation status and responses to Question B indicated that respondents from non-accredited programs advocated significantly more inclusion of concrete gender equity topics than their counterparts in accredited programs. The relationship between gender and responses to Question B was not as strong, although females were generally in favor of significantly more in-depth instruction on concrete topics than males were.

For the mid-level topics, relationships significantly different from chance were noted in three cross tabulations. The first occurred between size of the respondent's program and response to Question A on extent of actual instruction included by that educator (χ^2=6.88, 2 d.f., p=.033). The second occurred between the public/private status of the respondent's institution and responses to Question B (χ^2=8.90, 2 d.f., p=.012). The third occurred between the respondent's age and responses to Question B (χ^2= 6.186, 2 d.f., p=.045).

Respondents from smaller institutions, that is, those from programs with fewer than 100 certification candidates annually, were significantly less likely to be including information on mid-level topics at the time of the survey. Respondents in public institutions were more likely than their counterparts in private institutions to believe that mid-level topics should be included in the pre-service curriculum. Respondents more than 50 years of age were more likely to believe that mid-level topics should be included in the pre-service curriculum.

None of the demographic variables were significantly related to educators' responses to either Question A or B on the most abstract gender equity topics. Nor were there significant relationships between these demographic characteristics and overall, summarized total scores secured from responses to all 30 topics.

It should be noted that in instances where many chi-squares are computed, the probability is enhanced that some will appear significant although they actually are not (Type II errors). The findings reported above, therefore, should be considered as tentative rather than definitive, especially since no existing literature lent further support to these findings of significance. The primary relevance of apparently significant chi-square results, therefore, was in suggesting areas and directions for further exploration of these topics.

At the end of Part II on inclusion of specific gender equity topics, survey participants were provided with an opportunity to describe any other gender equity topics not previously listed which they included in their own classes. Most frequently mentioned topics related to socio-cultural factors, psychological and developmental factors, and educational practice and theory. A transcript of all open-ended comments to this section from respondents' questionnaires is provided in Appendix C. Following are examples of other gender equity topics named by respondents.

"Old boy and old girl networks"

"Justice (Kohlberg) vs. caring (Gilligan)"

"Gender bias in the media, film, books, and toys that might be used in and out of the classroom"

"Sexual harassment"

"I try to use a balance of equity issues: race, religion, gender, culture, social-economic, body type, size, and appearance."

Curricular Approaches

Respondents were provided an opportunity to select one statement among four statements provided which best reflected their opinion about the inclusion of gender equity instruction in pre-service programs. The results are shown in Table 8 below.

Table 8. Preferred Curricular Approach to Gender Equity Instruction (N=131 Responses)

Curricular Approach	n	%
1. Gender equity instruction should be provided in a separate course.	3	2.3
2. Gender equity instruction should be provided throughout the program.	102	77.9
3. Gender equity instruction should be provided using both approaches: throughout the program and in a separate course.	25	19.1
4. Gender equity instruction should not be provided in pre-service education.	1	0.7

The clear preference of these educators was for instruction to be offered throughout the curriculum, with more than 75% of those responding selecting this option and another almost 20% preferring this option plus a separate course. Only a single respondent expressed the opinion that gender equity instruction should not be included at all in pre-service programs. More than 99% believed that some approach to curricular inclusion should be utilized.

Facilitators

A list of 10 potential facilitators of gender equity instruction was provided on the questionnaire, and respondents were asked to describe to what extent these had increased or would increase their coverage of gender equity issues in their classes. Forced choice options of "not at all," "somewhat," and "very much" were provided. Space was also provided for respondents to list other facilitators which had not been specifically named. Table 9 summarizes the responses provided to the 10 specific facilitators.

Table 9. Facilitators of Gender Equity Instruction

Potential Facilitators	Not at All n	%	Somewhat n	%	Very Much n	%
1. Texts, Materials	13	10.2	80	62.5	35	27.3
2. Professional Literature	10	7.8	73	57.0	45	35.2
3. General News, Media	18	14.1	82	64.6	27	21.3
4. In-Service Seminars	26	20.3	67	52.3	35	27.4
5. Certification Testing	59	47.2	43	34.4	23	18.4
6. Accreditation	53	41.7	46	36.2	28	22.1
7. Formal Policies	36	28.3	64	50.4	27	21.3
8. Colleague Support	19	14.8	72	56.3	37	28.9
9. Administrative Support	16	12.5	78	60.9	34	26.6
10. Student Interest	6	4.8	65	52.4	53	42.8

As the results in Table 9 illustrate, most of these facilitators were rated as having at least some influence on increased classroom coverage of gender equity issues. Student interest in gender equity instruction was perceived as the greatest facilitator, with less than 5% (n=6) of the

educators saying that such interest would have no effect at all, and almost 43% (n=53) concluding that it would have significant effect.

Other facilitators which appeared at least somewhat potent were professional literature which addressed gender equity issues, teacher education texts and materials which addressed gender equity issues, general news and media coverage of gender equity issues, and support from faculty colleagues for gender equity instruction. Factors considered to be least facilitating of those named were teacher certification testing on gender equity issues and the inclusion of stronger accreditation standards related to gender equity instruction.

Respondents also provided information on other facilitators in response to the open-ended question in this section. Facilitators mentioned included curriculum modules specifically on the topic of gender equity, availability of guest speakers, professional articles, laboratory classes, and collaboration with other professors in blocked courses. Examples of responses appear later in this chapter in the general section on open-ended responses to facilitators. Appendix D contains the full transcript of all facilitators noted by these educators.

Instructional Typology

Respondents were presented with a five-phase model describing the "gradual process whereby scholarship on women

enters the curriculum." The model was based on curricular typologies discussed in Chapter II of this study. Faculty were instructed to choose the stages most representative of (a) their own current approach to such instruction, (b) their program's current approach, and (c) the approach of teacher education in general. Some 110 respondents completed this section of the questionnaire.

Utilizing these stages descriptively, 6.4% (n=7) of the educators regarded themselves as being at Stage 1, the stage at which scholarship on women is not present. Another 6.4% (n=7) considered themselves to be at Stage 2, the stage at which curricular emphasis is placed only on exceptional women. Stage 3, a stage characterized as one giving emphasis to females achieving equality with males, was selected as the best personal descriptor by 52.7% (n=58). Another 17.3% (n=19) evaluated themselves as being at Stage 4, the stage where emphasis is placed on explicitly female experiences. The final 17.3% (n=19) selected the highest stage, Stage 5, as the most accurate descriptor. At Stage 5, scholars search for points where human experiences intersect and the lives of all men and women are studied.

Individual faculty members were next provided with an opportunity to select the stages they believed characterized the program of their own institution and teacher education in general. Table 10 provides the results of this selection process. Individuals' designations of their own stage are shown here for comparative purposes.

Table 10. Instructional Typology: Ranking for Self, Program, and Profession (N=110 Respondents)

	Stages									
	1		2		3		4		5	
Subject	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Self	7	6.4	7	6.4	58	52.7	19	17.3	19	17.3
Program	18	16.8	28	26.3	50	46.7	7	6.5	4	3.7
Profession	21	19.3	45	41.3	33	30.2	1	.9	9	8.2

Utilizing chi-square analysis, the relationships between respondents' stage descriptors and all other variables (demographic and dependent) were examined; however, no relationships differing significantly from chance were discovered.

As is evident, however, these faculty members as a group considered themselves to be, generally, at higher levels than they considered their programs to be. Likewise, they generally considered their programs to be at higher levels than teacher education as a whole. As Table 10 demonstrates, nearly 35% (n=38) of the 110 faculty responding to this item selected Stage 4 (n=19) or Stage 5 (n=19) as the most accurate self descriptor. In contrast, about 10% (n=11) of the 107 faculty describing their own program selected Stage 4 (n=7) or Stage 5 (n=4) as most appropriate.

Even fewer faculty members, some 8.0% (n=10) of the 109 respondents, placed teacher education in general at Stage 4

(n=1) or Stage 5 (n=9). Not surprisingly, Stage 1 was selected as a personal descriptor by about 6% (n=7) of the educators, as a program descriptor by about 17% (n=18), and as a descriptor of teacher education in general by about 19% (n=21).

The most common modal response of individuals describing their own stage was Stage 3 (52.7%); describing their own program, Stage 3 (46.7%); and describing teacher education in general, Stage 2 (41.3%).

Responses to Open-Ended Questions

Survey respondents were provided with a final opportunity to give unstructured information regarding gender equity instruction in pre-service teacher education programs. Their input was sought regarding facilitators of such instruction, barriers to such instruction, and any additional thoughts and general comments about such instruction.

A lengthy list of facilitators and barriers was generated by respondents. Many of the facilitators described were included in the earlier section of the questionnaire on this topic; however, since a greater amount of space was provided at this point in the questionnaire, more detailed comments were secured. Among the most common facilitators noted was the availability of good research and materials, good texts, good journal articles, and other supportive information upon which to base student

assignments. Another facilitator of inclusion frequently mentioned was the gender composition of teacher education classes, with a large percentage of students being female. Several respondents mentioned specific works of literature or texts which facilitated instructional practices. Appendix D contains the verbatim transcript of respondents' comments on facilitators. Following are examples of facilitators named by respondents.

> "Having competent resource people speak to my students has been most beneficial."
>
> "Older female students in class who are willing to speak up"
>
> "The fact that our college has been strongly supporting multiculturalism, which has caused me to be more cognizant of a problem which I did not give adequate thought to previously. In textbooks, pamphlets, etc., when I see the gender equity topic, I am more likely to consider the information than in previous years."
>
> "I have a spouse very attuned to these issues; she has educated me greatly. I have two grown daughters and have been concerned about their futures. As a result, I have read quite a bit of feminist literature: Steinem, Rich, Bernard, etc., and have tried to keep current because I have been concerned about the mounting pressures on the U. S. family."

In terms of barriers to the inclusion of gender equity instruction, there was considerable consensus that time constraints had a negative effect upon the amount of such instruction that could be included in the curriculum. Many individuals mentioned this either directly or indirectly, noting, for example, that there was too much other material that had to be covered. Another constraint was noted to be student resistance to the topic, or lack of student

interest. This pattern corresponded rather directly to the comments of other educators who noted student interest to be a significant facilitator. Some respondents even noted their own ignorance of and biases toward the topic as significant barriers. A complete transcript of respondents' comments on barriers is found in Appendix E. Following are examples of barriers named by respondents.

> "There is so much to cover. Gender is only one area I must address. My responsibility is to all groups and helping all kids learn."
>
> "I've never had a workshop--or anything--in gender equity."
>
> "Student resistance to the realities of gender inequity. Although my students are overwhelmingly female, they do not readily identify with the issues. Most have a decidedly anti-feminist orientation and tend to view advocates of gender equity as 'radical.'"
>
> "I have been told by at least one male professor in this college and by two of my male students that I am making 'too big a deal.' The professor went on to say the topic is not relevant anymore."
>
> "Enforcing (testing, accreditation standards, faculty in-service development) is a mistake. Those who disagree will undermine the process; those who agree are doing it already."
>
> "There are more important issues; it is not my topic."

The section for general comments, not surprisingly, drew the most varied responses. A few individuals shared thoughts, feelings and personal behaviors in this section, noting, for example, that the level of fear expressed in their female students' journals is "scary"; that the "proper sources of information" are not known; and that "males tend to hold power" in this culture. A full transcript of the

many rich comments by respondents is provided in Appendix F. Three final examples must suffice to represent the variety of opinions generated by these questions.

> "My emphasis is not just on equity. As a radical feminist, I disagree with the limited views for women sponsored by liberal feminists. I do believe that an examination of feminism is essential to enable women and men to break through the public backlash against advances for women."
>
> "I feel that there are so many groups trying to gain equity. I hope that the different causes don't overwhelm people. As a teacher, one must be prepared to deal with gender as well as race, and maybe even religion. It's tough."
>
> "As a teacher and coordinator, I need to be mentor and counselor. Do I want to also be the feminist conscience from hell? Can I do both? How?"

Summary

In this chapter the results of program and faculty surveys identified the extent to which gender equity instruction was included in Michigan teacher education programs. Responses were generally consistent despite several demographic variables.

Data analysis demonstrated that programmatic and faculty response to gender equity instruction was minimal to moderate, although strong support existed for including such instruction at moderate to in-depth levels. Results also included preferred curricular approaches, facilitators and barriers to gender equity instruction, and assessment according to a five-phase instructional typology. In Chapter V the results and implications of this study will be analyzed and future research directions identified.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS

In this chapter an analysis and interpretation of the results of the study will be presented, and future research directions suggested by the findings will be discussed. The discussion will move beyond the numbers and tables of Chapter IV to an examination of the potential applications these findings may have for the inclusion of gender equity instruction in programs for pre-service teacher education.

Conclusions

Most of the results presented in Chapter IV stand alone, requiring little further elaboration or analysis for basic understanding. However, a consideration of possible meanings which are not entirely evident upon first examination points to seven themes or conclusions which are supported by the results:

1. Gender equity instruction was perceived by administrators and faculty to be present, at least to some extent, in Michigan pre-service teacher education programs.

2. At the program level, gender equity instruction did not occupy a prominent place in Michigan teacher education

curriculum, philosophy, structure, or design. Nor was there significant relationship between this lack of prominence and variables such as program size, public/private status, or accreditation status.

3. Considerable divergence existed between the amount of gender equity instruction advocated by faculty members and actual inclusion patterns in their own classrooms.

4. Considerable divergence existed between preferred curricular approaches identified by faculty members and actual inclusion patterns in their own classrooms.

5. The most frequently identified barriers to the inclusion of gender equity instruction were those over which faculty perceived themselves having little control. The most frequently identified facilitators were those which would result in the fewest formal constraints on faculty or program autonomy.

6. Considerable divergence existed between faculty members' self-rankings according to an instructional typology and actual inclusion patterns in their own classrooms. Considerable divergence also existed between perceptions of their own stages and perceptions of their program and of teacher education in general.

7. Responses to open-ended questions from program surveys and faculty surveys displayed a rich and remarkable variety of opinions and practices related to gender issues in general and gender equity instruction in particular.

Each of these themes or conclusions will be discussed in greater detail, extrapolating from the body of results reported in the preceding chapter to explore their possible meanings and other qualitative features.

1. Overall Inclusion

Gender equity instruction was perceived by administrators and faculty to be present, at least to some extent, in Michigan pre-service teacher education programs. Based upon both the program survey and faculty survey responses, it was evident that at least minimal instruction on gender equity topics was occurring in 29 of the 30 Michigan pre-service teacher education programs under study here.

This conclusion is supported by the 22 program respondents, all of whom indicated at least minimal inclusion in their institutions, and by the 131 faculty respondents, all but four of whom documented at least minimal inclusion of at least one topic in their classes. It appears safe to conclude that virtually all teacher candidates in Michigan teacher education programs in 1993 were provided with at least minimal exposure to gender equity instruction during their sequence of professional courses.

Of greater interest, perhaps, is the estimation of how minimal such "minimal exposure" is. In the previous chapter it was reported that the highest mean level of inclusion for

all respondents was 1.83 for concrete-level topics, 1.85 for mid-level topics, and 1.63 for topics of an abstract, philosophical or theoretical level, as scored on a 3.0 scale where 1.0 = not at all, 2.0 = somewhat, and 3.0 = in depth. For all three levels of data, the inclusion level was between "not at all" and "somewhat," meaning that none of these topics were frequently incorporated into classroom offerings. At best, most received "some" attention in respondents' classrooms.

At this juncture, it is appropriate to digress briefly to note that the choices afforded the respondents to these survey items undoubtedly had both qualitative as well as quantitative dimensions, but for this study the quantitative features received primary focus. An effort was made in the survey construction to imply that "not at all < somewhat < in depth" is a quantitative relationship, with "somewhat" representing more inclusion than "not at all," and so on. Still, the question arises about the comparability of these response choices across the entire faculty respondent population.

In fact, there is a rather considerable likelihood that faculty members more knowledgeable about the field of gender equity may have been teaching quantitatively more than others who were less knowledgeable, but they may have rated themselves at only a "somewhat" level because they were aware of how extensive the gender equity topic was. Other, less informed faculty may have believed they taught the

topics "in depth" because, with limited knowledge of the field, they may have overestimated the extent of their inclusion patterns.

There is the related possibility that faculty who included all 30 topics in class would not be able to cover all of them in depth because of reality constraints, such as limited time, so they would report inclusion at the "somewhat" level. These faculty who covered several topics "somewhat" might have earned an average score of only 2, although they were including gender equity instruction to considerably greater extent than other faculty with higher scores.

2. Program Inclusion

At the program level, gender equity instruction did not occupy a prominent place in Michigan teacher education curriculum, philosophy, structure or design. Nor was there significant correlation between this lack of prominence and variables such as program size, public/private status, or accreditation status.

Of the 22 institutions responding to the program survey, only one estimated that it provided extensive gender equity instruction; over a third of the respondents estimated minimal levels of instruction. Although half the respondents reported recent increases in gender equity instruction and forecast future increases, almost half reported no recent increase and anticipated no future

increase. Over half the institutions required minimal demonstration of student competency in gender equity instruction, and most required no separate course in gender equity issues, although almost half included gender equity as a component in other equity courses.

That gender equity instruction received little emphasis was not surprising in view of responses reporting minimal formal faculty discussion on the topic, minimal to moderate administrative support, and limited presence of formal program policies or philosophy statements on gender equity instruction.

Less expected was the lack of relationship between the extent of gender equity instruction and accreditation status. Indeed, despite consistent suggestions in the professional literature for the inclusion of gender equity instruction in accreditation standards, there was no indication that NCATE accreditation standards had improved gender equity instruction in accredited Michigan teacher education programs. On the other hand, perhaps accreditation standards were too general, too recently instituted, or not rigorously enforced.

3. Actual Inclusion Compared to Advocated Inclusion

Considerable divergence existed between the amount of gender equity instruction advocated by faculty members and actual inclusion patterns in their own classrooms.

As previously noted, the general level of reported inclusion for the 30 gender equity topics in the classrooms of these respondents ranged from 1.83 for concrete, 1.85 for mid-level topics, and 1.63 for abstract topics, levels between no inclusion at all and some inclusion. In contrast, these same respondents believed that these same topics should be included in their programs, with support for inclusion at 2.33 for concrete topics, 2.31 for mid-level, and 2.16 for abstract. All of these fall in the "somewhat" to "in depth" range.

When the aggregated answers to the first question, "Do you include this topic in the classes you teach?" were compared to the aggregated answers to the second question, "Should this topic appear somewhere in the curriculum?", the divergence between what these educators did and what they believed should be done was evident. Table 11 below (which repeats Table 7 from the previous chapter) highlights this divergence.

Table 11. Faculty Inclusion of Concrete, Mid-Level, and Abstract Topics By Mean Score of Respondents

Level of Topic	A. Include in Own Classes $\bar{X}$	B. Should Be Included in Program $\bar{X}$
Concrete	1.83	2.33
Mid-level	1.85	2.32
Abstract	1.63	2.16
Overall "Score"	1.75	2.30

Faculty clearly believed a high level of inclusion would be most appropriate but reported their own level of response as falling short. They advocated inclusion at a much higher level than they reported in their own practice.

4. Actual Inclusion Compared to Preferred Curricular Approaches

Considerable divergence existed between preferred curricular approaches identified by faculty members and actual inclusions patterns in their own classrooms.

Further evidence for divergence between the beliefs and behaviors of faculty members was provided by respondents' selection of the best curricular approach for the inclusion of gender equity issues in teacher education programs. As Table 8 in the preceding chapter demonstrated, 97% of the faculty members believed gender equity instruction should be provided either throughout the pre-service program (77.9%) or both throughout the program and in a separate course (19.1%). Indeed, only a single respondent indicated that these issues had no place in the pre-service curriculum at all.

This strong support for instruction throughout the curriculum stood in contrast to the amount of inclusion reported in their own courses by faculty members. Again there was evidence that faculty believed that gender equity instruction was appropriate in all courses--except, perhaps, their own.

The question must be considered: Since faculty believed that these topics should be included and, in fact, believed they should be included throughout the curriculum, how can these differences be interpreted and understood? One set of possible answers comes from an analysis of respondents' perceptions of barriers to and facilitators of inclusion of gender equity instruction.

5. Barriers and Facilitators

The most frequently identified barriers to the inclusion of gender equity instruction were those over which faculty perceived themselves having little control. The most frequently identified facilitators were those which would result in the fewest formal constraints on faculty or program autonomy.

Faculty members perceived a variety of barriers preventing the inclusion of gender equity instruction in their classrooms and their programs. At the same time, respondents made clear that there were a number of other characteristics of the academic setting which stimulated, encouraged, or had the potential to stimulate or encourage a convergence between beliefs and practices.

As a general rule, factors identified as barriers were perceived by faculty to be features of the academic environment which were outside their sphere of influence. The most commonly mentioned barrier, for example, was lack of time, generally related to the demands of an already

overcrowded curriculum. There was little sense expressed by respondents that this characteristic could be changed or that the importance of gender equity instruction might cause it to replace other features of the pre-service curriculum.

Factors identified as facilitators, on the other hand, were perceived to be features which provided maximum support for inclusion of gender equity instruction without formal expectations for accountability or other constraints on professional or program autonomy. Facilitators which did not formally constrain faculty or their programs were preferred over formal requirements or institutionalized approaches. Thus, student interest, professional literature, texts and materials, and information about gender equity in the popular media were perceived to be more powerful facilitators than teacher certification requirements, teacher education program accreditation requirements, formal policies, or in-service faculty development.

Interestingly, pre-service students were perceived by the faculty respondents to be both barriers and potential facilitators of gender equity instruction in teacher education programs. Although slightly different forms of reasoning were evident in the comments of individual respondents, their general view of the role of students may be summarized as follows: Students were seen as barriers to the inclusion of gender equity instruction because, seemingly, they did not want to learn about gender equity;

but if students did want to learn about gender equity, their interest would be a powerful facilitator.

In fact, as Table 9 in Chapter IV indicated, some 42.8% of the respondents indicated that student interest would increase their coverage "very much." Another 52.4% indicated that it would increase their coverage "somewhat." Only 4.8% indicated that student interest would not increase their classroom coverage of gender equity topics at all.

Open-ended comments about barriers and facilitators reinforced the strength and pervasiveness of this perception, with many respondents citing student apathy, lack of interest, resistance, or overt hostility to gender-related topics as reasons for not including more coverage of such issues in their classes. This apparent juxtaposition of responsibility (how, after all, would future teachers understand gender equity instructional topics if they were not exposed to them?) perhaps requires further exploration.

In identifying facilitators and barriers to gender equity instruction, respondents indicated that instruction would be stimulated by features of the academic setting which were indirect, informal and optional rather than by features which standardized expectations for inclusion based upon performance criteria for themselves or their students. Again, further exploration of this area would be of value in understanding this perception more completely, especially since the presence of requirements for certification or

accreditation have produced obvious increases in the inclusion of other aspects of the pre-service curriculum.

6. Actual Inclusion Compared to Stage Rankings

Considerable divergence existed between faculty members' self-rankings according to an instructional typology and their actual patterns of inclusion in their own classrooms. Considerable divergence also existed between perceptions of their own stages and perceptions of their program and of teacher education in general.

The results of individual faculty members' identification of their own, their programs', and the profession's stages within a model of scholarship on women provided interesting results, particularly in contrast with other findings. The respondents as a group, for example, had already described their inclusion of gender equity topics earlier in the questionnaire. Overall, these self-reported patterns indicated that this population of educators was not highly involved in the usage or dissemination of scholarship on women. In particular, the almost total absence of abstract-level topics indicated the general lack of coverage given to the philosophical underpinnings of gender equity topics.

Yet, in completing the final section of the questionnaire, more than one-third (34.6%) of these respondents selected Stage 4 or Stage 5, the most philosophical phases of the model, to describe their

approach to scholarship on women. The results from these two different sections of the faculty survey are distinctly incongruent.

There was also an interesting difference of perception evident when individuals ranked their own stage compared to the stage of their programs and the stage of the teacher education profession. As was discussed in Chapter IV, faculty perceived themselves generally at a higher stage than their own programs, and their own programs generally at a higher stage than the profession as a whole. The implication was that those at the lower stages were other faculty, in other programs. This phenomenon may have been no more than a basic human tendency to value one's self and one's close associates more highly than others; or, it may represent something quite different. In any event, it is another area of incongruity within this data set which is both thought-provoking and worthy of further discussion.

7. Open-Ended Responses

Responses to open-ended questions from program surveys and faculty surveys displayed a rich and remarkable variety of opinions and practices related to gender issues in general and gender equity instruction in particular.

As a set, these responses belied the apparent self-satisfaction displayed in respondents' stage rankings. Most noteworthy about the open-ended responses was the almost total absence of self-satisfaction, complacency or smugness

about gender equity and its place in teacher education. Respondents displayed an earnestness about teaching the subject to their students and frustration with the lack of materials, modest support from colleagues, and apparent student resistance to the topic.

In granting the possibility that respondents who took additional time to write extensive and thought-provoking comments might represent a population already disposed to gender equity instruction, it should also be noted that their responses demonstrated sincere self-reflection, self-examination, and general soul-searching about how they might do a better job in teaching future teachers about gender equity.

Interpretations

Several possible interpretations may be made of the many areas and aspects of incongruence evident in the responses of faculty members and program administrators. Among these possible interpretations, the following appear to possess the most potential.

Faculty may not have been knowledgeable enough about scholarship on women or gender equity to permit accurate self assessments of their own stages, the stages of their programs, and the stages of the profession, or to accurately assess their beliefs and behaviors related to the inclusion of gender equity topics. It would seem, on the one hand, that these individuals underestimated or under-reported

their classroom inclusion patterns or, on the other hand, that they overestimated or over-reported their beliefs or stage achievements. This would result in the impression of a greater divergence than actually existed. The alternative is also possible: that the classroom inclusion patterns were overestimated and the stage achievement levels under-estimated. In this case, the divergence is even larger than presently documented.

Another interpretation of the data is that faculty may have ranked their stages in a holistic fashion, while assessing the 30 items in a more literal fashion. It should be noted here that achievement of Stage 5 is considered to be perhaps unattainable at this time in the evolution of scholarship on women. Phase theorists themselves are reluctant to evaluate their own scholarship at the upper levels of the model. Yet more than a third of the faculty participating in this study exhibited no such reluctance. Perhaps respondents selected the stage they believed they had achieved with other equity issues, not gender equity, or the stage to which they aspired, not the one they had actually reached. Viewed in this light, the results would take on an entirely different interpretation, indicating the direction toward which pre-service programs in Michigan were moving rather than the stage it had already reached.

There was in the faculty responses to the instructional typology a measure of personal satisfaction. Respondents perceived they were at somewhat higher levels than others

and that their programs were at somewhat higher levels than the field of teacher education in general. Although this perception could not be accurate, since almost every institution within the state was represented, only 4.5% of the respondents (n=5) acknowledged being at Stage 1, teaching in a Stage 1 program, within a Stage 1 profession. Yet the results of both faculty and program surveys suggested that Stage 1 or Stage 2 was probably the best characterization of teacher education programs in Michigan, with few programs or individuals differing significantly from the overall pattern. Additionally, only a single program survey respondent assessed the coverage of gender equity instruction in that institution's program as "extensive." Only 10 of 22 program respondents noted the presence of a guiding philosophy statement related to gender equity; and just two programs required coursework in gender equity for pre-service teachers.

At the time this study was conducted, actual gender equity instruction was not reported to be extensive in Michigan teacher education programs, despite the seemingly elevated rankings on the instructional typology. This interpretation was further verified by the responses to the open-ended questions, which acknowledged that individual faculty members must do much more with the subject of gender equity. They also reflected frustration that gender equity instruction did not occupy a more prominent place in Michigan teacher education programs.

Limitations of the Study

The present research has endeavored to examine beliefs and practices related to the inclusion of gender equity instruction in teacher education programs within the state of Michigan. To accomplish this, it has relied on the self report of faculty members and program administrators on confidential questionnaires. At least three related limitations have entered into the study as a consequence.

In the first place, the self report method depends heavily on respondents providing accurate information in a standardized form. Every effort was made to design survey instruments which were unambiguous, brief, and focused to the point of the inquiry. Both forced-choice and open-ended questions were provided to balance the need for structure with the need for flexibility of response. But there is no doubt that a wide range of survey respondent interpretations of the questionnaire items and instructions probably occurred.

Another limitation lies in the potential differences between what individuals report and what they actually do. Other methods of gathering data, such as direct observation, tape recording, video recording, or student report, may have yielded significantly different results.

A third limitation of the study is that respondents returning the survey instruments may or may not have been typical of the entire sets of programs or faculty members in the state. Some 73% of the 29 teacher education programs in

Michigan returned the program survey. Some 53% of the faculty members responded to the faculty survey. In all likelihood, programs and individuals returning surveys were more likely to be interested in the topic of gender equity in teacher education than programs and individuals who did not respond. Whether or not this presumably heightened level of interest influenced the results must at least be seriously considered, although the exact effect upon findings is not known.

Directions for Future Research

This effort has discerned a number of important features about the inclusion of gender equity instruction in pre-service teacher education programs within the state of Michigan. These findings are of importance not only at the statewide level but also, potentially, at the national level because Michigan programs produce large numbers of elementary and secondary teachers for schools across the country.

The findings can be summarized briefly as follows: Gender equity instruction was documented in Michigan teacher education programs, but it existed at a minimal level. Faculty in teacher education programs provided the most instruction on concrete and mid-level gender equity topics but rarely incorporated abstract topics into their classroom offerings, regardless of the courses taught. Faculty believed in-depth instruction should be provided

throughout the curriculum, but no one reason emerged to explain why this instruction did not occur. Barriers to inclusion of more in-depth information were identified, as were facilitators. Faculty generally rated themselves and their programs above average in the provision of gender equity instruction but rated the field of teacher education in general below average in this respect. Open-ended responses demonstrated positive attitudes toward gender equity instruction and disappointment with the barriers to inclusion.

The need for future research to explore and extend these findings in more depth is clear. Some areas of the present effort would appear to yield particularly useful information with additional study. These include the following:

1. Explorations of actual faculty inclusion patterns utilizing observation, recordings, student surveys, syllabi analysis or personal interviews in Michigan institutions and across the country.

2. Further examination of the apparent distance between what faculty members advocate about gender equity instruction and what they actually provide in their classes; attention should also be given to their perceptions that gender equity content is best provided throughout the curriculum.

3. Focused study of the perceived barriers to and facilitators of gender equity instruction, including

comparisons of pre-service programs in the nation where formal requirements already exist and programs which have no formal requirements. The differential impact of features such as collegial support, availability of texts, in-service development, and professional journals needs closer examination, as does the role of student attitudes and behaviors in influencing faculty perceptions and behaviors about these topics. The area of student attitudes and behaviors particularly begs for in-depth analysis and explication as it appeared to have particular significance as both a barrier to and a facilitator of gender instruction in this study.

4. Additional attention should be directed toward studying educational organizations and educators in terms of instructional typologies. It is unclear whether the application of the phase model to gender equity instruction is appropriate at this point.

Michigan pre-service programs have provided a useful focus in pursuing answers about gender equity instruction. Not only do institutions within the state produce a large cadre of teacher candidates each year, the diversity among these institutions is wide. Michigan pre-service programs include very large programs and very small, accredited programs and non-accredited, and private institutions and public. Within this single state are present many of the

variables found in such programs across the entire nation. Findings from this study, therefore--though confined to a single Midwestern state--can be generalized to some extent. Certainly they will have implications for gender equity issues in pre-service teacher education programs in other states.

Survey respondents have displayed a variety and intensity of opinions about gender issues and gender equity instruction. Yet the area of gender equity instruction in teacher education programs seems to have received neither the attention it deserves nor the emphasis researchers have advocated for over two decades. Future teachers must develop the knowledge, sensitivity and skills to teach females and males in ways that promote equity and also transform limited perspectives on gender. Further research is needed on program design, faculty attitudes, and curriculum development if teacher education is to participate in this important aspect of preparing professional educators.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM SURVEY INSTRUMENT

PROGRAM SURVEY INSTRUMENT

GENDER EQUITY IN SCHOOLS: THE ROLE OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

About This Project:

A substantial body of research over the last several years has examined gender equity issues in elementary and secondary schools — including areas such as gender equity in textbooks and materials, student behavior, teacher expectations, and gender-related patterns in learning styles.

However, little is known about the extent to which gender equity issues are covered in teacher education programs.

This state-wide Program Survey is part of a research project I am conducting on gender equity instruction in pre-service teacher education. A Faculty Survey is also being sent to individual teacher education faculty members. By participating, you will suggest possible directions for pre-service curriculum development and gender equity instruction.

- The questionnaire requires about 20 minutes to complete.
- All responses will remain strictly confidential.
- A return envelope is included for your convenience.

I would appreciate return of the questionnaire within 10 days after you receive it. If the return envelope has been lost, please mail the questionnaire or any questions you might have to the following address:

C.E. Mader
School of Education
Grand Valley State University
Allendale, MI 49401

Note: One person in each institution is being sent this Program Survey. Respondents have been taken from the current DARTEP membership roster and/or MACTE personnel directory. However, if another colleague in your program is better able to answer this questionnaire, please feel free to ask him or her to do so.

_____ *(For Follow-Up Purposes Only)*

TERMINOLOGY

1. *Gender Bias*. Although gender bias can be harmful to both males and females, this study focuses primarily on bias affecting females. It stems from attitudes and beliefs, often unconscious, which relegate females to an invisible, passive, or inferior status.

2. *Gender Equity Instruction*. In teacher education programs, gender equity instruction prepares future teachers to recognize and address the effects of gender bias in schools and society. Also included is awareness of how the educational system itself can perpetuate inequity based on gender.

3. *Pre-Service Courses / Professional Program*. Those courses comprising the professional education sequence required of all teacher candidates regardless of content area endorsement.

The following questions will help provide a profile of pre-service programs for use in the analysis of results:

PROGRAM PROFILE

1. **Size of Program: Please indicate approximately how many candidates complete your pre-service program each year:**

   ___ Under 100 ___ 101-200 ___ 201-300 ___ 301-400 ___ 401-500 ___ Over 500

2. **Accreditation Status: Please indicate if your program is accredited by a national teacher education accrediting body:**

   Accredited by: .....

3. **Public/Private Institution: Please indicate whether yours is a public or private institution:**

   ..... Public Institution ..... Private Institution

4. **Education Faculty and Administrators: Please include only those in the pre-service professional program (defined above). Please do not include adjunct faculty or those in departments other than teacher education.**

Rank/Position of Faculty, Administrators	Number of Males	Number of Females
Professor	____	____
Associate Professor	.....	.....
Assistant Professor	____	____
Visiting Faculty	____	____
Instructor	____	____
Lecturer	____	____
Dean	____	____
Associate/Assistant Dean	.....	.....
Director	____	____
Associate/Assistant Director	____	____
Other Administrative Personnel	____	____

Please respond to the following as they pertain to your pre-service professional program.

A. Programmatic Response to Gender Equity Instruction

1. At this time, the overall amount of gender equity instruction in our program would best be described as:
   ___ Extensive, ___ Moderate, ___ Minimal, ___ Not Sure.

2. Over the last 2-3 years, the amount of gender equity instruction in our program has:
   ___ Increased, ___ Decreased, ___ Stayed the Same, ___ Not Sure.

3. For the next 2-3 years, we have planned the following for gender equity instruction in our program:
   ___ More Coverage, ___ Less Coverage, ___ No Change, ___ Not Sure.

4. Formal faculty discussion on gender equity instruction in our program would best be described as:
   ___ Extensive, ___ Moderate, ___ Minimal, ___ Not Sure.

5. Expressed administrative support for gender equity instruction in our program would best be described as:
   ___ Extensive, ___ Moderate, ___ Minimal, ___ Not Sure.

6. Our requirements for demonstrated student competency in gender-fair instruction would best be described as:
   ___ Extensive, ___ Moderate, ___ Minimal, ___ Not Sure.

7. Our program's policy and/or philosophy statements specifically address gender equity instruction: ___ Yes, ___ No, ___ Not Sure.

8. Our program offers at least one course devoted wholly to gender equity issues:
   ___ Yes, ___ No, ___ Not Sure. If so, is it: ___ Required? ___ Elective?
   If so, please provide the course title(s):

9. Our program offers at least one course devoted to equity issues, including gender equity: ___ Yes, ___ No, ___ Not Sure. If so, is it: ___ Required? ___ Elective?
   If so, please provide the course title(s):

B. This section provides an opportunity to respond in an open-ended fashion. You may wish to also attach additional pages.

1. **Facilitators:** To the extent that your program does include gender equity instruction, what have been the main facilitators?

2. **Barriers:** To the extent that your program does not include gender equity instruction, please suggest why you think this is.

3. **Additional Comments:** Please share any additional thoughts and comments about gender equity instruction in teacher education programs.

APPENDIX B

FACULTY SURVEY INSTRUMENT

FACULTY SURVEY INSTRUMENT

GENDER EQUITY IN SCHOOLS: THE ROLE OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

About This Project:

A substantial body of research over the last several years has examined gender equity issues in elementary and secondary schools — including areas such as gender equity in textbooks and materials, student behavior, teacher expectations, and gender-related patterns in learning styles.

However, little is known about the extent to which gender equity issues are covered in teacher education programs.

This state-wide Faculty Survey is part of a research project I am conducting on gender equity instruction in pre-service teacher education. By participating, you will suggest possible directions for pre-service curriculum development and gender equity instruction.

- The questionnaire requires about 20 minutes to complete.
- All responses will remain strictly confidential.
- A return envelope is included for your convenience.

I would appreciate return of the questionnaire within 10 days after you receive it. If the return envelope has been lost, please mail the questionnaire or any questions you might have to the following address:

C.E. Mader
School of Education
Grand Valley State University
Allendale, MI 49401

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!

_____ *(For Follow-Up Purposes Only)*

TERMINOLOGY

1. *Gender Bias*. Although gender bias can be harmful to both males and females, this study focuses primarily on bias affecting females. It stems from attitudes and beliefs, often unconscious, which relegate females to an invisible, passive, or inferior status.

2. *Gender Equity Instruction*. In teacher education programs, gender equity instruction prepares future teachers to recognize and address the effects of gender bias in schools and society. Also included is awareness of how the educational system itself can perpetuate inequity based on gender.

3. *Pre-Service Courses / Professional Program*. Those courses comprising the professional education sequence required of all teacher candidates regardless of content area endorsement.

The following questions will help provide a profile of respondents for use in the analysis of results:

RESPONDENT PROFILE

Age:	Sex:	Rank:	Status:
___ Under 30 ___ 31-40 ___ 41-50 ___ 51-60 ___ Over 60	___ Male ___ Female	___ Professor ___ Associate Professor ___ Assistant Professor ___ Instructor ___ Lecturer ___ Other:	___ Tenured Faculty ___ Tenure Track Faculty ___ Visiting Faculty ___ Adjunct Faculty ___ Other:
Race/Ethnicity:		**Appointment:**	**Current Assignment(s) In Professional Program:**
___ African American ___ Asian American ___ Caucasian ___ Hispanic American ___ Native American ___ Other:		___ Department/School/ College of Education ___ Department/School/ College of:	___ Foundations Courses ___ Methods Courses ___ Clinical Experiences ___ Human Development/ Psychology Courses ___ Other:

I. General Perspective on Gender Equity Instruction

1. The overall amount of gender equity instruction I currently provide in my classes would best be described as:
___ Extensive, ___ Moderate, ___ Minimal, ___ Not Present.

2. My overall level of familiarity with gender equity issues would best be described as:
___ Extensive, ___ Moderate, ___ Minimal, ___ Not Present.

Directions: Please repond to the following as they pertain to courses *In your pre-service professional program:*

II. Examples of Gender Equity Topics for Pre-Service Classes	Do You Include This Topic in the Classes You Teach?			Should It Appear Somewhere in Pre-Service Courses?		
	Not At All	Some-what	In Depth	Not At All	Some-what	In Depth
1. Direct discussion with students about various forms of gender bias	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Analysis of school textbooks and materials for gender equity.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Title IX and other sex equity laws	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Gender patterns in subjects such as mathematics, science, technology	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Gender patterns in extra-curricular school activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Test bias as related to gender	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Gender patterns among those referred for remedial help and special education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Sexual harassment/discounting of female students by classmates or teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Gender-related patterns in counseling — college, career, and personal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Direct practice in gender-fair lesson plans, instruction, and teaching styles	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Gender-related differences in learning styles and preferred classroom activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Single-gender vs. mixed-gender learning groups	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. Amount and quality of teacher attention as it relates to student gender	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Teacher grading standards as they relate to student gender	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. Teacher expectations of student behavior as related to student gender	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Gender-related reward systems for assertiveness/passivity	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. Loss of personal "voice" in adolescent females	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Effects of gender-exclusive language	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

II. Examples of Gender Equity Topics for Pre-Service Classes	Do You Include This Topic in the Classes You Teach?			Should It Appear Somewhere in Pre-Service Courses?		
	Not At All	Some-what	In Depth	Not At All	Some-what	In Depth
19. Differential valuing of "male" and "female" attributes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. Encouraging "female" attributes in male students, as well as vice versa	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. Incorporating issues of gender, power and violence against females into the traditional school curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. Gender-specific concepts of "success" and "achievement" in education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. Inter-connections between gender, race and class inequity	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. Viewing education topics from explicitly female perspectives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25. Gender-related staffing patterns in schools and in teacher education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26. Women's role in education; implications of teaching as a female profession	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. Whether bias against females can be present in a largely female profession	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28. Competition-nurturance conflict within education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
29. Education's traditional reliance on male developmental models; inclusion of female developmental models	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
30. The absence of gender equity as a topic in most educational reform literature	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

31. Please describe other gender equity topics which you include in your classes:

III. Curricular Approaches: Which statement best reflects your opinion about pre-service instruction?	I Most Agree With: (Check *only* One)
1. Gender equity instruction should be provided in a separate course.	☐
2. Gender equity instruction should be provided throughout the program.	☐
3. Gender equity instruction should be provided using both approaches: throughout the program and in a separate course.	☐
4. Gender equity instruction should not be provided in pre-service programs.	☐

IV. Facilitators: To what extent do (or, would) the following increase your coverage of gender equity issues in your classes?	Not At All	Some-what	Very Much
1. Teacher education texts and materials which address gender equity issues	☐	☐	☐
2. Professional literature, articles, journals which address gender equity issues	☐	☐	☐
3. General news and media coverage which address gender equity issues	☐	☐	☐
4. In-service faculty seminars on gender equity issues	☐	☐	☐
5. Teacher certification testing on gender equity issues	☐	☐	☐
6. Stronger accreditation standards on gender equity instruction	☐	☐	☐
7. Formal program policies on gender equity instruction	☐	☐	☐
8. Support from faculty colleagues for gender equity instruction	☐	☐	☐
9. Support from program administrators for gender equity instruction	☐	☐	☐
10. Student interest in gender equity instruction	☐	☐	☐
11. Other facilitators:			

V. This section provides an opportunity to respond in an open-ended fashion. You may wish to also use the back page or attach additional pages.

1. **Facilitators**: To the extent that you do include gender equity instruction in your classes, what have been the main facilitators?

2. **Barriers**: To the extent that you do not include gender equity instruction in your classes, please suggest why you think this is.

3. **Additional Comments**: Please share any additional thoughts and comments about gender equity instruction in teacher education programs.

VI. Instructional Typology: The following stages* are said to describe the gradual process whereby scholarship on women enters the curriculum: (McIntosh, 1989; Tetreault, 1985)

Stage 1. Scholarship on women is not present. In the discipline, the omission of scholarship on women is not noticed. There is little consciousness that traditional models often overlook the existence of females as a group.

In schools, emphasis is on preparing students for achievement and success. In teacher education programs, candidates are not exposed to gender equity concepts.

Stage 2. Emphasis is on exceptional women. In the discipline, the omission of scholarship on women is noticed. An effort is made to include women who have succeeded according to a male norm of greatness or excellence, e.g., female prime minister, female astronaut, etc.

In schools, emphasis continues to be on preparing students for achievement and success. In teacher education programs, candidates are encouraged to include lesson plans with women in unusual roles.

Stage 3. Emphasis is on females achieving equality with males. In the discipline, traditional scholarship is challenged. Cultural and gender norms are questioned. There is an acknowledgment of female oppression and efforts to overcome it.

In schools, female students are encouraged to succeed in traditionally male fields and endeavors. In teacher education programs, traditional assumptions about gender roles are questioned.

Stage 4. Emphasis is on explicitly female experiences. This stage marks a dramatic shift in consciousness away from a male norm. In the discipline, women's experiences are studied on their own terms — rather than the extent to which they differ from male experiences. Women's everyday lives, friendships, child-rearing activities, and other work behind the scenes take on new value for their role in maintaining civilization and human relationships.

In schools, relational and affiliative skills are valued, not taken advantage of. In teacher education programs, candidates examine research on female models of learning, teaching, and administering schools.

Stage 5. This stage is difficult to conceive of because of distortions and omissions in the knowledge base.

In a Stage 5 curriculum, scholars would search for points where human experiences intersect. The lives of women and all men would be studied — not just the few successful men. The curriculum would be respectful and inclusive of women and men of diverse races, classes, sexual orientations, societies, and value systems.

Please mark "X" at the point best representing each of the following:

	STAGE 1	STAGE 2	STAGE 3	STAGE 4	STAGE 5
A. Your Own Current Approach:					
B. Your Program's Approach:					
C. Teacher Education in General:					

APPENDIX C

OTHER GENDER EQUITY TOPICS INCLUDED IN CLASSES

APPENDIX C

OTHER GENDER EQUITY TOPICS INCLUDED IN CLASSES

(Verbatim responses to Faculty Survey, Part II, Question 31.)

1. Socio-Cultural Factors

* Old boy and old girl networks

* Mentoring

* Sections on advertising

* Examination of women's collusion with their own subordination

* Examination of religion and women's subordination

* Examination of reason and women's subordination

* Examination of cultural socialization and women's silencing themselves

* Many of the gender equity topics [in this survey] as they apply to Christian Education

* Moral development perspectives: justice (Kohlberg) vs. caring (Gilligan)

* Gender bias in the media, film, books, and toys that might be used in and out of the classroom

* Thorough discussion of equal opportunity topics from all perspectives

* Review and analysis of historical and legal aspects of reports and cases related to gender

* Socialization of male vs. female

* Moral development

* Power and social control

* In [my class] we discuss women's roles as primary caregivers and links between home and school, female children's frequent role as surrogate parents and its effect on school performance, single parent families, homeless women and their children, and ways to involve fathers in school.

APPENDIX C: OTHER GENDER EQUITY TOPICS DISCUSSED IN CLASS

2. Socio-Cultural Factors (Continued)

* Assessment and critique of bureaucratic discourse and its effects on feminization of all workers

* Educational opportunity

* Structures of care

* My [class] deals with the perceived roles of the working mother vs. working father, females working outside the home, women affecting the political scene on behalf of children and families at local, state, national and international levels.

* Self-fulfilling prophecy as it relates to gender and race

* Sexual harassment

* NEA poster, "American Women: Leaders of Vision" has been on my door for over a month.

* Gender-role socialization and development

* Gender is one of many issues we explore, along with class, race and religion.

* Race, gender and religion are all part of the selection process, and we address the issues as they deal with contemporary literature.

* I try to use a balance of equity issues: race, religion, gender, culture, social-economic, body type, size, and appearance.

3. Psychological Factors

* Eating disorders as related to female issues

* Gender and sexuality issues

* Loss of self-esteem in adolescent, particularly white, females

* Early and late maturing (physically) girls and long-term effects on development

* Androgyny and research related to its importance in modern life (Heath's Fulfilling Lives)

* Seating arrangements, leadership assignments in classroom

APPENDIX C: OTHER GENDER EQUITY TOPICS DISCUSSED IN CLASS

4. Educational Practice and Theory

* Case study on adolescent girl--Gilligan response, Belenky, et al. research

* Examination of a connectionist philosophy for elementary classrooms

* Standardized tests

* How loss of self-esteem affects female student roles

* Teacher expectations which vary from male to female

* Textbook "slanted" presentations

* Male/female disparities in special education populations and placements

* Recent AAUW reports (on educational gender bias)

* Socialization of male vs. female [as it affects] behavior, grades, self-esteem, attention deficit disorder, verbal skills vs. math and science skills

* Appropriateness and nature of gender-related rewards for academic success

* My classes are in school finance and testing and evaluation. Most of the inclusions [in this survey] relate to assessment bias and equity in test construction, scoring and reporting.

* Girls in science and math--what helps retention

* The literacy courses I teach are based on an orientation toward "natural learning," which specifically encourages and enables university students to examine equity issues of all kinds; for example: Who has access to literacy? Who decided what counts as literacy? In whose interests are these decisions made? Gender equity is a vital aspect of these considerations.

* I stress books with strong female characters in my literature and show how gender change differs over the course of time.

* Different expectations for affective teaching aspects, e.g., male vs. female touching, etc.

APPENDIX C: OTHER GENDER EQUITY TOPICS DISCUSSED IN CLASS

4. Educational Practice and Theory (Continued)

* I try to look at both sides of the picture. Not only is there a problem of gender stereotyping for girls, but we know that boys do less well in the lower grades, likely because of teacher differences in expectations, and certain school activities, including reading, tend to be viewed as female activities in our culture. Gender expectations can be very harmful, period.

* Conscious appraisal of positive reinforcement, e.g., for girls, "You look pretty"; for boys, "You're smart."

* Gender and becoming "at-risk"

* I teach a course on individualized instruction, and [gender equity] is one subtopic. Also, I have taught a special themes class on [gender equity]. Each semester I teach reading methods courses in which I deal with gender issues.

* Gender equity instruction is primarily covered in class discussion and lectures related to the concept of student and teacher identity, i.e., Erik Erikson's concept of identity.

* Gender equity discussion is addressed by way of the impact that social expectations influence the behavior, academic performance and career choice of teachers and students.

* I teach a course on exceptional learners. We explore the manner in which any exceptionality (gender, race, disability, sexual orientation) can lead to marginalization and oppression.

APPENDIX D

FACILITATORS OF GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

APPENDIX D

FACILITATORS OF GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

(Verbatim responses to Faculty Survey, Parts IV, Question 11 and Part V, Question 1; Program Survey, Part B, Question 1)

(P=Program Survey; F=Faculty Survey)

1. Support From Faculty and Administrators

* Faculty members who are supportive of the issue of gender equity (P)

* Faculty (P)

* Female dean (P)

* [Particular colleague's] interest in gender equity (P)

* The professors (P)

* The dean, [another colleague] and I created this [gender equity] course two years ago. It is the first course cross-listed in the College of Arts and Sciences and in our School of Education. The first time the course was offered, we had four students, and we team taught it; the dean allowed it to go. This term we offered it again to 26 students, graduate and undergraduate, in the School of Education and as a Women's Studies elective. . . . We are speaking at ATE about the course and are called upon to present throughout the local area. (P)

* The early childhood and elementary education programs have gender equity as a strong theme due to faculty's interests and research agendas. (P)

* Other faculty (F)

* Collaboration with faculty teaching foundations courses (F)

* Discussion among colleagues (F)

* Former colleague with expertise in this area (F)

* Commitment by the School of Education for courses which address the subject; I've taught [this class] for 13 years. (F)

APPENDIX D: FACILITATORS OF GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

2. Professional Resources

* Speaker from the Office of Sex Equity (P)
* Campus-wide Women's Week (P)
* Textbook selection (P)
* Various people on and off campus (P)
* Recent research over the last 10 years (P)
* Reasonably good research in mathematics education on gender equity (P)
* I developed a module on this topic for my educational psychology course as a part of an NSF grant. (F)
* A directory of guest speakers and their area of expertise for use in various classes and faculty inservices (F)
* Bibliographies and abstracts of publications and projects addressing gender equity (F)
* Journal articles (F)
* Formal presentations by faculty members or college staff (F)
* Readings from outside sources (F)
* Books and articles on topics, an occasional video (F)
* TESA and GESA information (F)
* Newspaper articles (F)
* Research on gender identity and development (F)
* Appropriate textbook materials (F)
* Reading appropriate literature (F)
* The main facilitators other than myself are life history texts of women; historical work of all types written by feminist authors, male and female; pedagogical texts that have feminist authors and focus; text analysis of films and pop culture images (F)
* Current events (F)

APPENDIX D: FACILITATORS OF GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

2. Professional Resources (Continued)

* Writings (not very many) in journals, more in newspapers (F)

* Research reports of gender bias in teaching patterns (F)

* [Our] pre-service class text has good material, same for educational psychology text. (F)

* Text materials, visual tapes (F)

* Special materials designed to be incorporated in curriculum across the content sequences (F)

* Materials in texts, professional journals, news media (F)

* AAUW information [on gender equity] from last year piqued interest of students. (F)

* Materials and speakers of Office of Sex Equity (F)

* General news and media and professional literature have facilitated the inclusion of gender equity issues in my courses. (F)

* Professional reading (F)

* Textbooks (F)

* Professional literature, especially journals which address gender equity issues, especially in science education. I am also interested in books that address these issues. I have recently acquired a new book in this regard: Option For Girls: A Door to the Future, M. Wilson, editor. (F)

* Textbook material, current articles in the various media (F)

* Text stimulated discussions which occur from literature and basal stories (F)

* Both textbooks used have some information, so the students don't think it is my "personal" agenda. (F)

* Chapters on female educators in the history of education, e.g., Maria Montessori, Jane Addams) (F)

* Articles written by female academics on non-gender specific topics (F)

APPENDIX D: FACILITATORS OF GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

2. Professional Resources (Continued)

* AAUW, their video and commitment [to gender equity] (F)
* Professional journal articles (F)
* Conferences and presentations (F)
* Research in professional field (F)
* Kohle's Windows into Science Classrooms; Weiler's Women Teaching for Change; Women's Ways of Knowing; Miller's Thou Shalt Not Be Aware; McIntosh's White Privilege; Male Privilege; Gilligan's Making Connections (F)
* Topic covered in education text (F)
* Gilligan's work at Emma Willard and Meeting at the Crossroads (F)
* Examples of good texts and contributions to children's literature (F)
* Published research summaries (F)
* Literature on the subject (F)
* Texts and materials which address gender equity. Since my classes are largely literature, gender bias recognition in trade books is a part of the evaluation process in selecting materials for young people (F)
* Books like Hewlett's When the Bough Breaks and A Lesser Life (F)
* Using a course packet which is updated on a regular basis rather than a text (F)
* Presentations of gender equity reports/research (F)
* Video tapes from local TV stations (F)
* Speakers, especially politicians, who discuss issues (F)
* Research data (F)
* News and media coverage (F)
* Professional journals and articles (F)
* Having competent resource people speak to my students has been most beneficial. (F)

APPENDIX D: FACILITATORS OF GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

3. Student Interest

* Student requests and interest in gender equity issues (P)
* Older female students in class who are willing to speak up (F)
* Student interest: questions in class during discussion, as, recently, a guest speaker on learning disabilities was questioned (F)
* My students' questions and interests (F)
* Students sharing stories from their own experiences (F)
* Life stories of my students (F)
* Class discussion (mainly women) in my elementary reading classes (F)
* Presence of both male and female students in assigned classroom (F)
* Student interest and needs (F)
* Student experiences before they arrive in the course (F)
* Student experiences as they work in schools (F)
* Student feedback and discussion (F)

4. Program Goals/Overall Climate

* The fact that we were an historically all-female college has fostered a strong tradition of the assumed competence of women. In addition, the religious congregation that sponsors our institution has public and prominent feminist values. (P)
* A philosophical statement by faculty that supports equity issues. A diverse staff with a variety of experiences, backgrounds that bring such issues to meetings where curriculum decisions are made. Employment practices at this university. (P)
* Modeling of gender equity by members of this field (F)

APPENDIX D: FACILITATORS OF GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

4. Program Goals/Overall Climate (Continued)

* The fact that our college has been strongly supporting multiculturalism, which has caused me to be more cognizant of a problem which I did not give adequate thought to previously. In textbooks, pamphlets, etc., when I see the gender equity topic, I am more likely to consider the information than in previous years. I've not been gender conscious because I've never thought of women being inferior to me. I honestly do not practice inequity. (F)

* An additional support has been our college's expectation that women's issues be taken seriously. (F)

* We have a gender requirement in the core, and students are becoming more aware. (F)

5. Curriculum Structure and Practices

* Collaboration with other professors in blocked courses. It is much more time efficient to [relate issues in two courses] rather than trying to do it all in one. (F)

* Lab courses seem most meaningful during second year methods courses. I raise issues in the first year in foundations courses. The methods courses seem to mean more because students are aware of their students and patterns of sex bias that surface. (F)

* The main facilitators have been children's literature and teacher questioning techniques. (F)

* New focus of program learning outcomes provides stimulus to search for more information to pass on to students. (F)

* [My] own course requirements regarding in-depth evaluation of textbooks (F)

* The manner in which I conceptualize the ongoing process by which "normal" is constructed in our society serves to open the discourse to allow an examination of gender issues. (F)

* I generally try to familiarize students with the problem of gender equity and to identify ways in which it can and has been dealt with in real programs. I will also call gender bias to the attention of students when it occurs and will discuss it. In science methods, I assign several readings in this area. (F)

APPENDIX D: FACILITATORS OF GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

5. Curriculum Structure and Practices (Continued)

* I have cautioned my people about the use of gender when doing examples on the board. I have used textbooks to make people aware. I've tried to include unknown but famous women in doing research reports, poetry, etc. (F)

* I include issues that are directly associated with the course content and objectives. Most gender issues have been dealt with in foundations and developmental psychology courses. (F)

* [I include] issues that individuals have grappled with. Also, use of personal history reconstructions as a vehicle to discuss gender issues. (F)

* Student feedback and discussion (F)

* The reading courses examine gender and other biases as part of basal reader development over the years. All courses discuss the misconceptions of elementary education as particularly female. (F)

* Some courses lend themselves more to these issues than others although I include some of these in all my courses. (F)

* Course goals and objectives (F)

* I also use popular culture sources for discussing gender equity issues. (F)

* Open discussion of the issues so that new perceptions can be developed. Most teachers do not ignore girls or give them less response time because they want them to do poorly; they simply don't understand what they are doing and how they can change their behavior. (F)

* Most equity issues come up in discussion, often started by me. (F)

6. Accreditation Guidelines and Certification Testing

* [Stronger] accreditation standards on gender equity (P)

* New standards for outcomes-based education from North Central Association and Michigan Department of Education (P)

APPENDIX D: FACILITATORS OF GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

7. Personal Interest and Experience

* What I actually observe and experience in schools (F)

* I have a spouse very attuned to these issues; she has educated me greatly. I have two grown daughters and have been concerned about their futures. As a result, I have read quite a bit of feminist literature: Steinem, Rich, Bernard, etc., and have tried to keep current because I have been concerned about the mounting pressures on the U. S. family. (F)

* A personal desire to overcome gender difference between instructor and student. As a male faculty member in a teacher education program with strong elementary and special education components, my classes are made up of 85-90% females. (F)

* My own experiences and knowledge (F)

* Personal interest and knowledge; professional development activities (F)

* Course I attended on sexual harassment; I was determined to share this information with my predominantly female students. (F)

* Personal interest (F)

* My daughter (F)

* Myself and my background as a high school teacher; this, for me, is the biggest awareness factor. (F)

* My personal experience in education (34 years in public sector, 6 in higher education) (F)

* Personal experiences (F)

* Personal graduate coursework on gender issues (F)

* Past concern and involvement in K-12 programs (F)

* Personal experiences (F)

* I was [our institution's] first affirmative action officer! Developed [our] first affirmative action plan. Level of consciousness about equity issues has always been high. I teach several graduate law classes and members of NOLDE, use lots of literature, articles, journals and texts, attend seminars and workshops on law. (F)

APPENDIX D: FACILITATORS OF GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

7. Personal Interest and Experience (Continued)

* My own personal commitment to issues of gender, particularly as it relates to math and science instruction, has been a powerful motivator. (F)

* My own Ph.D. work on adult women students, connected classroom (F)

* Personally examining materials and books (F)

* Personal interest comes from 44 years of teaching preschool through higher education (F)

* My membership in organizations studying and supporting gender equity (AAUW, LWV, NOW, ACEI, etc.) (F)

* My observations as a supervisor of student teachers in our public schools (F)

* My husband's input as a public school administrator in research and testing (F)

* Awareness of the problem encountered; observations at all levels of schooling; working with student teachers (F)

* Personal and professional awareness of equity problems (F)

* My experiences with my three daughters and their male dominated environments (F)

* My own personal beliefs on the issue as well as [textbooks and professional literature] (F)

* Being a minority (of color) makes me sensitive to the issue of gender equity. (F)

* My passion for this issue and its power and influence in the lives of all people (F)

* Me. (F)

APPENDIX E

BARRIERS TO GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

APPENDIX E

BARRIERS TO GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

(Verbatim responses to Program Survey, Part B, Question 2 and Faculty Survey, Part V, Question 2)

(P=Program Survey; F=Faculty Survey)

1. Lack of Time/Overcrowded Curriculum

* Gender equity is only one issue among many issues that are addressed within the framework of [our program]. It probably takes a back seat to other pressing issues such as ethnicity and class differences. (P)

* Time required (P)

* Difficult to increase number of hours in program (P)

* Time, curriculum crowding (P)

* Because we are a small college, there is no room for any electives in our teacher education program. Consequently, all gender equity issues must be addressed within the content of other courses. At present, consideration of such issues is incorporated into [all required courses]. (P)

* Meeting university and state requirements for certification leaves no room for elective courses devoted to gender issues. (P)

* Time constraints (F)

* Time and amount of other material needed to be covered (F)

* There is so much to cover. Gender is only one area of issues I must address. My responsibility is to all groups and helping all kids learn. (F)

* We probably don't include more because of a tight curriculum. (F)

* Too many topics to be included (F)

* Lack of time in course curriculum (F)

* Time pressures (F)

* Too many other things I'm required to cover (F)

APPENDIX E: BARRIERS TO GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

1. Lack of Time/Overcrowded Curriculum (Continued)

* Time--trying to balance the million other important things in a methods course (F)

* So many issues to include, e.g., racial equity (F)

* Time factor; most of my time is spent in field experiences and weekly seminars. (F)

* Time (F)

* Time and amount of material presented in a course (F)

* It is a very important issue and one with which I am quite familiar, but other topics and issues have higher priority in courses with limited time. (F)

* Constraints of time, large volume of material to be covered (F)

* I wish I had the time to do more. (F)

* Time! (F)

* Time (F)

* Constraints of time are largely responsible; there are so many critical issues to be addressed in teacher education programs these days. (F)

* There's such a press of required material that in depth focus on an area such as gender issues gets squeezed out in significant ways. (F)

* Time; limited class time, pressure of other compelling needs, personal and professional development needs of other students (F)

* Because I teach reading in the content areas, it is difficult enough to cover each of the disciplines with the material I have to cover on topics that relate directly to reading instruction. (F)

* Lack of time (F)

* Time is the problem. We know what should be taught in depth, but few teacher education programs provide the time to teach! (F)

APPENDIX E: BARRIERS TO GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

1. Lack of Time/Overcrowded Curriculum (Continued)

* More time. The problem is the competing demands of the curriculum; gender is just one of many factors which pre-service students must recognize and deal with. (F)

* Takes time to rework text materials (F)

* Time! Time to teach the wide range of topics in 1993! (F)

2. Lack of Professional Resources

* [Few] convenient materials, including appropriate audio-visual material (P)

* The lack of good materials and resources has been the biggest barrier. (F)

* Lack of materials (F)

* As with anything, experience and training help with presentation; I've never had a workshop--or anything--in gender equity. (F)

* Lack of literature from historical and philosophical sources primarily written by or about female educators (F)

* Lack of concrete facts and information; lack of a framework to think about in looking at materials (F)

* Lack of support material (F)

* Lack of quality material which is clearly written, research based, and easily accessible (F)

* Lack of information in professional materials (F)

* Insufficient knowledge base (F)

* Lack of resources (F)

* [We need] statistics and comparisons of high school female students, broken down by age and race. (F)

3. Student Disinterest/Resistance

* Lack of student interest (P)

* Largely female student population (P)

APPENDIX E: BARRIERS TO GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

3. Student Disinterest/Resistance (Continued)

* Student resistance! I agree with pedagogical discussions of the pain and emotional involvement that inevitably are ignited. (F)

* Lack of student interest (F)

* Great resistance from both male and female students to become aware and look at the issue with something that resembles an open mind. Thus, they often don't do the reading or viewings, do not participate in discussions, frequently deny the issues exist. (F)

* Lack of interest on the part of students (F)

* Student resistance to the realities of gender inequity. Although my students are overwhelmingly female, they do not readily identify with the issues. Most have a decidedly anti-feminist orientation and tend to view advocates of gender equity as "radical." (F)

* My students are passive learners and have not been aroused by such issues. (F)

* Student attitudes (F)

* Lack of student interest (F)

* Apparent lack of interest on the part of students (F)

* I teach methods classes. Students are only interested in gender issues if they affect the instructional process in their classes. (F)

* Student resistance (F)

* From my perspective, I am "dealing with the enemy" from day one. These students are replications of teachers from their pasts, with all the gender baggage securely and comfortably in place. (F)

4. Lack of Program Goals/Overall Climate

* Lack of sense that the "real world" cares (P)

* Church policies (P)

* General apathy (P)

APPENDIX E: BARRIERS TO GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

4. Lack of Program Goals/Overall Climate (Continued)

* Harassment and fear (P)
* Not sufficient interest in the topic (P)
* Male administration (P)
* Few women professors on campus (P)
* In the secondary program, male professors are not as motivated to include this topic, and they're the majority. (P)
* An apparent lack of interest on the part of fellow educators, both male and female (F)
* Campus attitudes (F)
* Church attitudes (F)
* Apathy (F)
* Administrators (chairperson, deans) do not promote or encourage development of gender equity instruction. (F)
* I have been told by at least one male professor in this college and by two of my male students that I am making [gender equity] "too big a deal." The professor went on to say the topic is not relevant anymore. (F)
* Apparent lack of interest on the part of colleagues (F)
* If NCATE or NTE were to require such a focus, we'd address it more seriously and pervasively. (F)
* The current "accountability" of NCATE, etc., pressure helps shape curriculum, with a heavy emphasis on instructional research and practice available. Gender equity is seen as a peripheral aspect of any class. (F)
* No emphasis regarding this in our own education program (F)
* Not stressed in the curriculum (F)
* Male faculty members and students who view any discussion of gender equity issues pertaining to women and children as "male bashing." (F)
* Because I and my students are all female, [the topic] tends to be invisible to us. (F)

APPENDIX E: BARRIERS TO GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

5. Formal Requirements

* [Stronger accreditation standards] tend to become "paper rhetoric" in politically neutralized language! (F)

* Enforcing [testing, accreditation standards, faculty in-service development] is a mistake. Those who disagree will undermine the process; those who agree are doing it already. (F)

* This sort of enforcement of [testing, accreditation, formal program policies] might create a backlash. (F)

6. Lack of Personal Interest/Knowledge

* Lack of knowledge of the issues and specific data (F)

* We all like to think we don't have gender biases in the classroom. Probably we don't do more because we are not conscious of our biases and therefore don't have the will, the materials or the skills to include gender equity. (F)

* My own awareness of these issues did not come from my education courses; other information sources are there. I am less of an activist in this area because I didn't sense a personal need here. But I do think it should become included in our program. (F)

* Gender equity became an apparent problem after I left college. It just wasn't talked about. It's taken me awhile to become aware of discrepancies in equity. As I learn, I use the information to extend awareness to my students. (F)

* The [in]ability to keep current on everything (F)

* Probably because I'm male, I'm less sensitive. But I am very interested in two related areas: cultural role influences on the family, especially on women; and violence against women. . . I live in an inner city area and am particularly interested in the plight of black males. But I realize that the undervaluation of women by our culture is also a massive problem. (F)

* Lack of knowledge as to how important [the topic] might be or when and where to include it (F)

* Personally, this is not an area of interest or expertise, thus my presentation is limited. (F)

APPENDIX E: BARRIERS TO GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

6. Lack of Personal Interest/Knowledge (Continued)

* I need to do more reading, perhaps. Some of the 30 gender equity topics presented here had not previously occurred to me. (F)

* Perhaps because I have lived in families with gender equity and have not perceived my professional path to be blocked because of my femaleness, I have not focused on gender equity as much as on other societal inequities. (F)

* There are more important issues; it is not my topic. (F)

* Ignorance of available resources (F)

* My background, probably! (F)

* I'm not as well informed about gender bias in all the disciplines as I am about gender bias in literature and language instruction. I would need more specific information on each of the individual disciplines to cover gender bias with some confidence in fields other than my own. (F)

* I am one of four siblings--all male. (F)

* I've never thought of the other gender as being unequal to me. I've never treated women unequally or unfairly. I see them as my equal so it doesn't make a great deal of sense to stress how unequal they are, think they are, are believed to be by others, etc. It isn't something that is at the top of my consciousness. I am probably naive, but in my eyes women are equal to me and I am equal to them. Women who have a chip on their shoulder because I am a man do bother me; I am not going to react to them, however. I believe everyone should be equal according to our Constitution; that is the way I operate. So, in my classes I don't stress how poorly women are treated. I tell them they are equal and should demand being treated as such, period. It is their right--guaranteed right. (F)

7. Irrelevance of Gender Equity to Curriculum

* Lack of appropriateness to topical content (F)

* Some aspects of gender equity are conceptually more relevant to other courses in our professional sequence. (F)

* Topic not of interest to content under study at relevant points (F)

APPENDIX E: BARRIERS TO GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION

7. Irrelevance of Gender Equity to Curriculum (Continued)

* Courses cross all gender lines. (F)

* It is not a strong component, primarily because I think good teaching will facilitate learning in both males and females. (F)

* The nature of the content area of mastery; I would include this topic if I were teaching social foundations, methods, issues in education. (F)

* In my field the issue is acceptance of persons with disabilities--in many exceptionalities and male-dominated populations. (F)

* The nature of the classes I teach does not facilitate this. My classes all deal with using the computer in instruction. I do address gender inequity as part of the courses. (F)

* Most of my pre-service classes are skill-related and don't really open up for a lot of gender equity issues. (F)

* Perhaps I am unaware of the major gender issues. Since the one pre-service course I teach correlates with a field practicum, the course focuses exclusively on "how" to teach, i.e., methodology. It really is not designed to explore theoretical and philosophical viewpoints. Maybe this needs to be altered? (P)

8. Fear of Image/Perceived Image

* A fear of being viewed as a radical feminist and the put-downs and labeling that go along with it. Even girls themselves are socialized to believe they have no voice. (F)

* My fear is that my students, many of whom are male in secondary methods, will shut down because they feel I am biased. I try to present materials and issues in an objective manner--it is difficult. (F)

* Less favorable student evaluations; I'm perceived as biased against men. (F)

APPENDIX F

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

APPENDIX F

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

(Verbatim responses to Program Survey, Part B, Question 3 and Faculty Survey, Part V, Question 3)

(P=Program Survey, F=Faculty Survey)

1. Importance of Gender Equity Instruction

* Every pre-professional course should deal with gender issues. (P)

* Important issue for both genders (P)

* [Should be] a priority in our state. (P)

* I'm glad to see this interest! (F)

* [Gender equity] must be included throughout the teacher education program, as also must such similar issues related to ethnicity. (F)

* I hope [gender equity instruction] will be included, by requirement, in at least one course for college students. Male professors can and do, unconsciously, continue what is begun in high school. (F)

* [Gender equity instruction] is very much needed. (F)

* I strongly support the injection of gender equity issues into the teacher education programs. (F)

* We need more of it. (F)

* It should be a natural part of the coursework, not a separate topic. It should be reinforced in all classes as a logical part of the subject being studied. (F)

* A needed emphasis! (F)

* Gender equity instruction should be provided throughout undergraduate courses and in a separate course that is required. (F)

2. Topics Needing Emphasis

* I've been thinking that courses which provide for strong relationship building are helpful to most girls. My graduate women journals talk so much about not trusting, not believing in themselves. It's scary! (F)

APPENDIX F: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

2. Topics Needing Emphasis (Continued)

* Girls need to be given the opportunity to do well during their K-12 years so they have self-confidence to go into any academic field they choose in college and obtain a degree in that area. I obtained a Ph.D. a short ten years ago. At that time women talked about having the ability to get into Ph.D. programs but not being able to get out with a degree. This is a sad comment on society. (F)

* I believe that educators and parents should understand the importance of giving the child the "freedom to become." The freedom to become is a vital approach that facilitates the realization of true identity and happiness. (F)

* My emphasis is not just on equity. As a radical feminist, I disagree with the limited views for women sponsored by liberal feminists. I believe an examination of feminism is essential to enable women and men to break through the public backlash against advances for women. (F)

* As more research of K-12 manifestations becomes available, it allows us to present increased dimensions for concern, consideration, and action. (F)

* Most courses are too "technical/methodological." Issues of gender are often too categorical. More encompassing issues are human development and social justice. (F)

* I see the inequities, but I also see it as a two-way street. I don't like being disliked by blacks just because I'm white. I don't like being disliked by women simply because I'm a man. Gender equity education, in my estimate, should stress to women who are prejudiced against men just because they are men, that many men are on their side on the gender issue. I really haven't seen a great deal of fairness in this respect. I make a real effort to be very fair, and in the eyes of some women I'm still a chauvinistic pig. I think women harm their position by treating men who side with them like this. Gender equity education should point this out. (F)

* Some 95% of my students are female. If anything, we need to increase the number of males in education. (F)

* Although the issues and concerns reflected in this questionnaire are important, the instrument itself seems to me to ignore gender bias in [the direction of males]. Since some of my class discussions involve reflections on Patricia C. Sexton's work (schools as "feminine," a disadvantage for both sexes), this may explain my tentative or lukewarm responses to a number of items. (F)

APPENDIX F: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

3. Importance of Program Goals/Overall Climate

* We need guidelines or standards for integration into curriculum or policy, i.e., what content needs to be included to bring about expected outcomes in our students. (P)

* Should be standardized and formalized through accreditation agencies, state departments of education. (F)

* Here at our school we need much help! Harassment is ongoing and continuous. (F)

* [My course] is taken by many education majors to meet the multicultural course requirement for the university basic studies. I do see a change in the College of Education now that new faculty are teaching many of the general education courses. (F)

* The college where I teach does not take gender issues as being "important." Only because of accreditation does it get treated as section of a course, if at all. (F)

* We do a good job with pre-service introductory classes. More could be added in Methods and other courses. (F)

* I feel [gender equity instruction] is needed very much but provided and modeled throughout the program. (F)

* [Gender equity issues] have been an important problem especially in science, which is my area of specialization. However, I see changes in the attitudes of both men and women in my classes, quite apart from classroom instruction, which will influence their behavior. Such behaviors are a matter of socialization; true biases will be hard to eliminate. (F)

4. Need For Professional Resources

* I could use some research-based input and easily readable materials I could read and share with students. (F)

* I believe this is an important issue. However, I don't know the proper sources of accurate information. (F)

* Many instructors are unaware of the impact of gender bias and they think we've taken care of these issues. Therefore, awareness would be helpful. Also, guidance in terms of how to integrate issues such as these in courses where connections may not be obvious to instructors. (F)

APPENDIX F: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

4. Need for Professional Resources (Continued)

* Much is not done because of lack of awareness and lack of knowledge. Education is needed at all levels at the university. Individuals may be open to finding out more about these issues, but they do not know where to begin searching. I have shared some information with male members who have expressed an interest. I am hoping this will lead to a conversation within our College. (F)

* We as yet lack adequate developmental literature in the field for understanding gender sameness, differentiation, and variety. (F)

5. Other Concerns

* I feel that there are so many groups trying to gain equity. I hope that the different causes don't overwhelm people. As a teacher, one must be prepared to deal with gender as well as race, and maybe even religion. It's tough. (F)

* I don't think much about [gender equity]. Competent females model achievement and equity for their students. In the greater society, for K-12 students as well as college students, it is a problem of family values and church values. (F)

* If what happens in the college classroom is under control of students, the issue will be dealt with. (F)

* As a teacher and coordinator, I need to be mentor and counselor. Do I want to also be the feminist conscience from hell? Can I do both? How? (F)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of University Women (1989). Equitable treatment of girls and boys in the classroom. Washington, DC.

American Association of University Women (1992). The AAUW report: How schools shortchange girls. Washington, DC.

American Association of University Women (1993a). Creating a gender-fair federal education policy. Washington, DC.

American Association of University Women (1993b). Hostile Hallways: The AAUW survey of sexual harassment in America's schools. Washington, DC.

Antonucci, T. (1980). The need for female role models in education. In S. Biklen & M. Brannigan (Eds.), Women and educational leadership (pp. 64-89). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Baenninger, M., & Newcombe, N. (1989). The role of experience in spatial test performance: A meta-analysis. Sex Roles, 20, 327-344.

Banks, J. (1989). Integrating the curriculum with ethnic content: Approaches and guidelines. In J. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives (pp. 192-207). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Baumgartner-Papageorgiu, A. (1982). My daddy might have loved me: Student perceptions of differences between being male and being female. Denver, CO: University of Colorado.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, M. R. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books.

Best, R. (1983). We've all got scars: What boys and girls learn in elementary school. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Biklen, S. K., & Pollard, D. (Eds.). (1993). Gender and education. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. (1974). Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Brown, L. M. & Gilligan, C. (1992). Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology and girls' development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Campbell, P., & Greenberg, S. (1993). Equity issues in educational research methods. In S. K. Biklen & D. Pollard (Eds.), Gender and education (pp. 64-89). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Center research reveals how schools shortchange girls. (1992, Spring). Research Report, 11(2), Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

Chodorow, N. (1978). The reproduction of mothering. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cleary, T. A. (1991). Gender differences in aptitude and achievement test scores. In J. Pfleiderer (Ed.), Sex equity in educational opportunity, achievement, and testing: Proceedings of the 1991 ETS Conference (pp. 51-90). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Cornbleth, C. (1987). The persistence of myth in teacher education and teaching. In T. Popkewitz (Ed.), Critical studies in teacher education: Its folklore, theory and practice (pp. 186-210). London: Falmer.

Cronbach, L. (1970). Essentials of psychological testing (3rd ed.). New York: Harper and Row.

Davis, O. L., Ponder, G., Burlbaw, L, Garza-Lubeck, M., & Moss, A. (1986). A review of U.S. history textbooks. Education Digest, 52(3), 50-53.

Erikson, E. (1950). Childhood and society. New York: Norton.

Frazier, R. S., & Sadker, M. (1973). Sexism in school and society. New York: Harper & Row.

Freidus, H. (1990, April). The call of the sirens? The influence of gender in the decision to choose teaching as a career change. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 322 122)

Friedman, L. (1989). Mathematics and the gender gap: A meta-analysis of recent studies on sex differences in mathematical tasks. Review of Educational Research, 59, 185-213.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ginsburg, M., & Clift, R. (1990). The hidden curriculum of preservice teacher education. In W. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education: A project of the Association of Teacher Educators (pp. 450-465), New York: Macmillan.

Goodman, J. (1992). Feminist pedagogy as a foundation for reflective teacher education programs. In L. Valli, (Ed.), Reflective teacher education: Cases and critiques (pp. 174-186), Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Grand Rapids Public Schools (1991). Multicultural/gender-fair needs assessment. Grand Rapids, MI.

Grant, C., & Secada, W. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity. In W. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education: A project of the Association of Teacher Educators (pp. 403-422), New York: Macmillan.

Greenberg, S. (1985). Educational equity in early childhood education environments. In S. Klein (Ed.), Handbook for achieving sex equity through education (pp. 457-469). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hansot, E. (1993). Historical and contemporary views of gender and education. In S. K. Biklen & D. Pollard (Eds.), Gender and education (pp. 12-24). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Harvey, G. (1986). Finding reality among the myths. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 509-512.

Henington, M. (1981). Effect of intensive multicultural non-sexist instruction on secondary student teachers. Educational Research Quarterly, 6(1), 65-75.

Holmes Group (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI.

Howe, F. (1973). Introduction: The teacher and the women's movement. In N. Frazier & M. Sadker, Sexism in school and society. New York: Harper & Row.

Howe, F. (1979). The first decade of women's studies. Harvard Educational Review, 49, 413-421.

Jones, M. (1989a). Gender bias in classroom interactions. Contemporary Education, 60, 216-222.

Jones, M. (1989b). Gender issues in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(1), 33-38.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research (pp. 347-480). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). The philosophy of moral development. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Laird, S. (1988). Reforming "woman's true profession": A case for "feminist pedagogy" in teacher education? Harvard Educational Review, 58, 449-463.

Lambert, V., & Rohland, G. (1983, November). The feasibility of teaching about sex-role stereotyping in a pre-service teacher training setting: A pilot study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association Research/Special Interest Group: Women and Education, Tempe, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 242 606)

Lanier, J. & Little, J. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed., pp. 527-569). New York: Macmillan.

Lather, P. (1981). Reeducating educators: Sex equity in teacher education. Educational Horizons, 60, 38-40.

Lather, P. (1983). Feminism, teacher education and curricular change: Women's studies as counter-hegemonic work. Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 3182A-3183A. (University Microfilms No. 8401606)

Lather, P. (1984, April). Women's studies as counter-hegemonic work: The case of teacher education. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 246 036)

Lawton, M. (1993, April 28). Measures seek to insure equal opportunities for girls, boys. Education Week, p. 18.

Lerner, G. (1981). Teaching women's history. Washington, DC: American Historical Association.

Lockheed, M. (1984). Final report: A study of sex equity in classroom interaction. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Lockheed, M., & Harris, A. (1984). Cross-sex collaborative learning in elementary classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 21, 275-294.

Maher, F. A. & Rathbone, C. (1986). Teacher education and feminist theory: Some implications for practice. American Journal of Education, 94, 214-233.

Manicom, A. (1984). Feminist frameworks and teacher education. Journal of Education, 166, 77-88.

Martin, J. R. (1982). Excluding women from the educational realm. Harvard Educational Review, 52, 133-142.

Masland, S. (1992, October). Gender and ethnic awareness in teacher education. Paper presented at "Taking the Lead: Balancing the Educational Equation," conference co-sponsored by the California American Association of University Women and Mills College, Oakland, CA.

McCune, S., & Matthews, M. (1975a). Eliminating sexism: Teacher education and change. Journal of Teacher Education, 26, 294-300.

McCune, S., & Matthews, M. (1975b). Women's studies and teacher education: Actuality and potential. Journal of Teacher Education, 26, 340-344.

McIntosh, P. (1984). Interactive phases of curricular re-vision. In B. Spanier, A. Bloom, & D. Boroviak (Eds.), Toward a balanced curriculum (pp. 25-35). Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing.

McIntosh, P. (1989). Curricular re-vision: The new knowledge for a new age. In C. Pearson, D. Shavlik, & J. Touchton (Eds.), Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in higher education. New York: Macmillan.

McMillen, L. (1992, May 20). Looking at lives of ordinary people, 75 scholars in Europe and North America collaborate on a vast history of women. Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A1, A10.

Mercer, J. (1973). Labeling the mentally retarded. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Michigan State Board of Education (1990). Administrative rules governing the certification of Michigan teachers. Lansing, MI.

Michigan State Board of Education (1991a). The influence of gender-role socialization on student perceptions: A report based on data collected from Michigan public school students. Lansing, MI: Office for Sex Equity.

Michigan State Board of Education (1991b). Multicultural education in Michigan. Lansing, MI.

Michigan State Board of Education (1992). Proposed accreditation standards. Lansing, MI.

Mooney, C. (1993, March 10). Review of women's studies cites personalized learning as strength. Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A15, A18.

A nation at risk (1983). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Commission on Excellence in Education.

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (1979). Standards for accreditation of teacher education. Washington, DC.

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (1982). Standards for accreditation of teacher education. Washington, DC.

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (1990). Standards, procedures, and policies for the accreditation of professional education units. Washington, DC.

National Science Foundation (1990). Women and minorities in science and engineering. Washington, DC.

Nelson, C. (1990). Gender and the social studies: Training preservice secondary social studies teachers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 51, 730A-731A. (University Microfilms No. 9021339)

Nibbelink, W., Stockdale, S., & Mangru, M. (1986). Sex role assignments in elementary school mathematics textbooks. Arithmetic Teacher, 34(2), 19-21.

O'Reilly, P., & Frankel, J. (1982, October). Applying a theory of feminist psychology. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Midwest Association of Teachers of Educational Psychology. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 224 799)

Pallas, S. M., & Alexander, K. L. (1983). Sex differences in quantitative SAT performance: New evidence on the differential coursework hypothesis. American Educational Research Journal, 20, 165-182.

Powell, R., & Garcia, J. (1985). The portrayal of minorities and women in selected elementary science series. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 22, 519-533.

Purcell, P., & Stewart, L. (1990). Dick and Jane in 1989. Sex Roles, 22, 177-185.

Riley, L. (1993). "My worst nightmare": Wisconsin students' perceptions of being the other gender. Menomonie, WI: University of Wisconsin-Stout.

Rose, T., & Dunne, F. (1989). Gender equity for a new generation: Teacher educators can make a difference. Contemporary Education, 61, 29-31.

Rosser, P. (1989). The SAT gender gap. Washington, DC: Center for Women's Policy Studies.

Rutherford, F., & Ahlgren, A. (1989). Science for all Americans. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ryckman, D., & Peckham, P. (1987). Gender differences in attributions for success and failure situations across subject areas. Journal of Educational Research, 81, 123-124.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1980). Sexism in teacher education texts. Harvard Educational Review, 50, 36-46.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1981). The development and field trial of a non-sexist teacher education curriculum. High School Journal, 64, 331-336.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1982). Sex equity handbook for schools. New York: Longmans.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1985). The treatment of sex equity in teacher education. In S. Klein (Ed.), Handbook for achieving sex equity through education (pp. 145-161). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1986). Sexism in the classroom: From grade school to graduate school. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 512-515.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1991). Teachers, schools, and society (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1994). Failing at fairness: How America's schools cheat girls. New York: Scribner.

Sadker, M., Sadker, D., & Donald, M. (1989). Subtle sexism at school. Contemporary Education, 60, 204-212.

Sadker, M., Sadker, D., & Klein, S. (1991). The issue of gender in elementary and secondary education. In C. Grant (Ed.), Review of Research in Education, 17 (pp. 269-334). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Sadker, M., Sadker, D., & Steindam, S. (1989). Gender equity and educational reform. Educational Leadership, 46(6), 44-47.

Schuster, M., & Van Dyne, S. (1984). Stages of curriculum transformation. In M. Schuster & S. Van Dyne (Eds.), Women's place in the academy: Transforming the liberal arts curriculum (pp. 13-29). Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allanheld.

Scott, K., & Schau, C. (1985). Sex equity and sex bias in instructional materials. In S. Klein (Ed.), Handbook for achieving sex equity through education (pp. 218-260). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sexton, P. (1969). The feminized male: Classroom white-collars and the decline of manliness. New York: Random House.

Shakeshaft, C. (1986). A gender at risk. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 499-503.

Sleeter, C. (1993). Power and privilege in white middle-class feminist discussions of gender and education. In S. K. Biklen & D. Pollard (Eds.), Gender and education. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Smith, N., & Farina, R. (1984). Beneath the veneer of sex equity in education. Educational Considerations, 11(2), 29-33.

Smith, N., Greenlaw, M., & Scott, C. (1987). Making the literate environment equitable. Reading Teacher, 40, 400-407.

Solomon, B. M. (1985). In the company of educated women. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Stein, N. (1993). It happens here, too: Sexual harassment and child sexual abuse in elementary and secondary schools. In S. K. Biklen & D. Pollard (Eds.), Gender and education (pp. 191-203). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Stein, N., Marshall, N., & Tropp, L. (1993). Secrets in public: Sexual harassment in our schools. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

Stewart, L. (1992, March 27). Better training seen as solution: Colleges try improving qualifications. Detroit Free Press, pp. 1A, 13A.

Strober, M., & Tyack, D. (1980). Why do women teach and men manage? A report on research on schools. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 5, 494-503.

Stromquist, N. (1989, July). The state and gender equity in U.S. education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society, Cambridge, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 315 850)

Styer, S. (1982). Women's studies courses in teacher education. Chicago: Northeastern Illinois University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 218 262)

Style, E. (1992, October). Address presented at "Taking the Lead: Balancing the Educational Equation," conference co-sponsored by the California American Association of University Women and Mills College, Oakland, CA.

Talbot, M. (1987). A content analysis of social studies test materials using an example of feminist phase analysis. Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 2237A (University Microfilms, No. 3726111)

Tarbet, L. (1988). Feminist perspectives of teacher education reform. Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 3609A (University Microfilms, No. 8905730)

Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Tetreault, M. (1985). Feminist phase theory: An experience-derived evaluation model. Journal of Higher Education, 56, 363-384.

Tetreault, M. (1986a). Integrating women's history: The case of U.S. history high school textbooks. History Teacher, 19, 211-262.

Tetreault, M. (1986b). The journey from male-defined to gender-balanced education. Theory Into Practice, 25, 227-234.

Tetreault, M., Arch, E., & Kirschner, S. (1982, June). The inclusion of women and the conception of a discipline. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Women's Studies Association, Humboldt, CA.

Tetreault, M., & Schmuck, P. (1985). Equity, educational reform and gender. Issues in Education, 3, 45-67.

Thibault, G. (1988). Women and education: On being female in male places. In W. Tomm & G. Hamilton (Eds.), Gender bias in scholarship: The pervasive prejudice (pp. 63-98). Waterloo, Ontario: Laurier.

Tittle, C. (1985). Research on sex equity in education: An agenda for the divisions, SIGs, and AERA. Educational Researcher, 14(9), 10-18.

Titus, J. (1993). Gender messages in education foundations textbooks. Journal of Teacher Education, 44, 38-43.

Trecker, J. (1971). Women in U.S. history textbooks. Social Education, 35, 248-260.

Vogel, S. (1990). Gender differences in intelligence, language, visual-motor abilities, and academic achievement in students with learning disabilities: A review of the literature. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 23, 44-52.

Wilson, C. (1993, August). Gender equity components in preservice teacher education programs. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Coalition for Sex Equity in Education, Ann Arbor, MI.

Women on Words and Images (1972, 1975). Dick and Jane as victims: Sex stereotyping in children's readers. Princeton, NJ.

Woolever, R. (1981, November). Sex equity in teacher education. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, College and University Faculty Assembly, Detroit, MI. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 211 416)

Working toward equity: Cribs to classrooms (1987). Graduate Woman, 81(1), 1-2, 16-17.